HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, April 23, 1987*

The House met at 11 a.m.

Archbishop Mesrob Ashjian, prelate, Armenian Apostolic Church of America, New York, NY, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, amen.

Almighty God, Divine Leader of all nations, bestow Thy blessings on this Nation and this august body that they may be ennobled in the constant search for peace, freedom, and justice for all mankind.

We thank Thee in the name of the Armenian people for Thy eternal wisdom and divine mercy in providing them a safe refuge in these United States from the ravaging inhumanity of their enemies.

We beseech Thee on this day, to be mindful of the Armenian people who sorrowfully commemorate the 72d anniversary of the martyrdom of 1,500,000 Armenians in 1915. Mindful of Your teachings, we ask not for retribution or revenge but for repentance and redemption.

We pray that never again on this Earth will the horror of genocide afflict any of Thy children. Spare them the grief and anguish which we continue to suffer to this day.

Grant to all of the nations of mankind, the compassion and love which Thy Son offered to us through His sacrifice, that we may live freely with joy and happiness amidst all the glories of Thy creation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 304, nays 91, answered "present" 1, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—304

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Aspin
AuCoin
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Boggs
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Chappell
Cheney
Clarke
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conte
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dicks
Donnelly
Dornan (CA)
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gradison
Grant
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Herger
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Horton
Houghton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Latta
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken, Thomas
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McEwen
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Pashayan
Patterson
Pease
Perkins
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Rinaldo
Ritter
Robinson
Roe
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Scheuer
Schneider
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sweeney
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)

NAYS—91

Armey
Badham
Barton
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Brown (CO)
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Chandler
Clay
Coble
Coughlin
Craig
Dannemeyer
Daub
Davis (IL)
DeLay
Dickinson
Dreier
Emerson
Fields
Frenzel
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Goodling
Grandy
Gregg
Hawkins
Hefley
Henry
Hiler
Holloway
Hopkins
Hunter
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
Kolbe
Konnyu
Kyl
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lloyd
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lukens, Donald
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCandless
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Michel
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Moorhead
Parris
Penny
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Roukema
Schaefer
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Sikorski
Skeen
Slaughter (VA)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Solomon
Stump
Sundquist
Swindall
Thomas (CA)
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whittaker
Wolf
Wortley
Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bonker

NOT VOTING—37

Annunzio
Atkins
Bartlett
Bentley
Boland
Boulter
Collins
Conyers
Courter
Crane
Daniel
Davis (MI)
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Dorgan (ND)
Dymally
Frost
Gibbons
Guarini
Hatcher
Jones (TN)
Kemp
Leach (IA)
Leland
McDade
McKinney
Miller (CA)
Moody
Obey
Pepper
Rangel
Rodino
Saiki
Stangeland
Taylor
Wilson

□ 1120

Mr. MARTIN of New York changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 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.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 240. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Santa Fe Trail as a National Historic Trail.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will announce that on 1-minute speeches there will be only one before the business today. Other recognition will be postponed until the completion of business.

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

ARCHBISHOP MESROB ASHJIAN, PRELATE, ARMENIAN APOSTOLIC CHURCH OF AMERICA

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

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to welcome Archbishop Mesrob Ashjian, prelate of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America, and to introduce him to the Congress. The archbishop traveled here from New York City.

Archbishop Ashjian was born on January 3, 1941, in Beirut, Lebanon. At the age of 16 he was accepted into the Cilician Seminary in Antelias, Lebanon. He was ordained deacon in 1958.

Following his ordination as a celibate monk he received the name Mesrob in honor of the 1600th anniversary of the birth of Mesrob Mashdotz who established the Armenian alphabet.

Archbishop Ashjian continued his education at the Ecumenical Institute of Bossey, Switzerland, and received a masters of theology from the Princeton Theological Seminary in 1970. In October 1977 he was consecrated bishop and in December he was elected to his present position as prelate of the Armenian Apostolic Church of America, which serves the Armenian communities in the Eastern United States and Canada.

He was elevated to the rank of archbishop in June 1983, during the pontifical visit to the United States and Canada by Catholicos Karakin II, the religious leader of the Cilician See of the Armenian Apostolic Church.

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

□ 1130

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO SIT ON TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit at 11 today, Thursday, April 23, 1987, for the purpose of holding a hearing on H.R. 82—a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 to require vessels used to transport sewage sludge to be built in the United States.

The ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT] have been apprised of the hearing date and time and are in accord with this request.

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

There was no objection.

GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3, THE TRADE BILL, IN THE RULES COMMITTEE

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain the Rules Committee position on proposed amendments to the trade bill, H.R. 3.

The Rules Committee expects to meet on the trade bill on Monday April 27, of course I do not know now what sort of rule the committee will grant on the 27th, but Members should be advised, in case the committee grants a modified closed rule, all amendments must be submitted in advance of the committee meeting the committee asks that Members submit their amendments by 6 p.m., Friday, April 24. In the event we grant a modified close rule, it is the intention of the committee not to make in order any amendments submitted after the 6 p.m., April 24 deadline.

To assist Members interested in offering amendments, the Rules Committee is putting together a committee print. The various committees have reported their portions of the trade bill, and the Rules Committee print will represent our best estimate of what will be the original text for purposes of amendment. The Rules Committee print will be distributed to all Members and to all committees as soon as it is printed. Amendments should be drafted to page and line numbers as they appear in that committee print and should be submitted to the committee no later than 6 p.m., Friday, April 24.

Once again, I call Members attention to the April 24 deadline.

Mr. Speaker, I remind Members that the purposes of these guidelines is to provide fair and orderly consideration of the trade bill in the Rules Committee and on the floor. I have sent out a "Dear Colleague letter to all Members explaining these guidelines. I appreciate my colleagues' cooperation in this matter.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. For purposes of debate only, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the minority leader.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemam was having a little discussion with respect to the rule for the trade bill next week, and in my preliminary discussions with the Speaker, which I will resume again hopefully later on this afternoon to finalize our in-house agreement, it is my understanding of what the gentleman was saying that the Rules Committee must have in hand by 6 o'clock Friday, tomorrow, all those amendments that Members would like to have the Rules Committee consider when they meet Monday. is that not correct.

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell me whether or not the base bill which we are going to consider is actually in final form at this moment?

Mr. MOAKLEY. In answer to the gentleman, it is being printed now. It will be in the hands of the membership late this afternoon or very early tomorrow morning.

Mr. MICHEL. Well, I want to say again what kind of restriction this places on the minority. As a matter of fact the Gephardt amendment is not in final form, that we know of. It is going to be one of the more controversial amendments to be considered. It is not finalized, and we as the minority are supposed to respond to a comprehensive bill like this by 6 o'clock tomorrow night with amendments printed, substitutes, or whatever, in an effort to respond to what we may or may not like in the base bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. In answer to the gentleman, actually the minority and majority Members are in the same situation. Nobody has a copy of this bill, and as soon as it is available, all Members, both majority and minority, will receive it at the same time.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman to know that we are going to try to comply, because we know how strongly the Speaker feels

about deadlines, but to set this kind of tight deadline and then with no flexibility to get us up to this point where within 12 hours or 24 hours we have to come up to match a 900-page bill with clarifying amendments that every Member has a right and entitlement to frankly work his will, I have to really express my reservations about the kind of procedure.

We are going to try to comply, but it is going to be mighty, mighty difficult, and I just wish sometimes the members of the majority would have to experience what it is to be in the minority and to respond under that kind of a tight schedule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's reservation, and as I said, the statement was made today at this time in order that we could be as fair as possible given the parameters that both the minority and majority are under.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand the letter to which the gentleman referred, and I am somewhat dumbfounded by the date. It is April 9, and it just came to our attention today. Could the gentleman give us some explanation about this?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I am informed by my counsel that the date was a mistake. It went out yesterday; it was not held back for any purposes. Everybody got the letter at the same time. The date was erroneous.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is also important to point out, and I do not believe too many of the Members were listening to what the gentleman read in this letter, and to which the minority leader referred, that the Rules Committee is going to come up with a complete print. Is that not correct?

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LATTA. And the Rules Committee is going to provide that only amendments submitted by 6 o'clock tomorrow night, Friday, April 24, will be in order. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. MOAKLEY. As I said in my statement, I am not sure at this moment what type of rule there will be, but that is if we come up with the type of rule that allows these amendments, and my statement is only advisory at this time, and it is not binding, but it was just to give Members some idea of what is requested by the Rules Committee in the event that we come out with this type of rule.

□ 1140

Mr. LATTA. Last, those Members wishing to file amendments must file 35 copies of the amendments according to this letter.

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman from Ohio knows this is just normal procedure with the Rules Committee, that we request 35 copies whenever anybody gives any amendment to our committee.

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

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

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of understanding the Rules Committee guidelines, are we to assume that the Gephardt amendment, the so-called Gephardt amendment will be part of the body of the bill, and the only amendments, therefore, that would be necessary would be those to strike them, if we choose to do so? Or is there going to be an amendment as an addition to the bill?

Mr. MOAKLEY. The Gephardt amendment is going to be a separate part amendment and not part of the base text of the bill.

Mr. McGRATH. I thank the gentleman.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1987

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 148 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 148

Resolved, That all points of order for failure to comply with the provisions of sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344, as amended by Public Law 99-177), and with the provisions of clause 2(l)(3)(B) of rule XI, are hereby waived against the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1827) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes. During the consideration of the bill, all points of order against the bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI are hereby waived, except against the language beginning on page 52, line 3 through page 53, line 2. The following amendments shall be considered to have been adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole: (1) an amendment to strike out the paragraph beginning on line 5, page 32 through line 8; (2) an amendment to strike the colon on line 13, page 121 and all that follows up to the period on line 15; and (3) an amendment to strike the colon on line 8, page 123 and all that follows up to the period on line 10. No amendment which changes or affects the subject matter of either section 5 or 6 of chapter II of title I shall be in order in either the House or in the Committee of the Whole except amendments to strike each section, each said amendment to be debatable for not to exceed one hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a Member opposed thereto. Chapter IV of title I shall be considered as having been read, and no amendment which changes or affects the subject matter of said chapter shall be in order in either the House or in the Committee of the Whole except the amendments in the following order: (1) the amendments by Representative Edwards of Oklahoma, or his designee, printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, said amendments shall be considered en bloc, shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question, and shall be debatable for not to exceed sixty minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a Member opposed thereto; and (2) an amendment to strike out said chapter IV, said amendment to be debatable for not to exceed thirty minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a Member opposed thereto. It shall also be in order to consider the other amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, by and if offered by the Member designated, or his designee, each such amendment shall be debatable for not to exceed thirty minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a Member opposed thereto, and all points of order against each such amendment for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXI are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes, for the purposes of debate only, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 148 waives points of order against H.R. 1827, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987. As is customary during consideration of appropriations bills in the House, general debate on the bill will be governed by a unanimous-consent agreement.

This rule waives two provisions of the Budget Act against consideration of this supplemental appropriations bill. Section 302(f) of the Budget Act is waived against consideration of the bill. This section of the Budget Act prohibits consideration of measures that would cause appropriations subcommittee allocations, established pursuant to the budget resolution, to be breached.

The rule also waives section 311(a) of the Budget Act. This section of the Budget Act prohibits consideration of legislation which would cause the new budget authority or outlay ceilings established by the concurrent resolution on the budget for the current fiscal year to be exceeded.

Mr. Speaker, a supplemental appropriations bill is by definition a measure to respond to unanticipated and urgent funding requirements. These requirements were not anticipated in the drafting and consideration of the budget for this fiscal year. If we are to consider these urgent funding questions, therefore, it is necessary for us to waive these provisions of the

Budget Act. Moreover, I would note that a majority of the members of the Budget Committee do support these waivers due to the emergency nature of the funding at issue.

In addition to the waivers I have just discussed, Mr. Speaker, the rule waives clause 2(l)(3)(B) of rule XI against consideration of the bill. This rule requires that if the bill provides new budget authority that a statement required by section 308(a) of the Budget Act must accompany the bill. Since this statement was not provided by the Appropriations Committee, this rule must be waived if we are to take up this measure in a timely fashion.

This rule also waives clause 2 and clause 6 of rule XXI against all of the provisions of H.R. 1827 except those I will specify. These clauses of rule XXI prohibit unauthorized appropriations and reappropriations, respectively, in general appropriations bills. The only provisions which are not protected from points of order for possible violations of rule XXI are those found on page 52, line 3 through page 53, line 2. These provisions, which provide for certain investigations to be undertaken by the Secretary of Agriculture, are arguably within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and were therefore not protected by this waiver.

Three distinct amendments will be considered to have been adopted upon adoption of the rule. These so-called self-executing amendments are specified in the text of the rule. The first such amendment will strike the paragraph on page 32, lines 5 through 8. This paragraph would have repealed certain provisions adopted as part of last year's continuing resolution which provide for expedited congressional consideration of resolutions providing funding for Central America.

The second and third self-executing amendments strike similar language attached to two parts of the homeless assistance funding package found in title IV of the bill, on pages 121 and 123 of the bill. In both instances, the language restricted the availability of the amounts provided in the bill, totaling some $100 million, until released in a subsequent appropriations act. In the interest of insuring that this vital funding will be available at the earliest possible date, and without the need for further action by Congress, the rule will therefore provide for the elimination of these "fencing" provisions upon adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues are aware, there are two important arms control initiatives contained in this bill: A proposal to enter into a mutual and verifiable limited nuclear testing moratorium and a proposal to maintain the numerical sublimits of the SALT II Treaty until and unless the President certifies that the Soviets have breached these limits. This rule, Mr. Speaker, provides that no amendments may be offered to these arms limitation provisions, although a motion to strike each section will be in order. Each motion to strike, if offered, will be debatable for up to 1 hour, the time being equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the motion and a Member opposed thereto.

Next, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides special procedures for consideration of chapter IV of title I of the bill, the chapter which contains supplemental appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs. Under this rule an amendment is made in order to this chapter if offered by Representative EDWARDS of Oklahoma or his designee. The text of the Edwards amendment is printed in the report accompanying this rule, and if the amendment is offered it will be debatable for up to 1 hour, the time being equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a member opposed thereto. In addition to the Edwards amendment, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for a motion to strike the entire foreign affairs chapter. If such motion is offered, it is debatable for up to 30 minutes, the time being equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the motion and a member opposed thereto.

Other than the Edwards amendment and the motion to strike, Mr. Speaker, no other amendments or motions will be in order if offered to the foreign affairs chapter of the bill. It was the judgment of the Committee on Rules that this procedure would ensure an opportunity to consider a different funding mix for this part of the supplemental, as well as a complete elimination of the funding, without otherwise delaying timely completion of consideration of the supplemental appropriations bill.

In addition to the Edwards amendment to the foreign affairs chapter of the bill, the rule also specifically makes in order one other amendment. This amendment, to be offered by Representative MILLER of California or his designee, is printed in the report to accompany this rule and is debatable for up to 1 hour with the time being equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a member opposed thereto. The rule waives the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI against the Miller amendment. This clause of rule XXI, which prohibits consideration of provisions which change existing law in a general appropriations bill, is otherwise waived against the bill but must be separately waived against this amendment as well. The Miller amendment relates to the authorization of funds for the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program in California.

Mr. Speaker, it is urgent that we take up this supplemental appropriations bill. Over two-thirds of the funding in the bill, some $6.7 billion, is provided to compensate for losses incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation from various agricultural programs: $1.3 billion of the total is provided for defense. Over $500 million in urgent supplemental appropriations and transfers are provided for several Central American democracies. Critically important funding of over $400 million for homeless assistance, following House action on the authorization bill earlier this year, is provided in this bill. And as I have already noted, there are two compelling arms control issues which will be considered in the context of this legislation.

Overall, the supplemental would result in spending of approximately $2.2 billion over the spending ceiling set in the budget resolution for the current fiscal year. I would note, however, that this level of spending is some $1.1 billion below the President's supplemental request. As I have already noted, this bill provides for funding requirements that were not anticipated last year, but which it is urgent that we consider as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1827 is a fair rule, and one which will expedite the work of the House on this legislation. I urge adoption of the rule and yield to the gentleman from Ohio for purposes of debate only.

□ 1150

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

Mr. Speaker, the House should get on with this rule so that we can defeat this budget-busting supplemental appropriation bill. What we need, Mr. Speaker, is not a different rule. What we need is a different bill.

We need a bill which provides only necessary supplemental appropriations, not a bill loaded down with unnecessary extra spending and a lot of legislative provisions which are unrelated to necessary supplemental appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, in its request, the administration proposed supplemental appropriations that offset funding increases with reductions in lower priority programs. The President's net request for this bill was actually a reduction of about $350 million in budget authority. This bill includes none of the President's rescissions and proposes few offsets of any sort, thereby increasing budget authority by $6.6 billion above the administration request. The resultant $3 billion increase in fiscal year 1987 outlays is a major breach in the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings law.

Mr. Speaker, this bill includes two amendments that would undermine the credibility of our nuclear forces—on which the Western alliance must

rely for the foreseeable future to deter aggression—and seriously damage our ability to achieve arms control agreements providing for deep, equitable, and effectively verifiable reductions in Soviet and American nuclear arsenals. The proposed cutoff of funding for U.S. nuclear testing above 1 kiloton would preclude the very testing needed to maintain the safety, effectiveness, reliability, and survivability of our nuclear weapons. In addition, such a ban would not be effectively verifiable.

The proposal to mandate United States compliance with certain limitations in the SALT II Agreement—which the United States Senate refused to ratify, which would have expired had it been ratified, and which has been violated time after time by the Soviets—would send exactly the wrong message to Moscow. It would allow them to discard the limitations that constrained them the most, while perhaps choosing to stay within those that constrained the United States the most. And by writing into law parts of an agreement that has permitted, and would continue to permit, large increases in Soviet strategic forces, we would destroy the very foundation which could lead to real reductions that this administration has been working to establish.

The President told Congress, during his State of the Union Address on January 27, 1987 that:

> Enacting the Soviet negotiating position into American law would not be the way to win a good agreement. So I must tell you in this Congress I will veto any effort that undercuts our national security and our negotiating leverage.

These amendments would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also contains a number of objectionable provisions in the domestic area. For example, it would prohibit the use of funds to implement Executive Order 12564 relating to the drug testing of Federal workers.

It would provide $10 million for conducting a poll of farmers, analyzing farm programs, and measuring agricultural commodities in order to study mandatory production limitations. Returning to strong Federal controls offers no hope of providing relief to American farmers.

The bill would amend the Food Stamp Act to give a small minority of beneficiariess a windfall costing $365 million over fiscal years 1987-92. Although the provisions purport to aid the homeless, less than 2 percent of the increase would actually go to this segment of our population.

Mr. Speaker, now that I have described some of the reasons we need to defeat this bill, let me mention some of the provisions in the rule which provides for its consideration.

The first sentence in the rule waives the Budget Act, not once but twice. Section 311(a) of the Budget Act is waived because this bill is literally a budget buster. Even according to the figures cited by the chairman of the Budget Committee, this bill is approximately $2.265 billion over the ceiling for fiscal year 1987 budget authority set forth in the budget resolution for fiscal year 1987. Using more up to date economic assumptions, the bill is over the budget resolution by an amount far in excess of the $2.265 billion figure cited by the chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to requiring a budget waiver for exceeding the budget resolution spending ceiling, this bill requires a second budget act waiver because several Appropriations Committee subcommittees exceeded their allocations under the Budget Act.

Mr. Speaker, I should note that the majority members of the Budget Committtee had a little trouble making up its mind about whether to support these Budget Act waivers.

On the morning of April 20, the chairman of the Budget Committee wrote a letter to the chairman of the Rules Committee stating that, "A poll of members of the Budget Committee indicates that a majority would oppose waivers of sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Budget Act against consideration of H.R. 1827."

Then later in the same day apparently after some members of the Budget Committee had felt the leadership heat and saw the light. The chairman of the Budget Committee wrote a second letter reversing their earlier conclusion. The second letter states that "a poll of members of the Budget Committee indicates that a majority would support emergency waivers of sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Budget Act in order to permit consideration of H.R. 1827." All I can conclude is that there must be some aching arms among the Democrats on the Budget Committee today.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to waiving two sections of the Budget Act, the rule also waives a reporting requirement under rule XI, because the committee report fails to include a required statement.

Finally, the rule waives points of order against most provisions in the bill because they violate rules which prohibit unauthorized appropriations, legislation on appropriation bills, or reappropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the rule does not specify an amount of time for general debate. The Appropriations Committee will set that by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, the rule provides that three amendments will be considered to have been adopted when the rule is adopted. The first of these has been agreed to by both the Democratic and Republican leadership. It retains certain expedited procedures. The second and third allow the expenditures of certain funds for the homeless without having to go back through the appropriations process.

While amendments are in order to most parts of the bill, there are two areas where amendments are restricted.

First, the provision in the bill dealing with SALT II compliance and the provision dealing with a ban on nuclear testing will not be subject to amendment except one motion to strike each section. Each motion to strike is debatable for 1 hour.

The second area where amendments are restricted is chapter IV of title I, dealing with foreign assistance and related programs. No amendments will be in order to chapter IV except: First, an amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] which would redistribute the money to Central American democracies more in keeping with the administration's request; and second, an amendment to strike out chapter IV. The Edwards amendment would be debatable for 1 hour. The motion to strike would be debatable for 30 minutes.

One other amendment is specifically made in order and protected against a point of order which otherwise could be lodged against it. This is an amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. Speaker, I should note that there are other amendments which were requested to be made in order, but were excluded. The chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the ranking minority member of that committee had jointly requested an amendment to allow $20 million of the funds for the homeless in this bill to be used for homeless veterans. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee majority turned this worthwhile amendment down. I should note that funds under this amendment would have gone to veterans facilities in nine locations including Cleveland, OH. Mr. Speaker, this amendment should have been included.

Mr. Speaker, for all the reasons I have cited, we should adopt this rule so that we can proceed to defeat the bill it makes in order.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is a good example of everything that is wrong in this Congress. First of all, this rule is by definition allowing a budget buster.

It waives the Budget Act specifically. What it specifically waives is those

sections of the Budget Act that set numerical limits on spending.

Anyone who votes for this rule says that our commitments to the budget do not matter whatsoever. I am going to repeat that. Anyone who votes for this rule says that our commitments to the budget and the budget process do not matter whatsoever.

Another problem with this rule is that it is a closed rule. I do not care how many people want to describe it as giving the Members of the House a chance to do what we want. It does not do that.

This is not an open rule, and it goes in the tradition of this Congress so far, in the whole course of this session of Congress, we have had one open rule on the floor, so we have got another closed rule before us here today.

This speaker and this majority caucus are proceeding under a closed shop procedure. Democracy is a victim of this process and this procedure.

Once again we have it in this bill. House Members, we are being told, are not to be trusted. We might actually do what our constitutents want us to do. We might actually be fiscally responsible and live up to our commitments and our promises.

That cannot be countenanced so, therefore, every bill that comes out on the floor has to come out under a closed rule so the Speaker and the majority caucus can control what votes we take on the House floor.

That is terribly wrong, and it is high time that we get some changes.

The Rules Committee ought to be embarrassed to bring rule after rule out that does not allow this House to work its will.

Finally, this rule is another example of what is going wrong with the economy in this country. Big-spending liberals in this Congress are creating major economic problems.

Every month since this Congress has been in session, we have had inflation go up. Why? Because of bills and rules just like this one.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, once again our friends from the Appropriations Committee have done what we think is an attempt at legislating on an appropriations bill.

There is some discussion as to whether it actually is, or it is not, because of some craftily written language.

Nonetheless, I appeared before the Rules Committee, and I asked that a waiver not be granted. The Rules Committee acceded to our request.

Therefore, they were very gracious, and I feel that we must support, and I will support, the rule.

I will withhold my decision as to the vote on final passage after discussions during the general debate on this and other issues.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the bill and the rule. This supplemental appropriations bill represents the liberal Democrats at their worst.

In this one bill the liberal Democrats block drug testing, punish America's allies in Central America, and give money to Communist governments in Africa and to other governments but consistently vote against the United States in the United Nations. Furthermore, in this bill the liberal Democrats unilaterally cripple America's defenses.

This week the liberal Democrats reward the Soviets for corrupting our marine guards, and bugging our Embassy by offering to give the Soviets a victory in disarming America here in the United States House of Representatives.

In addition, this bill by spending too much money guarantees an increase in interest rates, makes more likely a recession, and kills jobs in America.

Finally, the bill simply has many flaws. Over the last few years, the Appropriations Committee has more and more decided to bury its pork somewhere in this kind of a bill.

Let me say flatly, the reason we have got the rule that was written today is because the liberal Democratic leadership of this House knows they could not bring this bill to the floor with an open rule and have it survive.

They cannot allow their Members to be forced to vote out in the open for item after item of pork barrel spending, for disarming America, for putting our allies at a disadvantage for helping the United States, and for giving aid to Communist governments that are consistently voting against the United States.

Therefore, we structure a rule to protect the Members by in effect having all congressional government occur in committees.

I think every Member who believes individual Members should be responsible should vote to defeat this rule. I think every Member who wants to create jobs instead of kill them should vote against this rule. I think that every American who wants to see us stand up to the Russians should vote against this rule, because this bill in its current form weakens America unilaterally, cripples us in our relationship with our allies, and is essentially the worst of everything that was defeated in 1984.

It is a classical liberal Democratic bill.

□ 1210

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise with regret but resolutely to oppose this rule. I voted for most of the rules that the Rules Committee has put before us on appropriations bills, on supplementals, and we have often had to vote to waive technical problems with the Budget Act. But this rule waives the essence of the Budget Act. The limit on overall spending, on overall budget authority for fiscal 1987.

We just voted for a budget a couple of weeks ago, and we told the American people that we were going to deliver on that budget. Yet, today shortly thereafter, we are being asked for the fiscal year that we are in now to waive that very control that exists because of that budget resolution.

I cannot, in good conscience, support that, nor do I think that it should have support. The Appropriations Committee has a difficult job to do, but it is a job that I think we have a right to expect. The funds in this supplemental, much of the funding here is required. It can be found in the $600 billion of Government spending that is under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee. We have a right to expect that they will come to the floor with the necessary transfers to do the job.

I think that that is what the Appropriations Committee should be bringing us and I think the Rules Committee should insist on it. By bringing us a rule that waives the Budget Act, that waives the spending limit and allows an expenditure of $2.26 billion over the budget, we are doing ourselves and the country a disservice.

I would hope that my colleagues would join me, not to vote technically on a budget waiver issue, but to vote on the substance. Sections 302(a) and 302(b) are our tools to ultimately enforce the budget and to ask the Appropriations Committee to do the hard job of making the choices.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule as I also oppose the bill. There are many reasons to vote against this rule, and they will be enumerated. I would like to focus attention on only one.

This rule protects the committee's prohibition of expenditures by the Department of Transportation of funds to study the privatization of Amtrak. Privatization is an important safety valve that we should avail ourselves of if we are going to do that hard business of cutting spending and achieving budget balance. We must have privatization as an alternative and it must be studied on every possible occasion. To prohibit the very study of this important subject by this bill is unacceptable, and for that reason, I urge everybody to vote "no" on the rule; vote "no" on the bill.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

Mr. Speaker, I just heard some comments about pork barrel again and Congress attempting to go beyond the Budget Act in an attempt to provide pork-barrel programs for communities and this part of the country.

I would like to say when we say $1 trillion for star wars, it is "Statesmanship." When it is millions of dollars for Contra aid, it is "National Security." When it is money for foreign aid, it is "Diplomacy." But when it is money for bridges and for roads and for American workers, it is "Pork Barrel." I am tired of that.

I think we should tell it like it is. If we had an open rule every time we come to the floor, the way we operate down here, we would not pass one piece of legislation. That Rules Committee has to ferret through the opinions of many Members and come out with a rule. Now, it is not the best rule, but I am going to support it. I am going to support very fervently the Dyson amendment.

I have a flight-service program in my district, my airport, Youngstown Municipal Airport, that actually went to court to keep it open years ago, and unless we pass this Dyson amendment, I will not have a shot to keep it open.

Now, with the fog, the snow, and the inclement weather in the Great Lakes area, how in God's name can Congress continue to make our skies more dangerous? We are starting to cut off our nose to spite our face with this Gramm-Rudman rhetoric garbage, and we are letting American fall apart.

I am for the rule. I commend the Rules Committee for making some tough decisions. Let us start getting down to some business here in the House that actually trickles down to people in our communities.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule for a number of reasons. Now, I acknowledge that there is a need for an urgent supplemental appropriations bill; in the Commodity Credit Corporation area; perhaps for the Papal visit we have coming up. But, there are some limitations in the bill.

We have had a request from the administration, although that request also, was far too much, in my opinion, for an urgent supplemental. But there are so many problems with the rule and with the bill, and I think the wisest thing to do today would be to defeat the rule at the beginning for a variety of reasons.

No. 1, we could save time; we would not go through this whole exercise today and perhaps have it even fall over into next week, and then have to go to the Senate and who knows when they will act? In this form, it would surely be vetoed and the veto would be sustained.

I am convinced that the Appropriations Committee could come back very quickly, probably early next week, with a truly urgent supplemental appropriations bill that would address those areas where we have a real need. I acknowledge up front that there are some areas that I do support in terms of trying to get some urgent supplemental appropriations.

The problem with the rule itself is that it is a continuation of what we have been dealing with all year.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic in this year of our Constitution's bicentennial that we, the people's representatives, are being increasingly denied participation in making the law. And yet, that's just what these restrictive rules do. They restrict the right of the duly elected representatives of the people to offer amendments to legislation. So far in this historic 100th Congress, the Rules Committee has reported three closed rules, two modified closed rules, and one open rule. Today's rule is therefore the sixth restrictive rule out of seven reported.

Put another way, 86 percent of the time rules have denied Members full and open participation in the legislative process—and that's not counting the numerous bills considered under the suspension and unanimous consent procedures which also prohibit amendments.

By contrast, in the first session of the last Congress, six of the eight rules reported by this date were open rules, and only two were restrictive—one closed and one modified closed rule. In other words, whereas in this Congress 86 percent of the rules have been restrictive, in the last Congress at this time only 25 percent were restrictive. If this isn't cause for concern and alarm, I don't know what is, unless we're aiming for a Congress of robots.

Mr. Speaker, this tendency toward shutting Members out of the amendment process is not new under your reign, though the rate is significantly more alarming. It has been an evolutionary trend toward restrictive rules. In the 95th Congress, only 12 percent of the rules were restrictive; in the 96th Congress it was 19 percent; in the 97th it was 20 percent; in the 98th Congress it was 28 percent; and in the 99th Congress it was 36 percent.

This is also the first time in my memory that we have shut down an entire chapter of a general supplemental to all amendments except one motion to strike the entire chapter—and especially a chapter as important as the foreign aid chapter on which several Members were interested in offering specific amendments. This is just one more indication that in our constitutional bicentennial, the people's representatives are losing increasing control over the pursestrings—probably the most important power given to us under the Constitution. This is just one more important reason to defeat this rule.

When I first came to this city some 20 years ago we did not have all these closed rules. Back then, the only thing that ever came to the floor—that was really a closed rule—was a bill out of the Ways and Means Committee; and that was when Wilbur Mills asked for one on a tax bill for fear it would open up the entire Tax Code and it would have impacts that we did not expect. But we did not have a closed rule on everything that came to the floor.

It may come as a shock to some that the Appropriation Committee needn't come to the Rules Committee if its bills conform to House rules. They are one of the few committees that has privileged access to the floor. But when provisions in an appropriations bill transgress House rules, they must either get protection from the Rules Committee or take chances on the floor with points of order.

The real thing that we should be doing is not even have appropriations go to the Rules Committee; just bring them straight to the floor. One thing that was really curious to me about this bill is that in spite of a large request for rescissions it does not approve any of the 73 new rescission proposals totaling $5.8 billion that the President submitted to Congress as part of an overall effort to achieve the deficit reduction goals of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. There is not one nickel in here for any rescissions. None.

Surely, there were some areas last year where we passed some legislation that maybe a recission would have been in order. But let us talk about the rule itself.

First of all, it waives the fact that it exceeds our own budget resolution of last year. We make these great speeches on the floor about how we need a budget resolution and how we are

going to comply with them and we are going to have reconciliation and we come right along with a supplemental appropriation the first part of each year that undoes it completely.

I have here in my hand a letter from the chairman of the Budget Committee, and he acknowledges right here that it exceeds by $2.265 billion our own budget resolution. Well, we waived that; that was last year's budget resolution, so we just waive it.

Then we also waive the Gramm-Rudman requirements. We waived points of order on legislation. I admit again that some of this legislation is in there, legislating on appropriations, because there is an emergency. But if you look through the bill itself and mark the portions that are legislation on appropriations bills, if you marked it in red, it would look like a bloody river.

Mr. Speaker, here we have a supplemental appropriations bill that is replete with legislation in an appropriations bill. So, anytime you not only appropriate, but legislate.

We should not have all of these waivers. The one that really bothers me in particular is the so-called foreign aid section. The administration, in my opinion, asks for too much in foreign aid. So I do not blame the committee for reducing it. They reduced it from about $1.1 billion down to about $650 million. But then the subcommittee not only did they reduce it, they completely reworked the priorities.

In Central America, they took money from El Salvador and Honduras and they put it down in Costa Rica. They just shipped it all around, all over the world.

□ 1220

Well, I guess maybe the committee has that authority, but then they come in and say, "We don't want you guys on the House floor messing with our section. You guys shouldn't be able to offer an amendment to change those priorities, except that we will make in order an amendment by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS], one amendment, to change the priorities back on Central America."

He does not even want to offer that amendment.

At least they give us a chance to strike the entire section and I think that is exactly what we ought to do. We ought to strike the entire foreign aid section, because the priorities are wrong. The way it is being handled is that we cannot offer amendments when it involves Mozambique or Zimbabwe, those are all precluded.

So I do not understand why the chairman of that subcommittee came in and said, "Here is what we have done. We have completely reworked it and you can't even offer amendments."

The Rules Committee, to my absolute astonishment, went along with it, even though members on both sides of the aisle in the Rules Committee said, "Hey, we shouldn't be saying there can't be any amendments to this section."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. So the foreign aid section in particular is a problem, and then there is the arms control issue. Why are we doing this? We are going to have to go through this act again in the DOD authorization program. Everybody knows that. So why do we have this in a supplemental appropriation?

Now, oh, yes, we are given an opportunity to have 1 hour of debate and a vote perhaps on those two arms control matters, but at a time when it looks like we have the greatest opportunity in years, maybe ever, to get real legitimate arms control, the House of Representatives, the Congress, is going to tell the President, "You can't have testing above a certain level," while that is an issue that is specifically being discussed by the negotiators and the Congress, 535 of us, we are going to get into saying when treaties are going to be enforced or not, or what the negotiations are going to be.

How irresponsible can that be? Yet that is in this bill. At least under the rule we get a chance to perhaps have a separate vote on it.

But, Mr. Speaker, in spite of a diligent effort on the part of the Rules Committee, we just should not have these kinds of rules. We should vote against the rule. We should vote against the supplemental appropriation. In my opinion we should not have supplemental appropriations at all. It is an omnibus spending bill. I would urge defeat of the rule, and failing that, defeat of the bill on final passage.

OPEN AND RESTRICTIVE RULES, 95TH–100TH CONGRESS [1]

Congress	Open rules		Restrictive rules		Total rules
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
95th	213	88	28	12	241
96th	161	81	37	19	198
97th	90	80	22	20	112
98th	105	72	40	28	145
99th	65	64	36	36	101
100th [2]	1	14	6	86	7

[1] Source for data: Survey of Activities of the House Committee on Rules (Reports by the Committee on Rules), 95th–99th Congress. Rules counted were those providing for the initial consideration of legislation (as opposed to special rules on conference reports, etc.) For the purposes of this table, restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules.

[2] Data for the 100th Congress is based on "Notice(s) of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 100th Congress, as of April 22, 1987.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot of debate this morning in reference to this rule on the supplemental appropriations bill. It never ceases to amaze me when my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle are inclined to completely ignore what their President has requested.

The supplemental appropriations bill which we will consider later in the day is $1.1 billion less than the President's request.

Now, for all their histrionics and arm waving about overspending, Mr. Speaker, on the opposite side of the aisle we are spending less money than your President requested us to spend.

Now, I am certain when it is all over we will be criticized for taxing and spending, and yet the fact of the matter is that we have not only met the obligation the President sent down here in terms of spending, we have gone further in cutting. We have cut spending.

How many Members on both sides of the aisle voted for such things as our farm program and now come in and criticize efforts to pay for the very program we voted for?

Mr. Speaker, it is tantamount to signing a mortgage agreement and then refusing to make the monthly payments. The payments being made to the Commodity Credit Corporation are required under law. They are $6.7 billion out of $11.3 billion, far more than half of this supplemental appropriation going to the Commodity Credit Corporation. And what do we hear? We hear from the gentleman from Mississippi on the Republican side of the aisle that we should vote down this entire spending bill.

I would ask the gentleman, what would we say to those farmers who signed their contracts in good faith with the law extant in the United States? That we are not going to honor our commitment to that program?

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

Mr. DURBIN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman has put the question to me, I have got to respond to a couple things that the gentleman said.

First of all, we in the House have been saying that deficits do matter and we are trying to cut back on the deficits and show restraint.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I have to say for me, and I think the gentleman

from Illinois, too, that just because the President asked for it and asked for more than he should have, that should not control us. I am not giving him any accolades on this supplemental appropriation. I think it was excessive.

Mr. DURBIN. Then I commend the gentleman on his balanced approach.

Mr. LOTT. But I think the Congress, the House, ought to show some restraint here.

Mr. DURBIN. I commend the gentleman for his balance and fairness.

I would say that once we have passed the farm program, once we have made our commitment, then we certainly cannot welsh on that agreement. We cannot walk away from farmers across this country who have made their plans accordingly. If we choose to change the law to reduce the cost, that is one thing.

Mr. LOTT. I think we should.

Mr. DURBIN. But when the laws are on the books, let us honor our commitment.

Mr. LOTT. I think we should honor our commitment.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me reclaim my time.

Mr. LOTT. Let me respond to the CCC question.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me reclaim my time. I will let the gentleman speak at the conclusion of my remarks.

I might also say that the President's request for more than $1 billion in foreign aid has been considered by this Appropriations Committee and as the gentleman acknowledged, reduced by almost half. That suggests to me that this Appropriation Committee is attempting to meet its obligation.

Now, the gentleman may quibble with our priorities, but the fact is that our bill is $1.1 billion below the President. If the President's supplemental had been before this House of Representatives, we would have been forced to waive the Budget Act. There would have been no alternative. The gentleman has to concede that point.

To come today and suggest that what we are doing is a radical departure and somehow inconsistent from meeting the budget goals I think is to turn a deaf ear to what the President has been saying from his own White House pulpit.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is $2.2 billion over our own budget resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. And how far was the President's request over our own budget resolution?

Mr. LOTT. With the rescissions that he asked for, it would have been under it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, if you include the rescissions in the President's bill, the President is $150 million under and there are no rescissions in this bill.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Sepaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman in the well for his comments and point out that OMB was threatening this supplemental when it came before the full committee, in part because we did no give them enough money in foreign aid.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Illinois simply could not be more wrong. The fact is that he is talking about the agricultural section of this bill and our interest in the Agriculture Committee in supporting the farm bill of 1985. Yes; exactly, we would like to support the farm bill. That is why we are against this supplemental, because everyone knows that this supplemental is, No. 1, going to be vetoed, and it ought to be vetoed, and, No. 2, that the $6.6 billion for the Commodity Credit Corporation is going to be lost in the process. Why? Because the Appropriations Committee is trying to rewrite the 1985 farm bill.

Take a look at page 77 of your report, and see what is there. It instructs the Secretary of Agriculture through three different studies to find ways, No. 1, by a national referendum to impose mandatory supply management; No. 2, by a study to find out exactly how much we have to cut back on the production of each commodity; and No. 3, to find out exactly what rules and regulations have to be changed so we can impose mandatory supply management.

What is in this bill? This bill not only is unilateral disarmament for the United States in the midst of arms control talks, but also is unilateral retreat in the face of world agricultural competition. From 1983 to 1985, we lost 12 percent of our market in grains. We lost 8 percent of our world market in wheat.

What we did in the 1985 farm bill was to try to find ways to get these markets back.

Now as we go into a new round of GATT talks, what is this supplemental appropriations bill going to do? It is going to call on the U.S. Department of Agriculture to unilaterally cut back our production.

Do you think that is going to raise our prices? No. Every Third World country in the world today, not only the developed countries, but the Third World countries are exporting agricultural products. If you think unilateral action by us will help our farmers, you have got it all wrong.

The supplemental appropriations bill has got it all wrong. That is why as the Democratic chairman, the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee said, we ought to take a good look at this section. I believe we ought to go further than that. We ought to defeat the bill.

□ 1230

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I shall not participate a whole lot in the general debate. I think that it has been clearly shown on our side of the aisle that it is necessary that we move ahead. A number of items here are absolutely necessary. With regard to others it is believed on our side that if we take this action we will push people into going ahead and reaching agreements where they have been dragging it out, in our opinion. Others think that they will agree if we do not do this.

I rise here just to point out and correct some misinformation that has been given. I have before me, and may I say that when we get into general debate I shall discuss many things in this bill, but at this point I would just like Members to realize that our committee in connection with agriculture has done what I think is a minimum of what we are charged with doing here.

In the national press—and I will read the titles of these stories; as a former district attorney I never have believed in putting in print what amounts to a charge without the other person or the person involved having the right to answer, so I shall not give the details in these matters—but here are the titles of several articles that have appeared over the United States: "Farm Payment Abuses May Exceed $2 Billion," "Foreigners Get U.S. Farm Subsidies," "* * * Interests Received $728 Million in Subsidies," "Loophole Allows Extra Farm Subsidies."

The facts are that the 1985 act provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall determine the definition of "persons." So far as I have been able to determine, he never has made any such decision. The gist of these articles is that people by dividing their property between any number of people have doubled and tripled the amount of checks from the Government.

I have a number of letters here from a whole lot of organizations which have "agriculture" in their title. But you look and you see that there are those branches which would like to buy their raw materials below cost of production.

Now the fallacy of the 1985 farm bill is that the farmer only shall sell below the cost of production so that the

buyers will have the benefits, and he will have to look to check from the Government. Now these agencies and departments who oppose the provision that I have here, look at them, every last one of them would hold their hands up in holy horror if you asked them to sell below the cost of production and look to the Government for a check.

So may I say that with all these charges here, and may I say that I have tried, I cannot find whether the Secretary of Agriculture ever made a determination of what "person" means, not to go into the question of whether he should have had that authority to start with. So we have asked what? We do not ask for indictment, we do not ask for investigation by the Department of Justice, we ask the Department itself to review these charges that have been in the papers.

May I say that the question has been raised, Are we exceeding our authority? I point out in Cannon's Procedures, and I read—this is on page 26:

INVESTIGATIONS BY AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

There shall be established at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word—

And numerous precedents upholding this.

So let me repeat again: Where the press has carried all these stories which may or may not be true, we have asked in view of that that the Department itself investigate the accuracy of these stories and make recommendations.

Now reference has been made to the report. That is advisory only, but it should be followed. That is to let the farmers themselves decide what we ought to do. It has worked in times past. I say as chairman of the committee that they should do it, because it is a proven and tried way. But it is not binding as a matter of law. If it were in the bill, it would be subject to a point of order.

So I say again, Members should not be misled on this. But I will say that if Members vote against what we have here, they are endorsing what the press says has happened. I think that the least we can do at this stage is to ask the Department itself to investigate these charges which at best prove some faulty handling on the part of the Department.

I say again, it needs to be done, it is authorized, and I trust that Members will not be caught voting against our efforts to clean this matter up.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a freshman, I came here 4 months ago with certain expectations—not that my views would frequently prevail, but at least that the rules would be fair and right. I have been disappointed.

Every schoolchild learns about "points of order"—to stop someone from doing what they should not do.

What message do we send to the people who elected us when we adopt a rule that reads: "* * * all points of order for failure to comply with [the Budget Act] are hereby waived * * *"

Why do we have a law requiring that we stick to a budget if we willy-nilly waive it?

The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 as amended by Gramm-Rudman-Hollings states in section 311 that neither the House nor the Senate may consider proposals subsequent to the current fiscal year budget resolution that would cause the total budget authority or total outlay levels set in the resolution to be exceeded.

We cannot even say under this rule, "Wait, Mr. Speaker, our action is not in order. It violates the law." How do we explain this to the taxpayers of this country?

We should not adopt a rule that prevents us from even raising a point of order that we would be violating the law if we passed the bill.

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACKAY].

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise in opposition to this rule. I say reluctantly because I do not like to oppose rules, and I particularly do not like to oppose open rules.

However, I do oppose this rule because it waives the Budget Act, and these waivers are not merely for technical provisions of the Budget Act, they waive the budget ceiling on total budget authority.

By any measure, this bill busts the budget. By supporting this rule containing waivers of that budget ceiling, we will be vitiating last year's budget resolution. And we will be doing so just days after passing the budget for this year.

So soon after saying "we really mean it" for fiscal year 1988, I cannot support a rule which says "we didn't mean it" for fiscal year 1987.

If this rule is adopted, I intend to offer an amendment to reduce the discretionary budget authority across the board to bring it into compliance with the fiscal year 1987 budget resolution. That such an amendment will require a 22-percent reduction is testimony to just how much this bill busts the budget.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 191, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—222

Ackerman	English	Lowry (WA)
Akaka	Erdreich	Luken, Thomas
Alexander	Espy	Manton
Anderson	Evans	Markey
Andrews	Fascell	Martinez
Anthony	Fazio	Matsui
Applegate	Feighan	Mavroules
Aspin	Flake	Mazzoli
Atkins	Flippo	McCloskey
AuCoin	Florio	McCurdy
Barnard	Foglietta	McHugh
Beilenson	Foley	McMillen (MD)
Bennett	Ford (MI)	Mfume
Berman	Ford (TN)	Mica
Bevill	Frank	Miller (CA)
Biaggi	Frost	Mineta
Bilbray	Garcia	Moakley
Boggs	Gaydos	Mollohan
Boland	Gejdenson	Moody
Boner (TN)	Gephardt	Morella
Bonior (MI)	Gibbons	Mrazek
Bonker	Glickman	Murphy
Borski	Gonzalez	Murtha
Bosco	Gordon	Nagle
Boucher	Grant	Natcher
Boxer	Gray (IL)	Neal
Brennan	Guarini	Nelson
Brooks	Hall (OH)	Nichols
Brown (CA)	Hawkins	Nowak
Bruce	Hayes (IL)	Oakar
Bryant	Hayes (LA)	Oberstar
Bustamante	Hefner	Obey
Byron	Hertel	Ortiz
Campbell	Hochbrueckner	Owens (NY)
Cardin	Howard	Owens (UT)
Carr	Hoyer	Panetta
Chapman	Hubbard	Pease
Chappell	Huckaby	Perkins
Clarke	Jacobs	Pickett
Clay	Jenkins	Pickle
Coelho	Johnson (SD)	Price (IL)
Coleman (TX)	Jones (NC)	Quillen
Conyers	Jontz	Rahall
Cooper	Kanjorski	Rangel
Coyne	Kaptur	Richardson
Crockett	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Darden	Kennedy	Roe
de la Garza	Kennelly	Rose
DeFazio	Kildee	Rostenkowski
Dellums	Kleczka	Roybal
Derrick	Kolter	Russo
Dicks	Kostmayer	Sabo
Dingell	LaFalce	Savage
Dixon	Lantos	Sawyer
Donnelly	Leath (TX)	Scheuer
Dowdy	Lehman (CA)	Schroeder
Downey	Lehman (FL)	Schumer
Durbin	Leland	Sharp
Dwyer	Levin (MI)	Sikorski
Dymally	Levine (CA)	Skaggs
Dyson	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Early	Lipinski	Smith (FL)
Eckart	Livingston	Smith (IA)
Edwards (CA)	Lloyd	Solarz

Spratt	Torricelli	Waxman
St Germain	Towns	Weiss
Stallings	Traficant	Wheat
Stokes	Traxler	Whitten
Studds	Udall	Williams
Swift	Valentine	Wise
Synar	Vento	Wolpe
Tallon	Volkmer	Wyden
Tauzin	Walgren	Yates
Torres	Watkins	Yatron

NAYS—191

Archer	Hastert	Ray
Armey	Hefley	Regula
Badham	Henry	Rhodes
Baker	Herger	Ridge
Ballenger	Hiler	Rinaldo
Barton	Holloway	Ritter
Bateman	Hopkins	Roberts
Bates	Horton	Robinson
Bentley	Houghton	Roemer
Bereuter	Hughes	Rogers
Bilirakis	Hunter	Roth
Bliley	Hutto	Rowland (CT)
Boehlert	Hyde	Rowland (GA)
Broomfield	Inhofe	Saiki
Brown (CO)	Ireland	Saxton
Buechner	Jeffords	Schaefer
Bunning	Johnson (CT)	Schneider
Burton	Kasich	Schuette
Callahan	Kolbe	Schulze
Carper	Konnyu	Sensenbrenner
Chandler	Kyl	Shaw
Cheney	Lagomarsino	Shumway
Clinger	Lancaster	Shuster
Coats	Latta	Sisisky
Coble	Lent	Skeen
Coleman (MO)	Lewis (CA)	Slattery
Combest	Lewis (FL)	Slaughter (NY)
Conte	Lightfoot	Slaughter (VA)
Coughlin	Lott	Smith (NE)
Courter	Lowery (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Craig	Lujan	Smith (TX)
Crane	Lungren	Smith, Denny (OR)
Dannemeyer	Mack	Smith, Robert (NH)
Daub	MacKay	Smith, Robert (OR)
Davis (IL)	Madigan	Snowe
Davis (MI)	Marlenee	Solomon
DeLay	Martin (IL)	Spence
DeWine	Martin (NY)	Staggers
Dickinson	McCandless	Stangeland
DioGuardi	McCollum	Stenholm
Dornan (CA)	McGrath	Stratton
Dreier	McMillan (NC)	Stump
Duncan	Meyers	Sundquist
Edwards (OK)	Michel	Sweeney
Emerson	Miller (OH)	Swindall
Fawell	Miller (WA)	Tauke
Fields	Molinari	Thomas (CA)
Fish	Montgomery	Thomas (GA)
Frenzel	Moorhead	Upton
Gallegly	Morrison (CT)	Vander Jagt
Gallo	Morrison (WA)	Visclosky
Gekas	Myers	Vucanovich
Gilman	Nielson	Walker
Gingrich	Olin	Weber
Goodling	Oxley	Weldon
Gradison	Packard	Whittaker
Grandy	Parris	Wolf
Green	Pashayan	Wortley
Gregg	Patterson	Wylie
Gunderson	Penny	Young (AK)
Hall (TX)	Petri	Young (FL)
Hamilton	Porter	
Hammerschmidt	Price (NC)	
Hansen	Pursell	
Harris	Ravenel	

NOT VOTING—20

Annunzio	Hatcher	McKinney
Bartlett	Jones (TN)	Pepper
Boulter	Kemp	Roukema
Collins	Leach (IA)	Stark
Daniel	Lukens, Donald	Taylor
Dorgan (ND)	McDade	Wilson
Gray (PA)	McEwen	

□ 1250

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Boulter against.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1827, the bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1987, and that I may include extraneous and tabular material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule just adopted, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1827), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] and myself.

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

There was no objections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1259

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1827, with Mr. PEASE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

□ 1300

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill is absolutely necessary for the operation of Government with regard to a number of items that are contained herein.

As regard to other matters that are included here, there are a number that are controversial, to say the least. In my opinion, much of it is due to differences of opinion, however it reflects the desire of the leadership in many respects. It covers practically the whole Government. I do not know of anybody who agrees with every item in it.

There are two main items here, which have to do with nuclear testing and with SALT II. In my opinion, the belief on my side of the aisle is that by inserting these provisions here and taking action by the Congress, it will expedite and speed up efforts at bringing about a solution by agreement.

According to my interpretation of the Republican view, and certainly the arguments of many of my friends, is that the administration should be left alone so they could work it out on the appropriate vehicle.

Personally, I can see a reason for that difference of opinion and I subscribe to the one that if you wait long enough, it might be well to take some action here to show that unless the executive branch is able to work something out, that the legislative branch will be forced to do so.

Be that as it may, these are the main items.

The other question is that we have to waive the Budget Act. With all due deference to the Budget Committee, and my friends who are on it, they base their action on assumptions and projections and sometimes, may I say, they go far afield, but they do not have the year-in and year-out experience that our Committee on Appropriations does.

In the average year, we have about 5,000 witnesses who appear before 13 subcommittees. Before us is a bill passed not only on past experience, plus information on the current year, plus the President's budget, but a bill that was developed by the Members who have brought it to you, who have years of experience, and years of dealing with these departments and agencies.

In many cases, the executive branch leaves out those things that are most essential because they have been given a limit and they leave them for Congress to replace. It is a customary practice. So many of the things that we had to do here, the executive branch, according to my knowledge, expects us to do.

There is always an argument here as to whether the President is for saving more money than the Congress, and I am proud to say that as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for the ninth year, I recognize that in this Congress, we need all three branches

to work together: legislative, judicial, and executive.

I want to tell you that of 83 appropriation bills which we have handled since Mr. Reagan became President, 78 have been signed by the President; the other 5, we worked out with the President. So certainly there is no purpose in my mind except to do my job as best I can, representing 57 committee members who have spent years in handling the very things that they bring to you.

We have a few new Members, but by and large, it reflects many years of experience.

This bill is below the President's budget by $1,105,536,996. I know, on the other side, that it will be said that you do not count the credits that the President deserves for recommending rescissions; that is, to cancel some moneys that you have appropriated heretofore. In almost every case, it is something that Congress added, that they had not recommended in the 1987 budget.

Further, they proposed that we should pass user fees and to sell some of our assets for current expenses, things that they have not been able to get done in the past.

This is the third year that that has been done. I think it is unrealistic to count that when you are adding up the totals.

I say it does exceed the budget allocations. Some of my friends ask to just keep the paper money strong—make the figures look good. They do not care about soil conservation or highways, bridges and all the material wealth. It can go down the drain if your concern is just to keep a balanced figure in paper money.

Nobody could be more disturbed than I am about the financial situation in this country. Do you realize that in 6 years, we have increased the public debt, though we are below the budget requests of the President, the public debt has increased from $900 billion to two-and-a-third trillion dollars.

Not only that, but we have gone down to where we are the debtor Nation for the first time since 1914. We are buying $170 billion over and above—most of it on credit—what we export.

May I say to our President and to you, we cannot deal with what we have here until we start the work in producing here because there is quite a difference between production and activity. It is true that we have lots of activity.

May I say that we have held the line as best we knew how. We have included some new programs here for the homeless and I think, frankly, it is going to take a whole lot of working out before we can implement it. But we provide a beginning.

When you read the papers about some of the sad things, you want to do something about it. When you read the cost of doing it, as we are doing, you can see that there is going to have to be some thought taken as to how much we can do and how we can get the job done.

□ 1310

With regard to our foreign involvement, do you realize that we have 352 overseas military establishments. How in the world could anybody hope to defend them? If we should have trouble, I do not know what would happen. We have foreign aid, and I do not know if anybody can figure that it is 100-percent defensive.

I have frequently said, having grown up around a country store, if a wholesaler had a retail outfit burn, it might be his business to restore the retailer, but goodness knows, you should not put him in the wholesale business.

We are devoting funds for the development of Korea, we are still spending $5.9 billion in West Germany to support them, and we are spending $1.9 billion in Japan.

I had a chance to tell the President this: "It might be easy to get into Nicaragua, but how are we ever going to get out?" It is a question, because we have not been able to get out of these other places.

I could go into more and more detail, but at this time let me just say that this bill reflects the work of 57 members of the Appropriations Committee, most all of whom have been there for years, where we have before us the past, the present, and the future.

I am not going to go into further detail, but as issues are raised here, I want the Members to know that substantial decreases have been made from the President's request. His complaint is that we do not have enough in foreign aid. May I say again on the military—and we are all for defense—that the President's recommendation for fiscal year 1988 is to increase the carryover funds from $260 billion, which they had at the beginning of the year, to $279 billion.

This year, we have studied the President's budget very closely. Since each legislative committee and each subcommittee on appropriations directs its hearings to a primary subject, and the witnesses in turn present the case for their department or agency, I feel that it falls on me as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and thus a member of each subcommittee, to pull together the overall picture.

DETERIORATING FINANCIAL SITUATION

I think it is evident to most all Americans that our financial situation is such that something must be done. Our debt has increased from $900 billion-plus in 1981 to $2.333 trillion in 6 years. We had 138 bank failures last year and 96 failures of savings and loan institutions. In the last 2 years, 170,000 farmers have been forced out of business with their land being sold, largely to land speculators. The domestic textile business is in dire straits, as are the shoe business and the steel industry. We have tremendous unemployment in some regions of the country. Our country is spread almost all over the world, 352 overseas military establishments. Our trade deficit is approximately $170 billion annually; we buy that much on credit above what we are able to export. This trade deficit even includes agriculture, $358 million in May, though we are the greatest Nation in the world in ability to produce food. For the first time since 1914, our Nation is a debtor nation, depending on our creditors to finance our current expenses. Our President is recommending sale of our assets to pay current expenses. I believe all will agree that something must be done. That being true, we must determine just what our present situation is.

REPORT ON CURRENT CONDITIONS AND FACTS

On that basis, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I submitted to the Budget Committee a record of the conditions and the facts which we face today with some thoughts as to what may have caused it. It is on that basis that I wish to discuss with you gentlemen our problem. For it is our problem. It is important to determine who is responsible; but more important is the fact it is absolutely essential that we do what we can to solve it.

At this point in the RECORD I will insert our views and estimates on the President's fiscal year 1988 budget request.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS VIEWS AND ESTIMATES ON THE BUDGET PROPOSED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1988

(Submitted by Mr. Whitten, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Pursuant to Section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on the Budget, Feb. 25, 1987)

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
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 301(d) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, as amended, I am transmitting the Appropriations Committee's report on the Views and Estimates of the proposed budget for fiscal year 1988. This report was approved at a meeting of the Committee on Wednesday, February 25, 1987.

Sincerely,

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in compliance with Section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974. This section requires that each standing Committee of the House submit to the Committee on the Budget its views and estimates each year regarding matters within its respective jurisdiction to be included in the concurrent resolution on the budget.

As we submit this report, the national debt has increased from $932.3 billion in 1981 to $2.3 trillion at the beginning of 1987. Interest on that debt in fiscal 1987 is $137.5 billion.

SHIFTS IN FEDERAL BUDGET PRIORITIES

The past eight years have witnessed not only a marked increase in the size of the federal budget, but also a dramatic shift in its internal priorities. An examination of where the federal budget stood in 1980 compared to where we are in this fiscal year (1988), and where the budget was proposed by the Administration projects us to be in 1992, shows these factors:

Between 1980 and 1988

Military spending has *increased* +50.5%.

Interest on the national debt has *increased* +82.3%.

Payments to individuals (including social security, medicare and medicaid) have *increased* +20.6%.

"All other" government spending (essentially discretionary *domestic programs*) has decreased −26.7%.

Between 1980 and 1992

Military spending would *increase* +66.6%.

Interest on the national debt would *increase* +41.9%.

Payments to individuals (including social security, medicare and medicaid) would *increase* +33.4%.

"All other" government spending (essentially discretionary *domestic programs*) would decrease −39.3%.

Graphically presented, a picture of budget priorities emerges. If projected forward to 1992, the Administration's current policies would look like this:

FISCAL YEAR 1988 BUDGET REQUEST

In the budget submitted to the Congress, $312 billion is for military spending, $19.1 billion is for international affairs, and $445.3 billion is for mandatory payments to individuals. Of the total of $1.1 trillion requested, only $268 billion is classified as relatively controllable under existing law and subject to the discretion of the Congress.

We must provide for defense. A question does arise as to how much of foreign aid is defense. With our military establishments outside the United States numbering 352, how can we protect such a spread? Included in the budget is a proposal to increase military spending by a total of six percent—three percent above inflation and to provide an increase of $13.8 billion in carryover of unspent funds to meet future contingencies. To meet this target, after paying $139.2 billion in interest and $461.1 billion in entitlements fixed by law, in the absence of increased income, the budget recommends reductions of $34 billion in education, housing, transportation, economic and rural development, examples of which are shown in the following table:

Programs Eliminated—Outlays

Department of Education:	
Compensatory education (HEP & CAMP)	$6,000,000
Several elementary and secondary programs	41,000,000
Education for the handicapped (grants for infants and families)	38,000,000
Vocational education	312,000,000
Immigrant and refugee education	23,000,000
Several higher education programs	80,000,000
Several student aid programs	1,239,000,000
Library grants	55,000,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development:	
Categorical housing programs	10,000,000
Urban development action grants	23,000,000
Rehabilitation loans	97,000,000
Housing development action grants	(19,000,000)
Department of Transportation:	
Mass transit discretionary grants	52,000,000
State maritime schools	9,000,000
Miscellaneous highway projects	12,000,000
Department of Commerce:	
Economic Development Administration	60,000,000
Trade adjustment assistance	3,000,000
National undersea research program	6,000,000
Coastal zone management and sea grants	44,000,000
Public telecomunications facilities	11,000,000
Department of Agriculture:	
Rural housing loans	2,033,000,000
Rural development loans	522,000,000
Farm program loans	520,000,000
Conservation programs	453,000,000
Extension Service	69,000,000
Rural development grants	162,000,000
Emergency Food assistance	50,000,000
Marketing payments to States	1,000,000
REA direct loans	570,000,000
Environmental Protection Agency:	
Sewage construction grants	90,000,000
Asbestos-in-schools loans/grants	39,000,000
Other Agencies:	
Postal subsidy	523,000,000
Interstate Commerce Commission	35,000,000
TVA economic development programs	12,000,000
Communication technology satellite	11,000,000
Appalachian Regional Development Commission	9,000,000
Legal Services Corporation	276,000,000
Community services block grant	54,000,000
General Government: Justice assistance grants	118,000,000

(For additional detail, see appendix 1).

These reductions are being proposed largely to increase available funds for military spending, foreign aid, and related activities, which when added to the existing carryover of $260,000,000,000 would make a total of $273,700,000,000 in unspent funds.

This pattern has been followed since 1975, as shown in the following table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

[In billions of dollars]

Unobligated balances		Unexpended balances	
FY 1975	$16.7	FY 1975	$44.0
FY 1976 (TQ)	21.0	FY 1976 (TQ)	51.4
FY 1977	20.0	FY 1977	62.6
FY 1978	21.3	FY 1978	73.6
FY 1979	23.0	FY 1979	83.9
FY 1980	24.2	FY 1980	92.2
FY 1981	26.5	FY 1981	112.8
FY 1982	34.6	FY 1982	142.2
FY 1983	43.4	FY 1983	172.1
FY 1984	51.6	FY 1984	205.1
FY 1985	61.5	FY 1985	244.3
FY 1986	59.0	FY 1986	255.5
FY 1987 estimated	50.5	FY 1987 estimated	259.9
FY 1988 estimated	49.7	FY 1988 estimated	273.7

USER FEES AND ASSET SALES

In addition, increases in user fees of $3.2 billion in fiscal year 1988 are proposed. Many of these have been proposed in prior years but have yet to be approved by the Congress.

To meet current expenses, the budget also proposes the sale of national assets such as the regional power marketing administrations (Bonneville, Alaska, Southeastern, Southwestern, and Western), the naval petroleum reserves, Government-owned real estate, and proposes restrictions on the rural electrification administration, housing, and other Federal activities.

These actions, which have not been accepted in past years, would sell off assets in order to pay current expenses. Further efforts are being made to eliminate national programs. Since we started meeting local needs with federal programs in 1934, our wealth has increased 41 times and since 1940, 36 times. It is important that we continue those practices that have made our entire country great—to encourage productivity and to ensure that essential programs of benefit to the people of the entire country be continued. We must not make the poorer states poorer, and the richer states richer. The budget must be balanced, but at a high enough level to support essential domestic programs, for a strong economy is the first essential of real defense.

In order to ensure our continuation as a great nation, we need a strong national defense that is backed by public support and a strong economy—strength that can come only by protecting and developing our nation's resources—our real wealth, our lands and waters. The development of our rivers and harbors and the construction of our schools, highways, airports, etc., along with an educated, healthy populace, with adequate food and nutrition flowing from a strong agricultural base, provides the foundation for our national growth.

COMMITMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Since the end of World War II, the United States has entered into collective defense arrangements by formal treaty with 43 separate countries in addition to various types of facilities and access agreements with 57 countries and territories. In total, these agreements are a responsibility of the government of the United States and potentially embrace significant costs which we pay both in times of peace and conflict. It means that the outs in such countries run against the incumbents and the U.S. It means that

any new government can raise the ante to us or out we go.

Our foreign policy is to give to foreign countries our domestic business—not only because they will sell, but because the Administration refuses to use our laws giving our industry, including steel, textiles, shoes, and agriculture, etc. the same protection that our foreign competitors give to their industries. Instead of us using our laws enabling us to sell competitively, and to protect our industry when threatened, we beg Japan and others to quit using their laws to limit us.

In 1986 our trade deficit was $169.7 billion. In addition, we have become a debtor nation. In 1985, foreigners bought $107 billion more of our property in the United States than we bought overseas. This is the first time since 1914 that the U.S. has been a debtor nation. In spite of this, this year we still have defense expenditures in Germany of $5.9 billion; in Japan, $1.9 billion; and $.6 billion in Korea. (The countries with which we have treaties and agreements are listed in Appendix 2).

OUR FARMERS—BANKRUPT

Our government has made, or is in the process of making, concessions to every foreign group which owes us, even to the Farm Credit System, which foreclosed thousands of farmers—but not to the farmer for whom the system was set up to help.

Our policy clearly draws a distinction between programs set up to serve the urban areas, housing, etc. and the 84 percent of our nation classified as rural.

Agriculture, our largest industry, the consumer's most economic supplier, labor's largest employer, industry's biggest customer, and our largest dollar earner in world trade is being sacrificed to our so-called allies. Hundreds of thousands of farmers are forced into the streets without a chance to come back.

Hendrik Willem Van Loon, an eminent historian, describing the fall of the old Roman Empire, had this to say:

"Unfortunately, the old empire had fallen upon evil days. Bad economic management had impoverished the small farmers who from the beginning of the republic had been the mainstay of the armies and who now flocked to the cities clamoring for bread and amusements."

We must not let that happen here.

In the month of May, 1986, the farm trade deficit also reached an all time high of $348 million in the red with the overall total yearly trade deficit being $170 billion. The following table, based on information provided by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, shows failures of financial institutions since 1981:

	Total bank failures	Agriculture banks	Federally insured savings and loans failures
1981	10	NA	NA
1982	42	NA	56
1983	48	NA	61
1984	79	NA	56
1985	120	62	104
1986	138	59	96

(All banks, including both national and non-national banks.)

When our financial situation reached the place where we have spent the money we have, the money we could borrow, and the Administration recommends the sale of assets to pay current bills, when our recent opponents have to finance our debt, which causes us to pay interest of billions to them annually, it is time we recognize that productivity is essential instead of activity; that money is only a medium of exchange, and as important as money is, it is material things which constitute our real wealth.

REVENUE LOSS FROM 1981 TAX ACT

The revenue loss in 1988 due to the 1981 Tax Act, repealing the windfall profits tax and authorizing the sale of tax credits, will be $258.7 billion, or more than the entire estimated unified budget deficit. The net revenue loss in 1988 reflecting all changes in recent years will still be more than $136.4 billion. (Appendix 3.)

SIGNIFICANT BUDGET FACTORS

The Committee on Appropriations recognizes that the soundness of our defense, including Department of Defense procurement, our military forces, and related programs, depends upon a healthy domestic economy and public support. To retain these essentials, it is absolutely necessary to protect and develop our physical resources and continue essential domestic programs in order to maintain public support of our defense. It is our country and our people on which all else depends. We need a strong defense—but we can never have a strong defense unless it is backed by a strong country—strength that can only come by developing our nation's resources—our real wealth—with an educated, healthy populace, and with adequate food and nutrition flowing from a strong agricultural base.

The Committee points out that even though it has held the line overall for the past six years and has recommended appropriations below the budget request, the debt has increased tremendously. The Committee on Appropriations has acted, and will continue to act, responsibly in regard to the deficit situation. It is mainly other areas, including revenue, that must be addressed by the Congress and the Administration, if the deficit situation is to be controlled.

Several factors depicted in the President's budget, some of which are outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, will greatly affect our efforts. For example:

Great attention has focused on the need to reduce the deficit in connection with a fiscal year 1988 budget. The Administration is proposing a deficit figure of $107.8 billion. However, this figure is based on drastic domestic spending reductions and policy changes. Many of the proposed policy changes have been transmitted previously to the Congress and have been rejected. These include several different user fee concepts and other legislative proposals not previously acceptable to the people's branch of government.

While the projected deficits show large declines in future years, the decline in the increase in the national debt is far less—because the deficit numbers ignore trust fund borrowings. Thus, while the deficit figures are $107.8 billion in fiscal year 1988, $92.7 billion in fiscal year 1989, and $59.5 billion in fiscal year 1990, the total gross national debt is $2,573 billion in fiscal year 1988, $2,790 billion in fiscal year 1989, and $2,986 billion in fiscal year 1990—a dramatic consequence of the budget proposals.

Another way of looking at the magnitude of the deficit problem is to examine the increase in the total public debt. When the current Administration took office, the debt subject to limit was $932,288,000,000. By the end of fiscal year 1988, it will grow to $2,572,967,000,000!

CONGRESS CAN LIMIT BUT NOT CONTROL OUTLAYS

We must get away from the idea of controlling appropriations, which are budget authority, by outlay limits. Outlays are controlled by the executive, not by the Congress. Use of outlays to control appropriations just gives the executive another way to make line item vetoes, and the essential domestic programs that are proposed in the budget to be reduced or terminated would be the first stricken.

APPENDIX 1

Major programs proposed for termination or elimination include the following:

Programs Eliminated—Outlays

Department of Education:	
Compensatory education (HEP & CAMP)	$6,000,000
Several elementary and secondary programs	41,000,000
Education for the handicapped (grants for infants and families)	38,000,000
Vocational education	312,000,000
Immigrant and refugee education	23,000,000
Several higher education programs	80,000,000
Several student aid programs	1,239,000,000
Library grants	55,000,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development:	
Categorical housing programs	10,000,000
Urban development action grants	23,000,000
Rehabilitation loans	97,000,000
Housing development action grants	(19,000,000)
Department of Transportation:	
Mass transit discretionary grants	52,000,000
State maritime schools	9,000,000
Miscellaneous highway projects	12,000,000
Department of Commerce:	
Economic Development Administration	60,000,000
Trade adjustment assistance	3,000,000
National undersea research program	6,000,000
Coastal zone management and sea grants	44,000,000
Public telecommunications facilities	11,000,000
Department of Agriculture:	
Rural housing loans	2,033,000,000
Rural development loans	522,000,000
Farm program loans	520,000,000
Conservation programs	453,000,000
Extension Service	69,000,000
Rural development grants	162,000,000
Emergency Food assistance	50,000,000
Marketing payments to States	1,000,000
REA direct loans	570,000,000
Environmental Protection Agency:	
Sewage construction grants	90,000,000
Asbestos-in-schools loans/grants	39,000,000
Other Agencies:	
Postal subsidy	523,000,000

Interstate Commerce Commission	35,000,000
TVA economic development programs	12,000,000
Communication technology satellite	11,000,000
Appalachian Regional Development Commission	9,000,000
Legal Services Corporation	276,000,000
Community services block grant	54,000,000
General Government: Justice assistance grants	118,000,000

Proposed Program Reductions

Programmatic changes:	
Major medical:	
Medicare	−4,600,000,000
Medicaid	−1,400,000,000
Veterans medical care	−100,000,000
Federal employees health benefits	−500,000,000
Other	−100,000,000
Subtotal, major medical	−6,700,000,000
Other mandatory:	
Farm price supports	500,000,000
Federal retirement systems	−1,500,000,000
Child nutrition	−800,000,000
Family support payments	−600,000,000
Food stamps	−300,000,000
Other	−800,000,000
Subtotal, other mandatory	−3,400,000,000
Nondefense Discretionary:	
Economic subsidies and development:	
Rural Electrification Administration	−1,500,000,000
Natural resources and environment	−1,100,000,000
Rural housing insurance fund	−800,000,000
Rural development insurance fund	−500,000,000
Subsidized housing	−300,000,000
Other	−400,000,000
Subtotal, economic subsidies and development	−4,600,000,000
Social programs:	
Student financial assistance	−1,800,000,000
Other education	−1,100,000,000
Low income home energy assistance	−600,000,000
National Institutes of Health	−500,000,000
Legal Services Corporation	−300,000,000
Other	−300,000,000
Subtotal, social programs	−4,500,000,000
General government:	
IRS enforcement	400,000,000
Department of Justice	600,000,000
Conduct of foreign affairs	400,000,000
Public Law 480 food aid	−100,000,000
Federal supply service	−200,000,000
Export-Import Bank	−400,000,000
Other	−200,000,000
Subtotal, general government	500,000,000
Total, programmatic changes	−18,900,000,000

APPENDIX 2

COUNTRIES WITH WHICH WE HAVE TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS

According to information provided by the Department of Defense, the United States has various types of facility and access agreements with the following countries:

British Virgin Islands, Antigua, Argentina, Ascension Island (U.K.), Australia, Azores (Portugal), Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Bermuda, (U.K.), Brazil, British Indian Ocean Territory, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus.

Denmark, Diego Garcia (U.K.), Djibouti (France), Egypt, Faeroe Islands (Denmark), Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Greenland (Denmark), Honduras, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Korea.

Liberia, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands (Pacific Trust Territory), Morocco, Netherlands, Netherlands Antilles, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Reunion Island (France), Saudi Arabia, Seychelles.

Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Surinam, Thailand, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Turks and Caicos, United Kingdom, Zaire.

APPENDIX 3

NET EFFECT OF MAJOR ENACTED LEGISLATION ON RECEIPTS

[In billions of dollars]

	1986	1987	1988
Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981	−209.8	−238.5	−258.7
Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982	46.7	56.8	58.8
Highway Revenue Act of 1982	4.5	4.7	4.9
Social Security Amendments of 1983	10.2	12.1	24.6
Interest and Dividends Tax Compliance Act of 1983	−2.1	−1.7	−1.8
Railroad Retirement Revenue Act of 1983	1.1	1.1	1.0
Deficit Reduction Act of 1984	16.1	22.0	25.3
Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985	.9	2.7	3.0
Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986		−.4	−.8
Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986		2.6	2.8
Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986		.6	1.0
Continuing Resolution for 1987		1.9	2.7
Tax Reform Act of 1986		18.6	.9
Net tax reduction	−132.4	−117.5	−136.4

	1989	1990	1986–90
Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981	−282.0	−309.4	−1,298.4
Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982	58.2	59.9	280.4
Highway Revenue Act of 1982	5.1	5.1	24.2
Social Security Amendments of 1983	31.0	23.8	101.7
Interest and Dividends Tax Compliance Act of 1983	−2.0	−2.5	−10.0
Railroad Retirement Revenue Act of 1983	1.1	1.1	5.4
Deficit Reduction Act of 1984	27.7	31.1	122.1
Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985	3.0	3.1	12.7
Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986	−.8	−.9	−2.9
Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986	2.4	1.0	8.8
Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986	1.1	1.1	3.9
Continuing Resolution for 1987	2.4	2.5	9.5
Tax Reform Act of 1986	−11.7	−9.0	−1.2
Net tax reduction	−164.4	−193.1	−743.8

Source: Budget of the United States, 1988; Executive Office of the President (pp. 4–5).

Mr. Chairman, under my request to include tabular and extraneous material, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a summary table of the amounts requested by the President for the accounts in this bill compared with the amounts recommended by the committee:

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	TITLE I - PROGRAM SUPPLEMENTALS			
	CHAPTER I			
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
	General Administration			
100-17	Grants and loans administration (by transfer).....	(38,520,000)	---	(-38,520,000)
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration			
100-17	Federal ship financing fund, fishing vessels (limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(50,000,000)	---	(-50,000,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
	General Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses.....	11,212,000	10,450,000	-762,000
	Legal Activities			
100-17	Salaries and expenses, general legal activities.....	7,786,000	5,499,000	-2,287,000
100-17	Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division.....	299,000	299,000	---
100-17	Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys.....	887,000	887,000	---
100-17	Salaries and expenses, United States Marshals Service.	405,000	405,000	---
100-17	Support of United States Prisoners.....	9,630,000	9,630,000	---
100-17	Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service....	41,000	---	-41,000
100-17	United States Trustee System Fund.....	16,436,000	16,436,000	---
	Total, Legal Activities.....	35,484,000	33,156,000	-2,328,000
	Federal Bureau of Investigation			
100-17	Salaries and expenses.....	3,989,000	3,989,000	---
100-17	Reappropriation.....	(5,686,000)	---	(-5,686,000)
	Drug Enforcement Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses.....	776,000	776,000	---
	Immigration and Naturalization Service			
100-17	Salaries and expenses.....	147,793,000	147,793,000	---
	Federal Prison System			
100-17	Salaries and expenses.....	548,000	548,000	---
100-17	National Institute of Corrections.....	15,000	15,000	---
	Office of Justice Programs			
100-17	Justice Assistance.....	27,000	---	-27,000
	Total, Department of Justice.....	199,844,000	196,727,000	-3,117,000
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
	Administration of Foreign Affairs			
100-17	Salaries and expenses.....	59,750,000	61,750,000	+2,000,000
100-17	Acquisition and maintenance of buildings abroad.....	12,000,000	12,000,000	---
	International Organizations and Conferences			
100-17	Contributions for international peacekeeping activities.....	21,600,000	---	-21,600,000
---	Contributions to International Organizations.....	---	268,831	+268,831
	International Commissions			
100-17	American sections, international commissions.....	600,000	600,000	---
	Other			
100-17	United States Bilateral Science and Technology Agreements.....	2,000,000	---	-2,000,000
	Total, Department of State.....	95,950,000	74,618,831	-21,331,169
	THE JUDICIARY			
	Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services			
100-17				
100-44	Salaries and expenses.....	45,645,000	45,645,000	---
100-17	Defender services.....	2,500,000	2,500,000	---
100-17	Planning, design, and construction of court facilities	18,000,000	---	-18,000,000
	Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services.....	66,145,000	48,145,000	-18,000,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Administrative Office of the United States Courts			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	192,000	98,000	-94,000
	Federal Judicial Center			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	1,108,000	1,017,000	-91,000
	Total, The Judiciary	67,445,000	49,260,000	-18,185,000
	RELATED AGENCIES			
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
	Maritime Administration			
100-17	Federal ship financing fund	1,448,000,000	1,448,000,000	---
100-17	Portion applied to debt reduction	-1,375,000,000	-1,375,000,000	---
	Total, Maritime Administration	73,000,000	73,000,000	---
	Board for International Broadcasting			
100-17 100-44	Grants and expenses	33,195,000	33,195,000	---
	Commission on Civil Rights			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	375,000	---	-375,000
	Commission for the Study of International Migration and Cooperative Economic Development			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	275,000	+275,000
	Dwight David Eisenhower Centennial Commission			
---	Expenses	---	50,000	+50,000
	Small Business Administration			
100-17	Reappropriation	(4,116,000)	---	(-4,116,000)
	United States Information Agency			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	8,098,176	8,098,176	---
100-17	Radio broadcasting to Cuba	993,000	993,000	---
	Total, Chapter I:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	478,900,176	436,217,007	-42,683,169
	Appropriations	(1,853,900,176)	(1,811,217,007)	(-42,683,169)
	Appropriations for debt reduction	(-1,375,000,000)	(-1,375,000,000)	---
	(By transfer)	(38,520,000)	---	(-38,520,000)
	(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(50,000,000)	---	(-50,000,000)
	CHAPTER II			
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY			
	Military Personnel			
100-17	Military Personnel, Army	187,089,000	255,452,000	+68,363,000
100-17	Military Personnel, Navy	62,953,000	40,600,000	-22,353,000
100-17	Military Personnel, Marine Corps	39,820,000	36,520,000	-3,300,000
100-17	Military Personnel, Air Force	140,273,000	157,800,000	+17,527,000
100-17	Reserve Personnel, Army	2,915,000	---	-2,915,000
100-17	Reserve Personnel, Navy	2,128,000	---	-2,128,000
100-17	Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps	360,000	---	-360,000
100-17	Reserve Personnel, Air Force	701,000	---	-701,000
100-17	National Guard Personnel, Army	4,326,000	---	-4,326,000
100-17	National Guard Personnel, Air Force	1,335,000	---	-1,335,000
	Total	441,900,000	490,372,000	+48,472,000
	Operation and Maintenance			
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Army	75,000,000	---	-75,000,000
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Navy	120,000,000	50,000,000	-70,000,000
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	21,000,000	---	-21,000,000
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies	357,000,000	382,500,000	+25,500,000
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	15,000,000	15,000,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	5,000,000	---	-5,000,000
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	10,000,000	10,000,000	---
	Total	603,000,000	457,500,000	-145,500,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Procurement			
100-17	Procurement of Ammunition, Army	40,000,000	---	-40,000,000
100-17	Other Procurement, Navy	40,000,000	---	-40,000,000
100-17	Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	313,700,000	313,700,000	---
100-17	Other Procurement, Air Force	160,000,000	---	-160,000,000
	Total	553,700,000	313,700,000	-240,000,000
	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation			
100-17	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army	43,000,000	3,300,000	-39,700,000
100-17	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy	29,000,000	14,000,000	-15,000,000
100-17	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force	28,000,000	19,000,000	-9,000,000
100-17	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense Agencies	518,000,000	4,400,000	-513,600,000
100-17	Developmental Test and Evaluation, Defense	30,000,000	13,900,000	-16,100,000
100-17	Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense	46,000,000	---	-46,000,000
	Total	694,000,000	54,600,000	-639,400,000
	Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense			
100-17	Chemical agents and munitions destruction	250,000,000	---	-250,000,000
	Total, Chapter II: New budget (obligational) authority	2,542,600,000	1,316,172,000	-1,226,428,000
	CHAPTER III			
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL			
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY			
	Corps of Engineers - Civil			
	Operation and maintenance, general:			
100-17	(Trust fund transfer)	(-66,750,000)	---	(+66,750,000)
---	(By transfer)	---	(125,000)	(+125,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
	Bureau of Reclamation			
100-17	Construction program (by transfer)	(5,600,000)	(5,600,000)	---
---	Loan program (by transfer)	---	(570,000)	(+570,000)
	Total, Chapter III: (By transfer)	(-61,150,000)	(6,295,000)	(+67,445,000)
	CHAPTER IV			
	MULITLATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
	Funds Appropriated to the President			
	International Financial Institutions			
100-17	Contribution to the International Development Association	207,476,749	207,476,749	---
100-17	Contribution to the International Finance Corporation	42,238,610	---	-42,238,610
100-17	Contribution to the African Development Fund	36,639,000	36,639,000	---
	Contribution to the African Development Bank:			
100-17	Paid-in capital	6,492,127	6,492,127	---
100-17	Limitation on callable capital subscriptions	(17,375,058)	(17,375,058)	---
	Total	292,846,486	250,607,876	-42,238,610
	Bilateral Economic Assistance			
	Agency for International Development			
100-17				
100-51	Economic support fund	397,000,000	---	-397,000,000
---	Assistance for Central America (by transfer)	---	(300,000,000)	(+300,000,000)
	Total	397,000,000	---	-397,000,000
	Military Assistance			
100-17	Military Assistance	261,000,000	50,000,000	-211,000,000
	Foreign Military Credit Sales:			
100-17	Direct credits and forgiven loans	200,000,000	---	-200,000,000
	Total	461,000,000	50,000,000	-411,000,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Export-Import Bank of the United States			
100-17	(Limitation on program activity)	(-100,000,000)	(-100,000,000)	---
100-17	Budget authority effect	-100,000,000	-100,000,000	---
	Total, Chapter IV:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	1,050,846,486	200,607,876	-850,238,610
	(By transfer)	---	(300,000,000)	(+300,000,000)
	(Limitation on callable capital)	(17,375,058)	(17,375,058)	---
	(Limitation on program activity)	(-100,000,000)	(-100,000,000)	---
	CHAPTER V			
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
	Housing Programs			
	Housing for the elderly or handicapped fund:			
100-17	Authority to borrow, indefinite	-90,731,000	---	+90,731,000
100-17	(Limitation on direct loans)	(-90,731,000)	---	(+90,731,000)
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
	AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	1,424,000	3,000,000	+1,576,000
	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY			
---	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	---	(12,000,000)	(+12,000,000)
	Research and development (disapproval of deferral)			
100-25	(D87-54)	---	(11,000,000)	(+11,000,000)
	Abatement, control, and compliance:			
100-25	(Disapproval of deferral) (D87-55)	---	(11,400,000)	(+11,400,000)
---	(By transfer)	---	(18,000,000)	(+18,000,000)
	VETERANS ADMINISTRATION			
100-17	Compensation and pensions	80,200,000	80,200,000	---
---	Veterans job training	---	30,000,000	+30,000,000
	Total, Chapter V:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	-9,107,000	113,200,000	+122,307,000
	Appropriations	(81,624,000)	(113,200,000)	(+31,576,000)
	Authority to borrow	(-90,731,000)	---	(+90,731,000)
	(By transfer)	---	(30,000,000)	(+30,000,000)
	(Disapproval of deferrals)	---	(22,400,000)	(+22,400,000)
	(Limitation on direct loans)	(-90,731,000)	---	(+90,731,000)
	CHAPTER VI			
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
	Bureau of Land Management			
---	Management of lands and resources	---	450,000	+450,000
	United States Fish and Wildlife Service			
100-17	Resource management	2,800,000	2,800,000	---
	National Park Service			
100-17	Operation of the national park system	17,631,000	18,050,000	+419,000
---	Land acquisition and state assistance	---	13,910,000	+13,910,000
	Geological Survey			
100-17	Surveys, investigations, and research	2,597,000	2,597,000	---
	Minerals Management Service			
---	Leasing and royalty management	---	800,000	+800,000
	Total	23,028,000	38,607,000	+15,579,000
	RELATED AGENCIES			
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
	Forest Service			
---	State and private forestry (by transfer)	---	(1,500,000)	(+1,500,000)
---	Construction (by transfer)	---	(130,000)	(+130,000)
	Highway construction: Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument (liquidation of contract			
100-17	authority)	(9,915,000)	(9,915,000)	---

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	500,000	+500,000
	NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	80,000	+80,000
	Total, Chapter VI:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	23,028,000	39,187,000	+16,159,000
	(Liquidation of contract authority)	(9,915,000)	(9,915,000)	---
	CHAPTER VII			
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
	Employment and Training Administration			
---	Training and employment services	---	20,000,000	+20,000,000
---	Community service employment for older Americans	---	10,000,000	+10,000,000
100-17	State unemployment insurance and employment service operations (limitation on trust fund transfer)	(-90,000,000)	(130,000,000)	(+220,000,000)
	Total, Department of Labor	---	30,000,000	+30,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
	Health Resources and Services Administration			
---	Health resources and services	---	37,500,000	+37,500,000
	National Institutes of Health			
---	National Institute on Aging	---	1,800,000	+1,800,000
	Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration			
---	Alcohol, drug abuse, and mental health	---	750,000	+750,000
	Health Care Financing Administration			
100-17	Program management (limitation on trust fund transfer)	(10,000,000)	---	(-10,000,000)
	Family Support Administration			
---	Work Incentives	---	35,000,000	+35,000,000
	Office of Human Development Services			
100-17	Family social services	43,000,000	121,644,000	+78,644,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(54,727,000)	(43,583,000)	(-11,144,000)
	Total, Department of Health and Human Services	43,000,000	196,694,000	+153,694,000
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION			
---	Vocational and adult education	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000
100-17	Student financial assistance (by transfer)	(287,000,000)	(287,000,000)	---
---	Higher education	---	3,300,000	+3,300,000
100-17	College housing loans (limitation on direct loans)	(-60,000,000)	---	(+60,000,000)
---	College construction loan insurance	---	20,000,000	+20,000,000
---	Chicago litigation settlement (by transfer)	---	(83,000,000)	(+83,000,000)
	Total, Department of Education	---	24,300,000	+24,300,000
	RELATED AGENCIES			
100-17	Physician payment review commission (limitation on trust fund transfer)	(362,000)	---	(-362,000)
	Total, Chapter VII:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	43,000,000	250,994,000	+207,994,000
	(By transfer)	(341,727,000)	(413,583,000)	(+71,856,000)
	(Limitation on trust fund transfer)	(-79,638,000)	(130,000,000)	(+209,638,000)
	(Limitation on direct loans)	(-60,000,000)	---	(+60,000,000)

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	CHAPTER VIII			
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH			
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES			
---	Payments to widows and heirs of deceased Members of Congress	---	152,500	+152,500
	Contingent Expenses of the House			
	Standing Committees, Special and Select			
100-	Salaries and expenses	1,950,000	1,950,000	---
	Allowances and Expenses			
100-17	Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims	10,693,000	8,893,000	-1,800,000
100-17	Reemployed annuitants reimbursement	368,000	368,000	---
100-	Special session or ceremony of the Congress in honor of the Bicentennial of the Constitution	247,000	247,000	---
	Total, Allowances and Expenses	11,308,000	9,508,000	-1,800,000
	Salaries, Officers and Employees			
100-17	Office of the Clerk	402,000	280,000	-122,000
100-17	Office of the Sergeant At Arms	72,000	72,000	---
100-17	Office of the Law Revision Counsel	19,000	19,000	---
	Total, Salaries, Officers and Employees	493,000	371,000	-122,000
	Total, House of Representatives	13,751,000	11,981,500	-1,769,500
	JOINT ITEMS			
	Capitol Police			
100-17	General expenses	432,000	180,000	-252,000
	Official Mail Costs			
100-17	Expenses	3,395,000	---	-3,395,000
	Capitol Guide Service			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	109,000	---	-109,000
	Total, Joint Items	3,936,000	180,000	-3,756,000
	OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	350,000	350,000	---
	COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	17,000	---	-17,000
100-17	Authority to spend receipts	-14,000	---	+14,000
	Total	3,000	---	-3,000
	Total, Chapter VIII: New budget (obligational) authority	18,040,000	12,511,500	-5,528,500
	CHAPTER IX			
	MILITARY CONSTRUCTION			
100-17	Military construction, Army	250,000,000	---	-250,000,000
	Total, Chapter IX: New budget (obligational) authority	250,000,000	---	-250,000,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	CHAPTER X			
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
	Office of the Secretary of Agriculture:			
---	Investigations	---	10,000,000	+10,000,000
---	Agricultural Research Service	---	450,000	+450,000
---	Cooperative State Research Service	---	300,000	+300,000
---	Buildings and facilities	---	16,200,000	+16,200,000
---	Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service	---	3,000,000	+3,000,000
	Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:			
100-17	(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(24,000,000)	(24,000,000)	---
	General Sales Manager (transfer from Commodity			
100-17	Credit Corporation)	(705,000)	(705,000)	---
	Commodity Credit Corporation:			
100-17	Reimbursement for net realized losses	6,653,189,000	6,653,189,000	---
	Farmers Home Administration:			
---	Rural Development Grants	---	3,000,000	+3,000,000
	Soil Conservation Service:			
---	Watershed and flood prevention operations	---	300,000	+300,000
	Food and Nutrition Service:			
100-17	Special milk program	3,426,000	3,426,000	---
---	Foreign Agricultural Service	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000
	Total	6,656,615,000	6,690,865,000	+34,250,000
	RELATED AGENCIES			
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
	Food and Drug Administration:			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	1,500,000	+1,500,000
	Total, Chapter X:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	6,656,615,000	6,692,365,000	+35,750,000
	(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(24,705,000)	(24,705,000)	---
	CHAPTER XI			
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
	Federal Aviation Administration			
---	Operations	---	55,200,000	+55,200,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(50,000,000)	---	(-50,000,000)
	Grants-in-aid for airports:			
	(Liquidation of contract authorization) (Airport			
100-17	and Airway Trust Fund)	(42,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(+118,000,000)
100-17	Aircraft purchase loan guarantee program	2,602,000	2,602,000	---
100-17	Portion applied to debt reduction	-2,175,000	-2,175,000	---
	Total, Federal Aviation Administration	427,000	55,627,000	+55,200,000
	Federal Highway Administration			
	Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund)			
100-17	(Liquidation of contract authority)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	---
	Baltimore-Washington Parkway (Highway Trust Fund)			
---	(by transfer)	---	(2,000,000)	(+2,000,000)
	Highway Safety and Economic Development Demonstration			
---	Projects (Highway Trust Fund) (by transfer)	---	(5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)
	Highway Safety Improvement Demonstration Project			
---	(Highway Trust Fund) (by transfer)	---	(2,000,000)	(+2,000,000)
	Highway-Railroad Grade Crossing Safety Demonstration			
---	Project (Highway Trust Fund) (by transfer)	---	(2,000,000)	(+2,000,000)
	Vehicular and Pedestrian Safety Demonstration			
---	Project (Highway Trust Fund) (by transfer)	---	(5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)
	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration			
---	Operations and research (by transfer)	---	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
	Federal Railroad Administration			
	Rail service assistance (D87-42)			
100-25	(deferral disapproval)	---	(462,000)	(+462,000)
	Northeast corridor improvement program (D87-45)			
100-25	(deferral disapproval)	---	(16,962,000)	(+16,962,000)
	Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing			
100-17	Funds	13,290,000	13,290,000	---
100-17	Portion applied to debt reduction	-12,500,000	-12,500,000	---
100-17	Settlements of railroad litigation	102,379,000	62,142,278	-40,236,722
100-17	Portion applied to debt reduction	-95,879,000	-56,928,495	+38,950,505
	Conrail commuter transition assistance (D87-46)			
100-25	(deferral disapproval)	---	(10,000,000)	(+10,000,000)
	Total, Federal Railroad Administration	7,290,000	6,003,783	-1,286,217

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Urban Mass Transportation Administration			
100-25	Research, training, and human resources (D87-47) (deferral disapproval)	---	(4,036,000)	(+4,036,000)
100-25	Interstate transfer grants-transit (D87-48) (deferral disapproval)	---	(51,800,000)	(+51,800,000)
	Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation			
100-17	Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund	6,000,000	4,000,000	-2,000,000
	Total, Department of Transportation	13,717,000	65,630,783	+51,913,783
	RELATED AGENCIES			
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY			
100-17	Rebate of Saint Lawrence Seaway tolls (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund)	6,250,000	6,250,000	---
	PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION			
100-17	Operating expenses	8,013,000	8,013,000	---
	Total, Chapter XI:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	27,980,000	79,893,783	+51,913,783
	Appropriations	(138,534,000)	(151,497,278)	(+12,963,278)
	Appropriations for debt reduction	(-110,554,000)	(-71,603,495)	(+38,950,505)
	(By transfer)	(50,000,000)	(17,000,000)	(-33,000,000)
	(Disapproval of deferrals)	---	(83,260,000)	(+83,260,000)
	(Liquidation of contract authority)	(77,000,000)	(195,000,000)	(+118,000,000)
	CHAPTER XII			
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY			
	Office of the Secretary			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	5,650,000	5,500,000	-150,000
	Financial Management Service			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	1,900,000	1,900,000	---
	Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	10,000,000	+10,000,000
	Internal Revenue Service			
100-17	Processing tax returns	55,200,000	55,200,000	---
100-17	Examination and appeals	8,110,000	8,110,000	---
100-17	Investigation, collection, and taxpayer service	16,690,000	16,690,000	---
	Total	80,000,000	80,000,000	---
	United States Secret Service			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	5,722,000	+5,722,000
	Total, Department of the Treasury	87,550,000	103,122,000	+15,572,000
	UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE			
100-17	Payment to the Postal Service Fund	79,177,000	79,177,000	---
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
	Federal Buildings Fund:			
	Limitation on availability of revenue:			
100-17	Rental of space	(61,900,000)	(61,900,000)	---
	National Archives and Records Administration			
---	Operating expenses	---	475,000	+475,000
	Total, Chapter XII:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	166,727,000	182,774,000	+16,047,000
	(Limitation on availability of revenue)	(61,900,000)	(61,900,000)	---

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	TITLE I - PROGRAM SUPPLEMENTALS			
	TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority	11,248,629,662	9,323,922,166	-1,924,707,496
	Appropriations	(12,824,914,662)	(10,770,525,661)	(-2,054,389,001)
	Appropriations for debt reduction	(-1,485,554,000)	(-1,446,603,495)	(+38,950,505)
	Authority to borrow	(-90,731,000)	---	(+90,731,000)
	(By transfer)	(369,097,000)	(768,508,000)	(+399,411,000)
	(Limitation on trust fund transfer)	(-79,638,000)	(130,000,000)	(+209,638,000)
	(Limitation on availability of revenue)	(61,900,000)	(61,900,000)	---
	(Limitation on direct loans)	(-250,731,000)	(-100,000,000)	(+150,731,000)
	(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(50,000,000)	---	(-50,000,000)
	(Liquidation of contract authority)	(86,915,000)	(204,915,000)	(+118,000,000)
	(Deferral disapproval)	---	(105,660,000)	(+105,660,000)
	TITLE II - INCREASED PAY COSTS			
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH			
	House of Representatives			
100-17	House leadership offices	78,000	39,000	-39,000
100-17	Members' clerk hire	5,168,000	2,584,000	-2,584,000
100-17	Committee employees	10,713,000	720,000	-9,993,000
100-17	Special and select committees	892,000	446,000	-446,000
100-17	Allowances and expenses	815,000	408,000	-407,000
100-17	Salaries, officers and employees	1,229,000	618,000	-611,000
	Total, House of Representatives	18,895,000	4,815,000	-14,080,000
	Joint Items			
100-17	Joint Economic Committee	106,000	75,000	-31,000
100-17	Joint Committee on Printing	23,000	10,000	-13,000
100-17	Joint Committee on Taxation	77,000	---	-77,000
	Total, Joint Items	206,000	85,000	-121,000
	Office of Technology Assessment			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	209,000	209,000	---
	Congressional Budget Office			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	227,000	80,000	-147,000
	Architect of the Capitol			
100-17	Office of the Architect of the Capitol: Salaries	129,000	50,000	-79,000
100-17	Capitol buildings	142,000	70,000	-72,000
100-17	Capitol grounds	54,000	40,000	-14,000
100-17	House office buildings	354,000	300,000	-54,000
100-17	Capitol power plant	80,000	40,000	-40,000
100-17	Library buildings and grounds: Structural and mechanical care	90,000	50,000	-40,000
	Total, Architect of the Capitol	849,000	550,000	-299,000
	Botanic Garden			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	34,000	25,000	-9,000
	Library of Congress			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	2,422,000	605,000	-1,817,000
100-17				
100-44	Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses	364,000	173,000	-191,000
100-17				
100-44	Authority to spend receipts	-17,000	-17,000	---
100-17	Congressional Research Service: Salaries and expenses	862,000	215,000	-647,000
100-17	Books for the blind and physically handicapped: Salaries and expenses	99,000	---	-99,000
	Total, Library of Congress	3,730,000	976,000	-2,754,000
	Copyright Royalty Tribunal			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	9,000	5,000	-4,000
100-17	Authority to spend receipts	-7,000	-4,000	+3,000
	Total, Copyright Royalty Tribunal	2,000	1,000	-1,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Government Printing Office			
100-17	Office of Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses	96,000	46,000	-50,000
	General Accounting Office			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	3,905,000	2,500,000	-1,405,000
	Total, Legislative Branch	28,153,000	9,287,000	-18,866,000
	THE JUDICIARY			
	Supreme Court of the United States			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	504,000	504,000	---
100-17	Care of the building and grounds	24,000	24,000	---
	Total, Supreme Court of the United States	528,000	528,000	---
	United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	97,000	97,000	---
	United States Court of International Trade			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	90,000	69,000	-21,000
	Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	15,032,000	15,032,000	---
100-17	Defender services	593,000	593,000	---
	Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services	15,625,000	15,625,000	---
	Administrative Office of the United States Courts			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	504,000	504,000	---
	Federal Judicial Center			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	116,000	116,000	---
	Total, The Judiciary	16,960,000	16,939,000	-21,000
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
	White House Office			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	172,000	172,000	---
	Executive Residence and White House			
100-17	Operating expenses	43,000	43,000	---
	Special Assistance to the President			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	10,000	10,000	---
	Council of Economic Advisers			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	16,000	16,000	---
	Council on Environmental Quality			
100-17	Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	6,000	3,000	-3,000
	Office of Policy Development			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	23,000	23,000	---
	National Security Council			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	28,000	28,000	---
	Office of Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	57,000	57,000	---
	Office of Management and Budget			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	290,000	290,000	---

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Office of Federal Procurement Policy			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	12,000	12,000	---
	Office of Science and Technology Policy			
100-17	Office of Science and Technology Policy	9,000	3,000	-6,000
	Office of the United States Trade Representative			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	77,000	77,000	---
	Total, Executive Office of the President	743,000	734,000	-9,000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
	Agency for International Development			
100-17	Operating expenses, Agency for International Development	2,175,000	2,175,000	---
100-17	(By transfer)	(2,175,000)	---	(-2,175,000)
100-17	Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development, Office of Inspector General	103,000	103,000	---
100-17	(By transfer)	(103,000)	---	(-103,000)
	Total, Agency for International Development	2,278,000	2,278,000	---
	Peace Corps			
100-17	Peace Corps, operating expenses	324,000	324,000	---
	African Development Foundation			
100-17	African Development Foundation	15,000	15,000	---
	Total, Funds Appropriated to the President	2,617,000	2,617,000	---
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
---	Office of the Secretary	---	31,000	+31,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(31,000)	---	(-31,000)
---	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	---	7,000	+7,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(7,000)	---	(-7,000)
---	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental and Public Affairs	---	7,000	+7,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(7,000)	---	(-7,000)
---	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics	---	7,000	+7,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(7,000)	---	(-7,000)
---	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education	---	7,000	+7,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(7,000)	---	(-7,000)
	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Service	---	7,000	+7,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(7,000)	---	(-7,000)
	Office of the Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs	---	8,000	+8,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(8,000)	---	(-8,000)
	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development	---	8,000	+8,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(8,000)	---	(-8,000)
	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	---	7,000	+7,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(7,000)	---	(-7,000)
	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services	---	7,000	+7,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(7,000)	---	(-7,000)
---	Departmental administration	---	311,000	+311,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(541,000)	---	(-541,000)
---	Building operations and maintenance	---	35,000	+35,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(35,000)	---	(-35,000)
---	Office of Governmental and Public Affairs	---	62,000	+62,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(124,000)	---	(-124,000)
---	Office of the Inspector General	---	400,000	+400,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(799,000)	---	(-799,000)
---	Office of the General Counsel	---	300,000	+300,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(375,000)	---	(-375,000)
---	Agricultural Research Service	---	3,935,000	+3,935,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(7,799,000)	---	(-7,799,000)
---	National Agricultural Library	---	65,000	+65,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(65,000)	---	(-65,000)
---	Economic Reseach Service	---	415,000	+415,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(815,000)	---	(-815,000)
---	National Agricultural Statistics Service	---	490,000	+490,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(900,000)	---	(-900,000)
---	World Agricultural Outlook Board	---	15,000	+15,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(30,000)	---	(-30,000)

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
---	Foreign Agricultural Service	---	567,000	+567,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(567,000)	---	(-567,000)
100-17	General Sales Manager (by transfer)	(114,000)	(114,000)	---
	Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(8,967,000)	(8,967,000)	---
	Farmers Home Administration			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	3,000,000	+3,000,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(3,000,000)	---	(-3,000,000)
	Soil Conservation Service			
---	Conservation operations	---	7,297,000	+7,297,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(7,297,000)	---	(-7,297,000)
---	River basin surveys and investigations	---	102,000	+102,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(190,000)	---	(-190,000)
---	Watershed planning	---	74,000	+74,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(136,000)	---	(-136,000)
---	Watershed and flood prevention operations	---	943,000	+943,000
	Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	2,000,000	+2,000,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(2,000,000)	---	(-2,000,000)
	Federal Grain Inspection Service			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	53,000	+53,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(105,000)	---	(-105,000)
	Agricultural Marketing Service			
100-17	Limitation on administrative expenses (increase in limitation)	(501,000)	(501,000)	---
100-17	Funds for strengthening markets, income and supply (Section 32) (increase in limitation)	(112,000)	(112,000)	---
---	Packers and Stockyards Administration	---	78,000	+78,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(156,000)	---	(-156,000)
---	Agricultural Cooperative Service	---	32,000	+32,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(64,000)	---	(-64,000)
---	Office of Transportation	---	23,000	+23,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(45,000)	---	(-45,000)
---	Food Safety and Inspection Service	---	7,000,000	+7,000,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(7,996,000)	---	(-7,996,000)
	Food and Nutrition Service			
---	Food program administration	---	713,000	+713,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(713,000)	---	(-713,000)
	Human Nutrition Information Service			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	34,000	+34,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(34,000)	---	(-34,000)
	Forest Service			
100-17	Forest Research (by transfer)	(1,381,000)	(1,844,000)	(+463,000)
---	State and private forestry (by transfer)	---	(413,000)	(+413,000)
100-17	National forest system (by transfer)	(17,083,000)	(17,574,000)	(+491,000)
---	Construction (by transfer)	---	(2,859,000)	(+2,859,000)
	Total, Department of Agriculture	---	28,040,000	+28,040,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
	General Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(450,000)	(450,000)	---
	Economic Development Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(397,000)	(397,000)	---
	Economic and Statistical Analysis			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(332,000)	(332,000)	---
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration			
---	Operations, research, and facilities (by transfer)	---	(7,505,000)	(+7,505,000)
	National Telecommunications and Information Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(243,000)	(243,000)	---

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE--MILITARY			
	Operation and Maintenance			
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Army	2,679,000	2,679,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Navy	3,350,000	3,350,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	183,000	183,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	1,925,000	1,925,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies	2,307,000	2,307,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	109,000	109,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	29,000	29,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	3,000	3,000	---
100-17	Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve	281,000	281,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	285,000	285,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	618,000	618,000	---
100-17	Court of Military Appeals, Defense	1,000	1,000	---
	Total, Operation and Maintenance	11,770,000	11,770,000	---
	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation			
100-17	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army	336,000	336,000	---
100-17	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy	33,000	33,000	---
100-17	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force	306,000	306,000	---
100-17	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense Agencies	115,000	115,000	---
	Total, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	790,000	790,000	---
	Military Construction			
100-17	Military Construction, Army	93,000	---	-93,000
100-17	Military Construction, Navy	39,000	---	-39,000
100-17	Military Construction, Army Reserve	1,000	---	-1,000
	Total, Military Construction	133,000	---	-133,000
	Family Housing			
100-17	Family housing, Army	10,000	---	-10,000
	Total, Department of Defense--Military	12,703,000	12,560,000	-143,000
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE--CIVIL			
	Corps of Engineers--Civil			
100-17	General expenses (by transfer)	(1,832,000)	(1,832,000)	---
	Soldiers' and Airmen's Home			
100-17	Operation and maintenance (by transfer)	(378,000)	(554,000)	(+176,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY			
100-17	Energy Information Administration (by transfer)	(469,000)	(469,000)	---
100-17	Emergency preparedness (by transfer)	(89,000)	(89,000)	---
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
	Food and Drug Administration			
---	Program expenses	---	5,892,000	+5,892,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(5,892,000)	---	(-5,892,000)
	Health Resources and Services Administration			
---	Indian health services	---	7,686,000	+7,686,000
100-17	Indian health facilities (by transfer)	(4,877,000)	---	(-4,877,000)
	National Institutes of Health			
---	Office of the Director	---	150,000	+150,000
	Saint Elizabeths Hospital			
---	Federal subsidy for Saint Elizabeths Hospital	---	2,487,000	+2,487,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(2,487,000)	---	(-2,487,000)
	Social Security Administration			
---	Limitation on administrative expenses (increase in limitation)	---	(18,000,000)	(+18,000,000)
	Assistant Secretary for Human Development			
---	Human Development Services	---	500,000	+500,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Departmental Management			
100-17	General departmental management	2,200,000	1,500,000	-700,000
---	Office of Consumer Affairs	---	10,000	+10,000
	Total, Departmental Management	2,200,000	1,510,000	-690,000
	Total, Department of Health and Human Services	2,200,000	18,225,000	+16,025,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
	Management and Administration			
---	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	---	(9,714,000)	(+9,714,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
	Bureau of Land Management			
---	Management of lands and resources	---	5,622,000	+5,622,000
---	Oregon and California grant lands	---	815,000	+815,000
	Total, Bureau of Land Management	---	6,437,000	+6,437,000
	United States Fish and Wildlife Service			
---	Resource management	---	3,046,000	+3,046,000
	National Park Service			
---	Operation of the national park system	---	9,960,000	+9,960,000
---	National recreation and preservation	---	200,000	+200,000
	Total, National Park Service	---	10,160,000	+10,160,000
	Geological Survey			
---	Surveys, investigations, and research	---	6,072,000	+6,072,000
	Bureau of Mines			
---	Mines and minerals	---	900,000	+900,000
	Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement			
100-17	Regulation and technology (by transfer)	(642,000)	---	(-642,000)
	Bureau of Indian Affairs			
---	Operation of Indian Programs	---	9,765,000	+9,765,000
	Departmental Offices			
---	Office of the Secretary	---	350,000	+350,000
---	Office of the Solicitor	---	200,000	+200,000
---	Office of the Inspector General	---	120,000	+120,000
	Total, Departmental Offices	---	670,000	+670,000
	Total, Department of Interior	---	37,050,000	+37,050,000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
	General Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	575,000	575,000	---
	United States Parole Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	84,000	84,000	---
	Legal Activities			
100-17	Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	1,646,000	1,646,000	---
100-17	Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division	315,000	315,000	---
100-17	Salaries and expenses, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	3,000	---	-3,000
100-17	Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys	2,818,000	2,818,000	---
100-17	salaries and expenses, Oversight of Bankruptcy Cases	93,000	93,000	---
100-17	Salaries and expenses, United States Marshals Service	2,234,000	2,234,000	---
100-17	Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service	64,000	64,000	---
	Total, Legal Activities	7,173,000	7,170,000	-3,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Federal Bureau of Investigation			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	9,309,000	9,309,000	---
	Drug Enforcement Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	2,593,000	2,593,000	---
	Immigration and Naturalization Service			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	5,588,000	5,588,000	---
	Federal Prison System			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	3,932,000	3,932,000	---
100-17	National Institute of Corrections	20,000	20,000	---
100-17	Buildings and facilities	30,000	30,000	---
100-17	Limitation on administrative and vocational training expenses, Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (increase in limitation)	(133,000)	(133,000)	---
	Total, Federal Prison System	3,982,000	3,982,000	---
	Office of Justice Programs			
100-17	Justice assistance	172,000	172,000	---
	Total, Department of Justice	29,476,000	29,473,000	-3,000
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
	Occupational Safety and Health Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(1,583,000)	(1,583,000)	---
	Employment Standards Administration			
100-17	Black lung disability trust fund	708,000	708,000	---
	Departmental Management			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(1,476,000)	(1,476,000)	---
100-17	Office of the Inspector General (by transfer)	(460,000)	(460,000)	---
	Total, Department of Labor	708,000	708,000	---
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
	Administration of Foreign Affairs			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	6,900,000	6,900,000	---
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
	Office of the Secretary			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(763,000)	(750,000)	(-13,000)
	Coast Guard			
---	Operating expenses	---	10,000,000	+10,000,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(20,100,000)	(10,100,000)	(-10,000,000)
100-17	Reserve training (by transfer)	(1,231,000)	(1,200,000)	(-31,000)
	Federal Aviation Administration			
100-17	Headquarters administration (by transfer)	(542,000)	(500,000)	(-42,000)
---	Operations	---	35,500,000	+35,500,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(44,000,000)	(8,500,000)	(-35,500,000)
	Federal Highway Administration			
100-17	Limitation on administrative expenses (increase in limitation)	(1,299,000)	(1,200,000)	(-99,000)
100-17	Motor Carrier Safety (by transfer)	(147,000)	(140,000)	(-7,000)
	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration			
---	Operations and research	---	600,000	+600,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(634,000)	---	(-634,000)
	Federal Railroad Administration			
100-17	Office of the Administrator (by transfer)	(229,000)	(200,000)	(-29,000)
100-17	Railroad safety (by transfer)	(417,000)	(400,000)	(-17,000)
	Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation			
100-17	Limitation on administrative expenses (increase in limitation)	(30,000)	(30,000)	---

91-059 O-89-30 (Pt. 7)

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Research and Special Programs Administration			
100-17	Research and special programs (by transfer).....	(183,000)	(150,000)	(-33,000)
	Office of the Inspector General			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer).....	(447,000)	(400,000)	(-47,000)
	Total, Department of Transportation.....	---	46,100,000	+46,100,000
	DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY			
	Office of the Secretary			
100-17	Salaries and expenses.....	1,353,000	1,353,000	---
	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center			
---	Salaries and expenses.....	---	118,000	+118,000
	Financial Management Service			
100-17	Salaries and expenses.....	1,436,000	1,430,000	-6,000
	Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms			
---	Salaries and expenses.....	---	1,359,000	+1,359,000
	United States Custom Service			
---	Salaries and expenses.....	---	12,577,000	+12,577,000
	United States Mint			
---	Salaries and expenses.....	---	571,000	+571,000
	Bureau of the Public Debt			
---	Salaries and expenses.....	---	721,000	+721,000
	Internal Revenue Service			
---	Salaries and expenses.....	---	1,000,000	+1,000,000
---	Processing tax returns.....	---	7,003,000	+7,003,000
---	Examination and appeals.....	---	13,700,000	+13,700,000
---	Investigation, collection, and taxpayer service.....	---	11,400,000	+11,400,000
	Total, Internal Revenue Service.....	---	33,103,000	+33,103,000
	United States Secret Service			
---	Salaries and expenses.....	---	2,045,000	+2,045,000
	Total, Department of Treasury.....	2,789,000	53,277,000	+50,488,000
	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY			
---	Salaries and expenses.....	---	7,000,000	+7,000,000
100-17	(By transfer).....	(12,400,000)	(2,000,000)	(-10,400,000)
100-17	Hazardous Substance Response Trust Fund (increase in limitation).....	(2,365,000)	---	(-2,365,000)
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
	Federal Supply Service			
---	Operating expenses.....	---	1,233,000	+1,233,000
	Information Resources Management Service			
---	Operating expenses.....	---	297,000	+297,000
	Federal Property Resources Service			
---	Operating expenses.....	---	177,500	+177,500
	General Management and Administration			
---	Salaries and expenses.....	---	912,000	+912,000
	Office of Inspector General			
---	Office of Inspector General.....	---	198,000	+198,000
	Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents			
---	Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents.....	---	3,000	+3,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Federal Buildings Fund:			
	Limitations on availability of revenue:			
---	Real property operations	---	(2,740,000)	(+2,740,000)
---	Program direction and centralized services	---	(129,000)	(+129,000)
---	Design and construction services	---	(202,700)	(+202,700)
	Consumer Information Center			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	8,000	+8,000
---	Limitation on administrative expenses (increase in limitation)	---	(8,000)	(+8,000)
	Total, General Services Administration	---	2,828,500	+2,828,500
	NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION			
---	Research and program management	---	13,000,000	+13,000,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(24,927,000)	(12,000,000)	(-12,927,000)
	SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(2,400,000)	(2,400,000)	---
	VETERANS ADMINISTRATION			
100-17	Medical care	74,695,000	149,391,000	+74,696,000
100-17	Medical and prosthetic research	1,859,000	1,859,000	---
100-17	Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	736,000	400,000	-336,000
---	General operating expenses	---	5,500,000	+5,500,000
100-17	Construction, minor projects (increase in limitation)	(665,000)	(350,000)	(-315,000)
	Total, Veterans Administration	77,290,000	157,150,000	+79,860,000
	OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
	Administrative Conference of the United States			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	34,000	34,000	---
	Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	8,000	+8,000
	Advisory Committee on Federal Pay			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	1,000	+1,000
	American Battle Monuments Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	265,000	140,000	-125,000
	Arms Control and Disarmament Agency			
100-17	Arms control and disarmament activities	124,000	124,000	---
	Committee for Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	4,000	+4,000
	Consumer Product Safety Commission			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	250,000	+250,000
	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	2,640,000	2,640,000	---
	Export-Import Bank			
100-17	Limitation on administrative expenses (increase in limitation)	(157,000)	(157,000)	---
	Federal Communications Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	755,000	755,000	---
	Federal Election Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	88,000	---	-88,000
	Federal Home Loan Bank Board			
100-17	Federal Home Loan Bank Board (increase in limitation)	(350,000)	(200,000)	(-150,000)
	Federal Labor Relations Authority			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	136,000	136,000	---

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Federal Maritime Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	200,000	200,000	---
	Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	181,000	181,000	---
	Merit Systems Protection Board			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	170,000	170,000	---
100-17	Office of the Special Counsel	21,000	42,000	+21,000
	Total, Merit Systems Protection Board	191,000	212,000	+21,000
	National Archives and Records Administration			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	592,000	+592,000
	National Commission on Libraries and Information Science			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	6,000	6,000	---
	National Endowment for the Arts			
---	Grants and administration	---	200,000	+200,000
	National Endowment for the Humanities			
---	Grants and administration	---	200,000	+200,000
	National Labor Relations Board			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	628,000	628,000	---
	National Mediation Board			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	60,000	60,000	---
	National Science Foundation			
100-17	Research and related activities (increase in limitation)	(2,600,000)	(1,300,000)	(-1,300,000)
	Office of Personnel Management			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	731,000	+731,000
---	(By transfer)	---	(435,000)	(+435,000)
	Securities and Exchange Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	1,837,000	1,837,000	---
	Smithsonian Institution			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	2,654,000	+2,654,000
	National Gallery of Art			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	490,000	+490,000
	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	21,000	+21,000
	Unites States Holocaust Memorial Council			
---	Holocaust Memorial Council	---	19,000	+19,000
	United States Information Agency			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	2,691,000	2,691,000	---
	United States Tax Court			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	150,000	+150,000
	Total, Other Independent Agencies	9,836,000	14,964,000	+5,128,000
	TITLE II - INCREASED PAY COSTS			
	TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority	190,375,000	456,852,500	+266,477,500
	(Increase in limitations)	(8,100,000)	(3,879,000)	(-4,221,000)
	(Limitation on administrative expenses)	---	(18,000,000)	(+18,000,000)
	(By transfer)	(184,651,000)	(86,969,000)	(-97,682,000)
	(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(9,081,000)	(9,081,000)	---
	(Section 32 - increase in limitation)	(112,000)	(112,000)	---

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	TITLE III - INCREASED RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTIONS			
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH			
	House of Representatives			
100-17	Allowances and expenses	35,880,000	35,880,000	---
	Joint Items			
100-17	Joint Economic Committee	155,000	155,000	---
100-17	Joint Committee on Printing	34,000	34,000	---
100-17	Capitol Guide Service: Salaries and expenses	32,000	32,000	---
	Total, Joint Items	221,000	221,000	---
	Office of Technology Assessment			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	545,000	545,000	---
	Congressional Budget Office			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	452,000	452,000	---
	Architect of the Capitol			
100-17	Office of the Architect of the Capitol: Salaries	166,000	166,000	---
100-17	Capitol buildings	187,000	187,000	---
100-17	Capitol grounds	68,000	68,000	---
100-17	House office buildings	611,000	611,000	---
100-17	Capitol Power Plant	109,000	109,000	---
100-17	Library buildings and grounds: Structural and mechanical care	130,000	130,000	---
	Total, Architect of the Capitol	1,271,000	1,271,000	---
	Botanic Garden			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	48,000	48,000	---
	Library of Congress			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	1,906,000	1,906,000	---
100-17				
100-44	Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses	287,000	287,000	---
100-17				
100-44	Authority to spend receipts	-12,000	-12,000	---
100-17	Congressional Research Service: Salaries and expenses	617,000	617,000	---
100-17	Books for the blind and physically handicapped: Salaries and expenses	103,000	103,000	---
	Total, Library of Congress	2,901,000	2,901,000	---
	Copyright Royalty Tribunal			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	7,000	7,000	---
100-17	Authority to spend receipts	-6,000	-6,000	---
	Total, Copyright Royalty Tribunal	1,000	1,000	---
	Government Printing Office			
100-17	Office of Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses	83,000	83,000	---
	General Accounting Office			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	3,563,000	3,563,000	---
	Total, Legislative Branch	44,965,000	44,965,000	---
	THE JUDICIARY			
	Supreme Court of the United States			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	409,000	409,000	---
100-17	Care of the building and grounds	33,000	33,000	---
	Total, Supreme Court of the United States	442,000	442,000	---

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	23,000	23,000	---
	United States Court of International Trade			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	49,000	49,000	---
	Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	9,688,000	9,688,000	---
100-17	Defender services	887,000	887,000	---
	Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and other Judicial Services	10,575,000	10,575,000	---
	Administrative Office of the United States Courts			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	80,000	80,000	---
	Federal Judicial Center			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	108,000	108,000	---
	Total, The Judiciary	11,277,000	11,277,000	---
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
	The White House Office			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	374,000	374,000	---
	Executive Residence and White House			
100-17	Operating expenses	53,000	53,000	---
	Special Assistance to the President			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	107,000	107,000	---
	Council of Economic Advisers			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	95,000	95,000	---
	Office of Policy Development			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	89,000	89,000	---
	National Security Council			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	62,000	62,000	---
	Office of Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	214,000	214,000	---
	Office of Management and Budget			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	413,000	413,000	---
	Office of Federal Procurement Policy			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	20,000	20,000	---
	Office of Science and Technology Policy			
100-17	Office of Science and Technology Policy	40,000	20,000	-20,000
	Office of the United States Trade Representative			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	168,000	168,000	---
	Total, Executive Office of the President	1,635,000	1,615,000	-20,000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
	Agency for International Development			
100-17	Operating expenses, Agency for International Development	5,488,000	5,488,000	---
100-17	Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development, Office of Inspector General	218,000	218,000	---
	Total, Agency for International Development	5,706,000	5,706,000	---

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Peace Corps			
100-17	Peace Corps, operating expenses	436,000	436,000	---
	African Development Foundation			
100-17	African Development Foundation	99,000	99,000	---
	Total, Funds Appropriated to the President	6,241,000	6,241,000	---
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
---	Office of the Secretary	---	29,000	+29,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(29,000)	---	(-29,000)
---	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration	---	8,000	+8,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(8,000)	---	(-8,000)
---	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental and Public Affairs	---	6,000	+6,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(6,000)	---	(-6,000)
---	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics	---	6,000	+6,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(6,000)	---	(-6,000)
---	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education	---	6,000	+6,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(6,000)	---	(-6,000)
---	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Service	---	6,000	+6,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(6,000)	---	(-6,000)
	Office of the Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs	---	8,000	+8,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(8,000)	---	(-8,000)
	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development	---	8,000	+8,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(8,000)	---	(-8,000)
	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment	---	6,000	+6,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(6,000)	---	(-6,000)
	Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services	---	6,000	+6,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(6,000)	---	(-6,000)
---	Departmental administration	---	458,000	+458,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(458,000)	---	(-458,000)
---	Building operations and maintenance	---	165,000	+165,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(165,000)	---	(-165,000)
---	Office of Governmental and Public Affairs	---	126,000	+126,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(126,000)	---	(-126,000)
---	Office of the Inspector General	---	622,000	+622,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(622,000)	---	(-622,000)
---	Office of the General Counsel	---	239,000	+239,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(239,000)	---	(-239,000)
---	Agricultural Research Service	---	4,747,000	+4,747,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(4,747,000)	---	(-4,747,000)
---	Extension Service	---	6,500,000	+6,500,000
---	National Agricultural Library	---	97,000	+97,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(97,000)	---	(-97,000)
---	Economic Research Service	---	580,000	+580,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(580,000)	---	(-580,000)
---	National Agricultural Statistics Service	---	612,000	+612,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(612,000)	---	(-612,000)
---	World Agricultural Outlook Board	---	21,000	+21,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(21,000)	---	(-21,000)
---	Foreign Agricultural Service	---	607,000	+607,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(607,000)	---	(-607,000)
100-17	General Sales Manager (by transfer)	(107,000)	(107,000)	---
	Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(9,920,000)	(9,920,000)	---
	Office of International Cooperation and Development			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	114,000	+114,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(114,000)	---	(-114,000)
	Soil Conservation Service			
---	Conservation operations	---	5,331,000	+5,331,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(5,331,000)	---	(-5,331,000)
---	River basin surveys and investigations	---	130,000	+130,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(130,000)	---	(-130,000)
---	Watershed planning	---	97,000	+97,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(97,000)	---	(-97,000)
	Farmers Home Administration			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	4,678,000	+4,678,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(4,678,000)	---	(-4,678,000)

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Federal Grain Inspection Service			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	76,000	+76,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(76,000)	---	(-76,000)
	Agricultural Marketing Service			
---	Marketing services	---	490,000	+490,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(490,000)	---	(-490,000)
100-17	Limitation on administrative expenses (increase in limitation)	(213,000)	(213,000)	---
100-17	Funds for strengthening markets, income and supply (Section 32) (increase in limitation)	(84,000)	(84,000)	---
	Packers and Stockyards Administration			
---	Packers and Stockyards Administration	---	58,000	+58,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(58,000)	---	(-58,000)
	Agricultural Cooperative Service			
---	Agricultural Cooperative Service	---	46,000	+46,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(46,000)	---	(-46,000)
	Office of Transportation			
---	Office of Transportation	---	34,000	+34,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(34,000)	---	(-34,000)
	Food Safety and Inspection Service			
---	Food Safety and Inspection Service	---	4,573,000	+4,573,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(4,573,000)	---	(-4,573,000)
	Food and Nutrition Service			
---	Food program administration	---	1,503,000	+1,503,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(1,503,000)	---	(-1,503,000)
	Human Nutrition Information Service			
---	Human Nutrition Information Service	---	75,000	+75,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(75,000)	---	(-75,000)
	Forest Service			
---	Forest research (by transfer)	---	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
---	State and private forestry (by transfer)	---	(190,000)	(+190,000)
100-17	National forest system (by transfer)	(10,412,000)	(9,300,000)	(-1,112,000)
---	Construction (by transfer)	---	(1,600,000)	(+1,600,000)
	Total, Department of Agriculture	---	32,068,000	+32,068,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
	General Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	464,000	464,000	---
	Bureau of the Census			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	1,433,000	1,433,000	---
100-17	Periodic censuses and programs	2,806,000	2,806,000	---
	Total, Bureau of the Census	4,239,000	4,239,000	---
	Economic and Statistical Analysis			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	408,000	408,000	---
	Economic Development Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(400,000)	(400,000)	---
	International Trade Administration			
100-17	Operations and administration	2,237,000	2,237,000	---
	Minority Business Development Agency			
100-17	Minority business development	180,000	180,000	---
	United States Travel and Tourism Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	49,000	49,000	---

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration			
100-17	Operations, research, and facilities	5,972,000	5,972,000	---
	National Bureau of Standards			
100-17	Scientific and technical research and services	1,368,000	1,368,000	---
	National Telecommunications and Information Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	213,000	213,000	---
	Total, Department of Commerce	15,130,000	15,130,000	---
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE--MILITARY			
	Operation and Maintenance			
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Army	119,047,000	119,047,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Navy	148,880,000	148,880,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps	8,117,000	8,117,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	85,564,000	85,564,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies	102,453,000	102,453,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve	4,858,000	4,858,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,306,000	1,306,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	135,000	135,000	---
100-17	Operation and maintenance, Air Force Reserve	12,471,000	12,471,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard	12,666,000	12,666,000	---
100-17	Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard	27,479,000	27,479,000	---
100-17	National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army	7,000	7,000	---
100-17	Court of Military Appeals, Defense	36,000	36,000	---
	Total, Operation and Maintenance	523,019,000	523,019,000	---
	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation			
100-17	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army	14,955,000	14,955,000	---
100-17	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy	1,477,000	1,477,000	---
100-17	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force	13,609,000	13,609,000	---
100-17	Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense Agencies	5,165,000	5,165,000	---
	Total, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation	35,206,000	35,206,000	---
	Military Construction			
100-17	Military Construction, Army	4,136,000	4,136,000	---
100-17	Military Construction, Navy	1,736,000	1,736,000	---
100-17	Military Construction, Army Reserve	53,000	53,000	---
	Total, Military Construction	5,925,000	5,925,000	---
	Family Housing			
100-17	Family housing, Army	435,000	435,000	---
	Total, Department of Defense--Military	564,585,000	564,585,000	---
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE--CIVIL			
	Cemeterial Expenses, Army			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	74,000	40,000	-34,000
	Corps of Engineers--Civil			
100-17	General expenses (by transfer)	(1,400,000)	(1,400,000)	---
	Soldiers' and Airmen's Home			
100-17	Operation and maintenance (by transfer)	(578,000)	(578,000)	---
	Total, Department of Defense--Civil	74,000	40,000	-34,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
	Food and Drug Administration			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	4,108,000	+4,108,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(4,108,000)	---	(-4,108,000)
	Health Resources and Services Administration			
---	Indian health services	---	4,000,000	+4,000,000
100-17	Indian health facilities (by transfer)	(4,475,000)	---	(-4,475,000)
100-31	Health resources and services (by transfer)	(1,400,000)	---	(-1,400,000)
	Centers for Disease Control			
---	Disease control, research and training	---	1,237,000	+1,237,000
	National Institutes of Health			
---	Office of the Director	---	350,000	+350,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(755,000)	---	(-755,000)
	Saint Elizabeths Hospital			
	Federal subsidy for Saint Elizabeths Hospital	---	1,941,000	+1,941,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(1,941,000)	---	(-1,941,000)
	Departmental Management			
100-17	Office of the Inspector General (by transfer)	(500,000)	(500,000)	---
---	Salaries and expenses	---	8,000	+8,000
	Total, Departmental Management	---	8,000	+8,000
	Total, Department of Health and Human Services	---	11,644,000	+11,644,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
	Management and Administration			
---	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	---	(9,755,000)	(+9,755,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
	Bureau of Land Management			
---	Management of lands and resources	---	454,000	+454,000
---	Oregon and California grant lands	---	479,000	+479,000
100-17	Construction and access (by transfer)	(36,000)	---	(-36,000)
	Total, Bureau of Land Management	---	933,000	+933,000
	United States Fish and Wildlife Service			
---	Resource management	---	2,800,000	+2,800,000
	National Park Service			
---	Operation of national park system	---	4,000,000	+4,000,000
---	National recreation and preservation	---	100,000	+100,000
	Total, National Park Service	---	4,100,000	+4,100,000
	Geological Survey			
---	Surveys, investigations, and research	---	4,206,000	+4,206,000
	Bureau of Mines			
---	Mines and minerals	---	1,350,000	+1,350,000
	Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement			
100-17	Regulation and technology (by transfer)	(665,000)	---	(-665,000)
	Bureau of Indian Affairs			
---	Operation of Indian Programs	---	4,500,000	+4,500,000
	Departmental Offices			
---	Office of the Secretary	---	400,000	+400,000
---	Office of the Solicitor	---	200,000	+200,000
---	Office of Inspector General	---	180,000	+180,000
	Total, Departmental Offices	---	780,000	+780,000
	Total, Department of Interior	---	18,669,000	+18,669,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
	General Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	778,000	778,000	---
	United States Parole Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	155,000	155,000	---
	Legal Activities			
100-17	Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	2,213,000	2,213,000	---
100-17	Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division	430,000	430,000	---
100-17	Salaries and expenses, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	4,000	---	-4,000
100-17	Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys	3,510,000	3,510,000	---
100-17	Salaries and expenses, Oversight of Bankruptcy Cases	150,000	150,000	---
100-17	Salaries and expenses, United States Marshals Service	3,211,000	3,211,000	---
100-17	Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service	85,000	85,000	---
	Total, Legal Activities	9,603,000	9,599,000	-4,000
	Federal Bureau of Investigation			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	23,005,000	23,005,000	---
	Drug Enforcement Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	7,324,000	7,324,000	---
	Immigration and Naturalization Service			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	10,186,000	10,186,000	---
	Federal Prison System			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	17,053,000	17,053,000	---
100-17	National Institute of Corrections	129,000	129,000	---
100-17	Buildings and facilities	208,000	208,000	---
100-17	Limitation on administrative and vocational training expenses, Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (increase in limitation)	(55,000)	(55,000)	---
	Total, Federal Prison System	17,390,000	17,390,000	---
	Office of Justice Programs			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	210,000	210,000	---
	Total, Department of Justice	68,651,000	68,647,000	-4,000
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
	Employment and Training Administration			
100-17	Program administration (by transfer)	(808,000)	(808,000)	---
	Employment Standards Administration			
100-17	Black lung disability trust fund	494,000	494,000	---
	Occupational Safety and Health Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(1,533,000)	(1,533,000)	---
	Mine Safety and Health Administration			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(1,941,000)	(1,941,000)	---
	Departmental Management			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(1,302,000)	(1,302,000)	---
100-17	Office of the Inspector General (by transfer)	(556,000)	(556,000)	---
	Total, Department of Labor	494,000	494,000	---
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
	Administration of Foreign Affairs			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	16,734,000	16,734,000	---

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
	Office of the Secretary			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(535,000)	(450,000)	(-85,000)
	Coast Guard			
100-17	Operating expenses (by transfer)	(2,154,000)	(2,000,000)	(-154,000)
	Federal Aviation Administration			
100-17	Headquarters administration (by transfer)	(405,000)	(350,000)	(-55,000)
---	Operations	---	36,000,000	+36,000,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(48,267,000)	(10,000,000)	(-38,267,000)
	Federal Highway Administration			
100-17	Limitation on general operating expenses (increase in limitation)	(1,933,000)	(1,600,000)	(-333,000)
100-17	Motor carrier safety (by transfer)	(661,000)	(660,000)	(-1,000)
	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration			
---	Operations and research	---	400,000	+400,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(467,000)	---	(-467,000)
	Federal Railroad Administration			
---	Office of the Administrator	---	100,000	+100,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(156,000)	---	(-156,000)
---	Railroad safety	---	250,000	+250,000
100-17	(By transfer)	(306,000)	---	(-306,000)
	Total, Federal Railroad Administration	---	350,000	+350,000
	Urban Mass Transportation Administration			
100-17	Administrative expenses (by transfer)	(336,000)	(300,000)	(-36,000)
	Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation			
100-17	Limitation on administrative expenses (increase in limitation)	(34,000)	(30,000)	(-4,000)
	Research and Special Programs Administration			
100-17	Research and special programs (by transfer)	(139,000)	(100,000)	(-39,000)
	Office of the Inspector General			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(443,000)	(400,000)	(-43,000)
	Total, Department of Transportation	---	36,750,000	+36,750,000
	DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY			
	Office of the Secretary			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	863,000	863,000	---
	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	167,000	+167,000
	Financial Management Service			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	1,164,000	1,164,000	---
	Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	3,428,000	+3,428,000
	United States Custom Service			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	10,066,000	+10,066,000
	United States Mint			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	422,000	+422,000
	Bureau of the Public Debt			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	1,058,000	+1,058,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	Internal Revenue Service			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	3,110,000	3,110,000	---
100-17	Processing tax returns	81,854,000	81,854,000	---
100-17	Examinations and appeals	23,325,000	23,325,000	---
100-17	Investigation, collection and taxpayer service	11,711,000	11,711,000	---
	Total, Internal Revenue Service	120,000,000	120,000,000	---
	United States Secret Service			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	5,387,000	+5,387,000
	Total, Department of Treasury	122,027,000	142,555,000	+20,528,000
	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	5,000,000	+5,000,000
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(10,000,000)	---	(-10,000,000)
100-17	Hazardous Substance Response Trust Fund (increase in limitation)	(4,218,000)	---	(-4,218,000)
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
	Federal Supply Service			
---	Operating expenses	---	1,611,000	+1,611,000
	Information Resources Management Service			
---	Operating expenses	---	328,000	+328,000
	Federal Property Resources Service			
---	Operating expenses	---	290,000	+290,000
	General Management and Administration			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	1,214,000	+1,214,000
	Office of Inspector General			
---	Office of Inspector General	---	373,000	+373,000
	Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents			
---	Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents	---	5,000	+5,000
	Federal Building Fund			
	Limitations on availability of revenue:			
---	Real property operations	---	(5,065,000)	(+5,065,000)
---	Program direction and centralized services	---	(225,000)	(+225,000)
---	Design and construction services	---	(472,000)	(+472,000)
	Consumer Information Center			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	6,000	+6,000
---	Limitation on administrative expenses (increase in limitation)	---	(6,000)	(+6,000)
	Total, General Services Administration	---	3,827,000	+3,827,000
	NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION			
100-17	Research and program management (by transfer)	(16,557,000)	(10,500,000)	(-6,057,000)
	SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION			
100-17	Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(2,400,000)	(2,400,000)	---
	VETERANS ADMINISTRATION			
100-17	Medical care	131,600,000	131,600,000	---
100-17	Medical and prosthetic research	1,024,000	1,024,000	---
100-17	Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	345,000	175,000	-170,000
100-17	General operating expenses	9,242,000	5,000,000	-4,242,000
100-17	Construction, minor projects (increase in limitation)	(529,000)	(275,000)	(-254,000)
	Total, Veterans Administration	142,211,000	137,799,000	-4,412,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
	Administrative Conference of the United States			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	14,000	14,000	---
	Advisory Committee on Federal Pay			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	2,000	+2,000
	Arms Control and Disarmament Agency			
100-17	Arms control and disarmament activities	176,000	176,000	---
	Commission on Civil Rights			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	19,000	19,000	---
	Consumer Product Safety Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	496,000	250,000	-246,000
	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	1,889,000	1,889,000	---
	Export-Import Bank			
100-17	Limitation on administrative expenses (increase in limitation)	(227,000)	(227,000)	---
	Federal Communications Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	1,199,000	1,199,000	---
	Federal Election Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	202,000	83,000	-119,000
	Federal Home Loan Bank Board			
100-17	Limitation on administrative expenses (increase in limitation)	(350,000)	(200,000)	(-150,000)
	Federal Labor Relations Authority			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	220,000	+220,000
	Federal Maritime Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	147,000	147,000	---
	Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	188,000	188,000	---
	Intelligence Community Staff			
100-17	Intelligence community staff	155,000	155,000	---
	Marine Mammal Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	10,000	10,000	---
	Merit Systems Protection Board			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	272,000	+272,000
100-17	Office of the Special Counsel	---	79,000	+79,000
	Total, Merit Systems Protection Board	---	351,000	+351,000
	National Archives and Records Administration			
100-17	Operating expenses	863,000	863,000	---
	National Commission on Libraries and Information Science			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	17,000	17,000	---
	National Council on the Handicapped			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	10,000	10,000	---
	National Endowment for the Humanities			
---	Grants and administration	---	200,000	+200,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	National Labor Relations Board			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	1,659,000	1,659,000	---
	National Mediation Board			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	44,000	44,000	---
	Office of Personnel Management			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	1,129,000	+1,129,000
---	(By transfer)	---	(682,000)	(+682,000)
	Railroad Retirement Board			
100-17	Limitation on administrative expenses (increase in limitation)	(764,000)	(764,000)	---
100-17	Limitation on railroad unemployment insurance administration fund (increase in limitation)	(214,000)	(214,000)	---
100-17	Limitation on review activity (increase in limitation)	(22,000)	(22,000)	---
	Securities and Exchange Commission			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	2,163,000	2,163,000	---
	Smithsonian Institution			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	1,700,000	+1,700,000
	National Gallery of Art			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	330,000	+330,000
	Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	19,000	+19,000
	United States Holocaust Memorial Council			
---	Holocaust Memorial Council	---	16,000	+16,000
	United States Information Agency			
100-17	Salaries and expenses	5,443,000	5,443,000	---
100-17	Radio broadcasting to Cuba	516,000	516,000	---
	Total, United States Information Agency	5,959,000	5,959,000	---
	United States Tax Court			
---	Salaries and expenses	---	75,000	+75,000
	Total, Other Independent Agencies	15,210,000	18,887,000	+3,677,000
	TITLE III - INCREASED RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTIONS			
	TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority	1,009,234,000	1,136,927,000	+127,693,000
	(Increase in limitations)	(8,559,000)	(3,606,000)	(-4,953,000)
	(By transfer)	(141,204,000)	(58,705,000)	(-82,499,000)
	(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(10,027,000)	(10,027,000)	---
	(Section 32 - increase in limitation)	(84,000)	(84,000)	---
	TITLE IV - URGENT RELIEF FOR THE HOMELESS			
	CHAPTER I			
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
---	Grants for facilities to assist the homeless	---	75,000,000	+75,000,000
---	Emergency shelter grants program	---	100,000,000	+100,000,000
---	Transitional housing demonstration program	---	30,000,000	+30,000,000
---	Permanent housing for handicapped homeless persons	---	25,000,000	+25,000,000
	Total	---	230,000,000	+230,000,000
	FERERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY			
---	Emergency food and shelter program	---	50,000,000	+50,000,000
	Total, Chapter I: New budget (obligational) authority	---	280,000,000	+280,000,000

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
	CHAPTER II			
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
	Health Resources Services Administration			
---	Health resources and services	---	75,000,000	+75,000,000
	Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration			
---	Alcohol, drug abuse and mental health	---	25,000,000	+25,000,000
	Family Support Administration			
	Office of Community Services:			
---	Community services block grant	---	45,000,000	+45,000,000
	Total, Chapter II: New budget (obligationsl) authority	---	145,000,000	+145,000,000
	TITLE IV - URGENT RELIEF FOR THE HOMELESS			
	TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority	---	425,000,000	+425,000,000
	TITLE I - GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS			
	Chapter I:			
	Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary:			
	New budget (obligational) authority (net)	478,900,176	436,217,007	-42,683,169
	Appropriations	(1,853,900,176)	(1,811,217,007)	(-42,683,169)
	Appropriation for debt reduction	(-1,375,000,000)	(-1,375,000,000)	---
	(By transfer)	(38,520,000)	---	(-38,520,000)
	(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(50,000,000)	---	(-50,000,000)
	Chapter II:			
	Defense:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	2,542,600,000	1,316,172,000	-1,226,428,000
	Chapter III:			
	Energy and Water Development:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	---	---	---
	(By transfer)	(-61,150,000)	(6,295,000)	(+67,445,000)
	Chapter IV:			
	Foreign Operations:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	1,050,846,486	200,607,876	-850,238,610
	(By transfer)	---	(300,000,000)	(+300,000,000)
	(Limitation on callable capital)	(17,375,058)	(17,375,058)	---
	(Limitation on direct loans)	(-100,000,000)	(-100,000,000)	---
	Chapter V:			
	Housing & Urban Development-Independent Agencies:			
	New budget (obligational) authority (net)	-9,107,000	113,200,000	+122,307,000
	Appropriations	(81,624,000)	(113,200,000)	(+31,576,000)
	Authority to borrow	(-90,731,000)	---	(+90,731,000)
	(By transfer)	---	(30,000,000)	(+30,000,000)
	(Limitation on direct loans)	(-90,731,000)	---	(+90,731,000)
	Chapter VI:			
	Interior and Related Agencies:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	23,028,000	39,187,000	+16,159,000
	(Liquidation of contract authority)	(9,915,000)	(9,915,000)	---
	Chapter VII:			
	Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	43,000,000	250,994,000	+207,994,000
	(By transfer)	(341,727,000)	(413,583,000)	(+71,856,000)
	(Limitation on trust fund transfer)	(-79,638,000)	(130,000,000)	(+209,638,000)
	(Limitation on direct loans)	(-60,000,000)	---	(+60,000,000)
	Chapter VIII:			
	Legislative Branch:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	18,040,000	12,511,500	-5,528,500
	Chapter IX:			
	Military Construction:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	250,000,000	---	-250,000,000
	Chapter X:			
	Rural Development, Agriculture & Related Agencies:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	6,656,615,000	6,692,365,000	+35,750,000
	(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(24,705,000)	(24,705,000)	---
	Chapter XI:			
	Transportation:			
	New budget (obligational) authority (net)	27,980,000	79,893,783	+51,913,783
	Appropriations	(138,534,000)	(151,497,278)	(+12,963,278)
	Appropriation for debt reduction	(-110,554,000)	(-71,603,495)	(+38,950,505)
	(By transfer)	(50,000,000)	(17,000,000)	(-33,000,000)
	(Appropriation to liquidate contract authority)	(77,000,000)	(195,000,000)	(+118,000,000)
	Chapter XII:			
	Treasury, Postal Service & General Government:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	166,727,000	182,774,000	+16,047,000
	(Limitation on availability of revenue)	(61,900,000)	(61,900,000)	---

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	Recommendation	Recommendation compared with Request
TITLE I - GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS			
TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority (net)	11,248,629,662	9,323,922,166	-1,924,707,496
Appropriations	(12,824,914,662)	(10,770,525,661)	(-2,054,389,001)
Authority to borrow	(-90,731,000)	---	(+90,731,000)
Appropriations for debt reduction	(-1,485,554,000)	(-1,446,603,495)	(+38,950,505)
(Liquidate contract authority)	(86,915,000)	(204,915,000)	(+118,000,000)
(Limitation on trust fund transfer)	(-79,638,000)	(130,000,000)	(+209,638,000)
(By transfer)	(369,097,000)	(766,878,000)	(+397,781,000)
(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(24,705,000)	(24,705,000)	---
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(17,375,058)	(17,375,058)	---
(Limitation on availability of revenue)	(61,900,000)	(61,900,000)	---
(Change in limitation on direct loans)	(-250,731,000)	(-100,000,000)	(+150,731,000)
(Change in limitation on guaranteed loans)	(50,000,000)	---	(-50,000,000)
TITLE II - INCREASED PAY COSTS			
TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority	190,375,000	456,852,500	+266,477,500
(Increase in limitations)	(8,100,000)	(3,879,000)	(-4,221,000)
(By transfer)	(184,651,000)	(86,969,000)	(-97,682,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	---	(18,000,000)	(+18,000,000)
(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(9,081,000)	(9,081,000)	---
(Section 32 - increase in limitation)	(112,000)	(112,000)	---
TITLE III - INCREASED RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTIONS			
TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority	1,009,234,000	1,136,927,000	+127,693,000
(Increase in limitations)	(8,559,000)	(3,606,000)	(-4,953,000)
(By transfer)	(141,204,000)	(58,705,000)	(-82,499,000)
(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(10,027,000)	(10,027,000)	---
(Section 32 - increase in limitation)	(84,000)	(84,000)	---
TITLE IV - URGENT RELIEF FOR THE HOMELESS			
TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority	---	425,000,000	+425,000,000
GRAND TOTAL			
TOTAL - New budget (obligational) authority (net)	12,448,238,662	11,342,701,666	-1,105,536,996
Appropriations	(14,024,523,662)	(12,789,305,161)	(-1,235,218,501)
Authority to borrow	(-90,731,000)	---	(+90,731,000)
Appropriations for debt reduction	(-1,485,554,000)	(-1,446,603,495)	(+38,950,505)
(Liquidate contract authority)	(86,915,000)	(204,915,000)	(+118,000,000)
(By transfer)	(694,952,000)	(912,552,000)	(+217,600,000)
(Transfer from Commodity Credit Corporation)	(43,813,000)	(43,813,000)	---
(Increase in limitations)	(16,659,000)	(7,485,000)	(-9,174,000)
(Section 32 - increase in limitation)	(196,000)	(196,000)	---
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(17,375,058)	(17,375,058)	---
(Limitation on availability of revenue)	(61,900,000)	(61,900,000)	---
(Increase in limitation on administrative expenses)	---	(18,000,000)	(+18,000,000)
(Trust fund transfer)	(-79,638,000)	(130,000,000)	(+209,638,000)
(Limitation on indefinite contract authority)	---	---	---
(Change in limitation on direct loans)	(-250,731,000)	(-100,000,000)	(+150,731,000)
(Change in limitation on guaranteed loans)	(50,000,000)	---	(-50,000,000)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, year after year the salmon swin upstream to spawn. They fight rocks and currents bear, seals, and fishermen with large boots and large appetites, you name it.

Year after year I defend supplemental appropriation bills on the floor of this House. I feel like a salmon swimming upstream. Like the currents and the rocks and the fishermen, the bills and the arguments never change. So here I am again.

We are told that our priorities are wrong. Let me tell you what those priorities are.

We recommend: $6.7 billion for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Let me take a minute to explain this.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I received a letter from Agriculture Secretary Richard Lyng informing me that the Commodity Credit Corporation will run out of money on May 1—just 9 days from now.

I am not surprised, Mr. Chairman. The CCC is spending an average of $73 million a day. They have almost exhausted the $19.8 billion we gave them for fiscal year 1987 in less than 7 months.

This is the second year that we have been paying the new farm bills, and the checks are too fat; $27 billion this year, 50 times more than we spent in 1978. Double what we spent in 1985.

Where's this money all going?

For 1986 cotton program payments alone, Dunavant Enterprises in Tennessee, Arizona and California received $90.2 million; Allenberg Cotton Co. of Memphis got $83.6 million. And here's one for the books—Conticotton of Fresno, $27.2 million.

These are just a few examples of how we're ripping the cotton shirts right off the taxpayers' backs.

The farm programs are working so well that the CCC is bankrupt. I say "good." Let it shut down, and let it stay shut down until we get some real reform out of the legislative committees.

The sum of $250 million to fund programs established by this Congress to deal with illegal drugs, immigration, and bankruptcy; $80 million for veterans' compensation and pensions; $1.3 billion for the personnel, procurement, and research programs of the Department of Defense; $250 million to fulfill our commitments to international fi-

nancial institutions; $50 million for military assistance for the Philippines; $300 million by transfer for economic assistance for Central America; $287 million by transfer to avoid a serious reduction in student assistance through the Pell grant program; $80 million for the Internal Revenue Service; $457 million for the Federal pay raise that has already gone into effect; and $1.1 billion for the new Federal employees retirement system.

These supplementals, which total $10.3 billion in new budget authority, 90 percent of the bill was requested by the President.

We added $200 million in my Labor-HHS Subcommittee for worker's retraining under the Trade Act, older Americans community service, health programs to reduce infant and neonatal mortality rates, work incentives, and family social services. As the ranking minority member of that subcommittee, I would be pleased to debate those supplementals with any Member of this House.

We cut $1.5 billion from the request for defense and military construction. Those cuts were not "anti-defense."

They were made because DOD did not justify supplementals for programs like SDI and chemical weapons destruction.

We are told that this bill violates "the process," and in the same breath we are told that OMB scores this bill as $6.6 billion over budget.

Think about that for a minute.

They calculate that figure by charging the committee with inaction on $1.8 billion in negative supplementals and $5.7 billion in rescissions.

If you support "the process" then you must also support the proposition that supplementals are justified only when new developments require action before the regular bill can be enacted.

If you support "the process" then you cannot support rescissions and negative supplementals which are used to appeal issues that were clearly settled in last year's appropriation bill, or negative supplementals which are legislative in nature and should be addressed in the authorization process.

We are told that the bill is inconsistent with Gramm-Rudman-Hollings because it would add $3.9 billion to the deficit for fiscal 1987.

In fact, a report filed yesterday by the Budget Committee estimates that fiscal year 1987 outlays are $4.6 billion below the budget resolution, and that the fiscal year 1987 deficit is $13.8 billion below the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target.

Based on that report, the $3.9 billion in fiscal year 1987 outlays in this bill are within the levels in the budget resolution and within the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings target.

We are told that the bill exceeds the committee's allocation of discretionary new budget authority.

That is true, but only because the entire $6.7 billion for CCC is scored as discretionary.

Of this total, $3.4 billion is for mandatory payments, and is not discretionary.

If scored correctly, the committee would be under its allocation of discretionary new budget authority.

Mr. Chairman, I have been swimming upstream long enough.

In its present form this bill would be vetoed. There are supplementals in this bill that I cannot support, but there are also programs that are important to me, and to my constituents.

I think we should move forward, so I will vote for the bill.

I remind my colleagues that last year both the supplemental and the continuing resolution would have been vetoed as reported from committee. Once we got to conference, and the political games were over, we sat down with the Senate and with OMB and agreed on bills that were signed.

I know that circumstances have changed. The other body is under new leadership. But I have hope that we can conference a bill that will be signed, and we can't get to conference unless we pass the bill today.

□ 1320

Again, let me repeat, I do not like everything in this bill. There are a lot of things in here that I really feel are very, very important.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to go along with us. Give us that opportunity. We will go to conference with the Senate after they work their will. At that point, if we do not have a bill that is acceptable to the President, then he can veto the bill and it will come back here and we will have a chance to either sustain or override that veto.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE

Chapter I of the supplemental provides $436,217,007 for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the judiciary and related agencies. This represents a reduction of $42,683,169, or 9 percent, below the administration's budget requests for these agencies.

Significant items in this chapter include $197 million, 45 percent of the chapter total, for the Department of Justice to carry out activities authorized by new legislation such as the Immigration Reform Act, the Bankruptcy Act, the Anti-Drug Act and other law enforcement statutes. In addition, the judiciary is provided $49 million to exercise the courts' responsibilities under these acts.

The chapter provides $75 million for the Department of State, 63 percent of which is for currency exchange rate losses and inflationary wage and price increases overseas. Also provided is $12 million for initial work on a new U.S. Embassy in El Salvador because of earthquake damage to the existing building and $5 million for a national gift to the Australian bicentennial.

The chapter does not provide $22 million requested for the United States contribution to the United Nations interim force in Lebanon [UNIFIL], but it does include language restoring $130 million in outlay authority for contributions to international organizations other than the regular budget on the U.N. The administration may request funds to restore U.S. arrearages to the U.N. budget at a later date. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty will maintain current broadcasting levels with $33 million provided to the Board for International Broadcasting for currency exchange rate losses.

This chapter also includes four significant language provisions, as follows:

First, language directs the Small Business Administration to assist Texas gulf coast business injured by the red tide infestation. The administration opposes this language, citing the 1981 and 1984 reconciliation acts which eliminated the eligibility for disaster loan program assistance to economic losses which result from normal business risks;

Second, language provides for a reprogramming of $62.5 million for a two-spacecraft Landsat system with a restriction that funds for the second satellite should come from users or sources other than the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The administration requested one additional satellite as the final Federal Government commitment to the privatization of the Landsat system.

Third, language prohibits the Department of Commerce from obligating funds to promulgate or implement proposed regulations requiring gulf coast shrimp trawlers to use turtle excluder devices to protect endangered turtle species. The administration opposes this language, stating that voluntary use of the device has not been successful, and that the Endangered Species Act requires action.

Fourth, language is included in title V, general provisions, of the bill prohibiting the maritime Administrator or the Secretary of Transportation from (a) proceeding with a rulemaking allowing the repayment of construction differential subsidies by vessel-owning companies as a means of reentering the domestic shipping market; and (b) participating in any judicial proceeding on this subject. The administration strongly objects to this language on substantive grounds for part "A" and on constitutional grounds for part "B". If the language were enacted, the administration estimates that $114 million would have to be repayed to vessel owners.

Finally, this chapter provides $62 million in new budget authority and $7.5 million in transfers for pay supplementals, and $124 million in budget authority and $2.8 million in transfers is included for the Federal employee retirement system.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

In chapter III, the supplemental provides for programs under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development. The supplemental directs the Corps of Engineers to proceed, using available funds, with certain projects that had been identified in previous appropriations bills. The supplemental also provides for the appropriation of funds for corps operation and maintenance from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662.

For the Bureau of Reclamation, the supplemental provides an additional $5.6 million for the Kesterson Reservoir cleanup, to be derived by transfer. These funds are necessary to extend the Kesterson effort through the end of the fiscal year.

For the Department of Energy, under energy supply, research and development, the supplemental directs that an additional $1.2 million be made available for Mod-5B acceptance testing, out of available funds. These funds should not be taken out of funds previously earmarked for other projects, particularly the funds reserved for the Renewable Energy Research Center, Program at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Chapter IV of the supplemental provides $200,607,876 in new budget authority for foreign assistance programs. This represents a reduction of $850,238,610, or 81 percent, below the administration's budget requests.

In addition, $300 million is provided by transfer from the Department of Defense for economic assistance to Central America to continue the national bipartisan plan for that troubled region. Of this $300 million, $64 million is for Guatemala, $64 million is for Costa Rica, $55 million is for Honduras, $105 million is for El Salvador—of which, $50 million is for earthquake relief—$2 million is for Belize and $10 million is for child survival fund activities.

Language is included designating this additional aid to Central America for development assistance and disaster assistance only and requiring that the aid be obligated under existing statutory restrictions in regard to El Salvador and Guatemala. Those restrictions deal with human rights, the rule of law, land reform and other concerns of the Congress as expressed in the Foreign Assistance Act. Obligation of the Central America funds is also subject to the submission by the administration of an official budget request identifying the specific sources of these funds to be transferred from the Department of Defense.

This chapter also provides $250.6 million to clear up U.S. arrearages in our contributions to three international financial institutions. Within this total $207.5 million will complete our contribution to the seventh replenishment of the International Development Association [IDA VII], $6.5 million is for the African Development Bank, and $36.6 million is for the African development fund.

All military assistance requests have been denied with exception of $50 million in military grant aid to the Philippines. Items denied include $200 million in foreign military sales to Spain, $211 million in military grant aid for Turkey, Portugal, Morocco, Kenya, Somalia, El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala, and $97 million in economic support funds for Spain, Portugal, Morocco, and Oman, for new budget authority for southern Africa (provided by earmark instead) and for additional funds for the Bolivia narcotics program.

As I just mentioned, this chapter earmarks $50 million from previosuly appropriated economic support funds for assistance to the front line states bordering South Africa. Three-fourths of these funds, or $37.5 million, is to be used to assist the member states of the Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference [SADCC] in such sectors as transportation, communications, energy, agricultural research and training and private sector initiatives. The remaining $12.5 million is for humanitarian assistance to these nine countries, including the use of up to $5 million for emergency appeals by the United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF].

These funds for southern Africa will be in addition to any United States aid currently programmed for those countries. The funds are to be available only after this program has been authorized.

Language has been included in this chapter reducing the direct lending limitation of the Export-Import Bank in fiscal year 1987 from $900 million to $800 million. This has the effect of offsetting $100 million of the budget authority provided for the programs I have just outlined and offsetting all of the estimated outlays for those programs in this fiscal year. It is expected that the lower direct lending level for Exim will be adequate to meet demand this year.

Language has also been included placing a moratorium on an administration plan to alter the terms of foreign military sales agreements with borrowing countries until the end of this fiscal year or until a fiscal 1988 foreign assistance appropriations bill is enacted, whichever is later. This language is opposed by the administration.

And finally, this foreign operations chapter provides $2.6 million for pay supplementals and $6.2 million for the new Federal employees retirement system.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

In addition to the $56 billion in new budget authority already available for programs in the jurisdiction of the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee for fiscal year 1987, the committee recommends supplemental appropriations for programs totaling $113.2 million in chapter V, $177.6 million in title II, $143.1 million in title III and $280 million in title IV. These recommendations total $411.9 million over the administration's supplemental requests, and represent 6 percent of the total new BA recommended in H.R. 1827.

For program supplementals in title I, the committee has recommended the following: $80.2 million for veterans compensations and pensions, as requested by the administration; $3 million for the American Battle Monuments Commission to offset foreign currency fluctuations, this is a $1.6 million increase over the administration's request; $20,000 for salaries and expenses of the three Consumer Product Safety Commissioners; and $30 million for the continuation of the Veterans Job Training Program despite the administration's expressed opposition to the provision of any additional funds.

We have also agreed to release $1.2 billion in EPA construction grants that had been fenced off in the 1987 continuing resolution pending enactment of a Clean Water Act reauthorization.

The sum of $30 million of the total released is recommended for transfer into the new clean water programs established by Public Law 100-4; $12 million is for staffing, $10 million is for State water quality grants and $8 million is for technical assistance. The administration has expressed opposition to these provisions.

The committee has disapproved two EPA deferrals including $11 million in research and development, and $11.4 million in abatement, control, and compliance.

We have increased the limitation on administrative expenses for the school asbestos abatement program to provide an additional $1 million for lab accreditation. And, we have included language making available up to $16 million in the superfund trust fund for emergency planning and community right-to-know activities; $5 million for this amount is for FEMA State and local training grants.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The committee has included several legislative provisions affecting FEMA and the VA:

A provision postponing the effective date of FEMA's final regulations on the National Flood Insurance Program as they affect existing manufactured mobile home April 1, 1987, to October 1, 1988.

Language requested by the Veterans' Administration extending the availability of $62.1 million in 1987 automated data processing equipment and support contracts, and permitting the settlement of a contractor's claim involving a VA medical center in West Virginia.

Language prohibiting a mission change at the Walla Walla, WA, Medical Center.

PAY SUPPLEMENTALS

The committee reviewed the administration's requests for pay supplementals of $77.6 million in new BA, $37.3 million in program transfers, and $5.98 million in increases of limitations on administrative expenses. We recommend $177.6 million in new BA, $21.7 million of the proposed transfers and $3.9 million in limitation increases. The title II pay provisions total $99,984,000 in new BA over the requests.

RETIREMENT

The committee reviewed requests for FERS supplementals totaling $142.8 million in new BA, $26.6 million in program transfers and $5.1 million in administrative expense limitation increases. Our recommendations in title III include $143.1 million in new BA, $20.3 million of the proposed transfers and $481,000 in limitation increases. This represents only a $294,000 increase in new BA over the requests.

RESCISSIONS

The committee did not approve any of the $1,259,759,500 in program rescissions proposed by the administration since January 5. Nor did we include any of the requested language reducing 1987 programs by $552,994,000.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE

The committee has included H.R. 558, as passed the House, by reference in title IV of this bill.

Of the amounts authorized, we appropriate $280 million for programs and activities under the jurisdiction of the HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee.

These include: $75 million for a new HUD program providing grants to nonprofit organizations for facilities to assist the homeless and $25 million for a new HUD program of State grants to provide for permanent, community-based housing for the handicapped homeless; $100 million for the HUD Emergen-

cy Shelter Matching Grant Program in addition to the $10 million already made available for fiscal year 1987; $430 million for the HUD Transitional Housing Demonstration Program to supplement the $5 million already made available for fiscal year 1987; and $50 million for the FEMA Emergency Food and Shelter Program in addition to the $115 already made available for fiscal year 1987.

No request for fiscal year 1987 supplemental homeless assistance programs was submitted by the administration. And OMB has expressed strong opposition to our provision of additional funds at this time.

INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

The Interior chapter provides the full budget request for program supplementals with several add-ons, most of the pay costs and some of the costs associated with the new retirement system. Of the $541 million proposed to be rescinded, the bill recommends no rescissions.

Most of the funds recommended for program supplementals were requested by the administration. However, OMB does object to the $13.9 million added for National Park Service land acquisition; $2.1 million has been earmarked to purchase land in the Olympic National Park in Washington State. The remaining $11.8 million was provided to purchase land at Congaree Swamp National Monument as ordered by the U.S. district court. Under the court order, the Government is required to make this purchase. The administration is suggesting that the funds be made available through transfer or reprogramming.

The OMB also objects to the $2.8 million added to the energy conservation "steel initiative." These funds were taken from another program within the Department, and so the total appropriation for this account should remain the same.

The bill contains several language provisions relating to the operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

The administration objects to this restrictive language.

To cover the costs of the pay increase, the committee recommended $71.5 million, composed of $48.3 million in new budget authority and $23.3 million to be derived by transfer from other accounts. The administration proposed no new budget authority for increased pay costs. The full pay costs for the agencies in this bill would be $78.8 million.

To cover the costs associated with the new retirement system, the committee recommended an additional $37 million to be derived from $12 million in transfers and new budget authority totaling $24.9 million. No new budget authority was requested, and the full cost of the retirement system in fiscal year 1987 is estimated to be $51.9 million.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, there's a lot of good news in the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education chapter of this Supplemental. Once again, it bears the mark of Chairman NATCHER, demonstrating his sense of responsibility, restraint, and—as always—compassion in bringing spending measures before this body.

But, once again, Office of Management and Budget says it has a better sense of what the people want and need than does Chairman NATCHER or SILVIO CONTE or all the elected Members of Congress, and that senior staff will recommend that the President veto this bill.

Let me say to my colleagues that I think OMB is wrong to attack this portion of the bill, because what we recommend today is necessary to continue Government support for—

The older Americans who want to serve their communities, the unemployed summer youth with no positive alternatives, and the American workers who have been displaced from their jobs by foreign competition;

The next generation of American leaders who are enrolled in postsecondary education institutions, vocational education curriculum centers, historically black colleges and universities, public service graduate education programs, programs of international education that will help to prepare them for the world community, and those colleges and universities which have substantial needs for renovation and reconstruction of academic facilities and dormitories;

The homeless, the welfare mothers who need training and employment assistance, the mothers and children who depend on the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant Program, those who need the family social services and foster care and adoption assistance programs, and the sick or mentally impaired who can benefit from the research conducted by the National Institutes of Health and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, including geriatric clinical research and substance abuse research.

Let me give you some of the details.

For student assistance, the bill provides a transfer of $287 million in unused funds for the Guaranteed Student Loan Program to the Pell Grant Program. This transfer will not do any harm to the GSL Program, but it will substantially benefit the Pell Grant Program. It removes the spectre for hundreds of thousands of Pell Grant recipients of having their awards reduced this coming fall, because the Education Department misestimated the actual cost of the program. And for the future, we can be assured that whatever we appropriate for Pell Grants will go to student awards, rather than seeing portions used to retire past year shortfalls.

We recommend an additional $165.2 million for the Foster Care and Adoption Assistance Programs, including the Independent Living Program. These are entitlement programs whereby every eligible child is entitled to assistance. The Foster Care Program helps the States provide care to children who may need placement outside their homes, with a foster family or in an institution, and, for children with special needs who may be difficult to place, adoption assistance is provided to facilitate their eventual placement in permanent adoptive homes. Independent living is a wonderful program that helps older children obtain the skills to make the transition from institutional living to living on their own.

State unemployment insurance and employment services operations will receive an increase of $130 million from the trust fund, $30 million of which will go to pay for State administration of the targeted jobs tax credit. Many States are currently having difficulty in keeping up with the workload of their unemployment insurance operations, and are facing the prospect of having to lay off staff or close local unemployment offices. In addition, last year's tax reform legislation extended the TJTC, but we provided no funds to administer the program. The additional funds will alleviate these problems.

We propose to transfer $83 million to the Chicago Board of Education from unobligated program balances in the Education Department that have been put in escrow to be used to settle this litigation. These funds will be used to settle the Federal obligation arising out of a consent decree in 1980 on litigation between the United States and the Chicago Board over the board's desegregation plan. I am relieved that this payment will finally settle this issue which has been before this body several times.

We propose to transfer $50 million in funds appropriated for next summer to the 1987 Summer Youth Employment Program, in the expectation that we will not see a downturn in the numbers of youth served by this program when the youth unemployment figures contine to increase.

The maternal and child health block grant would be increased by $37.5 million over the amount provided in last year's regular Labor, HHS, and Education bill. This program is our first line of defense against infant mortality as it helps States to provide adequate health care to mothers and children who otherwise have no access to health care. Last year's reconciliation bill increased the authorization for this program and targetted the new funds in the manner provided for in this bill.

The bill proposes to increase funding for the WIN Program by $35 million. This program is very successful in many States at providing education and training to welfare mothers in an effort to make them self-sufficient. Unfortunately, because some States have had success with the program, many think it should be replaced with a new program. In last year's bill, we anticipated earlier action on new legislation in this area and provided WIN funds only through the first three quarters of fiscal year 1987. Now, because a new program will not be enacted in the near future, we are providing an additional $35 million, in order to allow the WIN Program to operate through the end of the fiscal year.

We provide an additional $20 million for worker retraining under the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. The Department of Labor has run out of money to pay for retraining of workers certified by the Department as having lost their jobs as a result of foreign imports. In my own State of Massachusetts and several other States, the Department has already approved contracts to provide the retraining, but has insufficient funds to pay for them. The additional funds would keep this program operating for the remainder of the fiscal year.

The newly-authorized College Construction Loan Insurance Association will receive the $20 million startup funding specified in last year's amendments to the Higher Education Act. This new program is overdue when one looks at the tremendous need for reconstruction and renovation on our Nation's college campuses. It would provide loan guarantees

on loans made to colleges and universities, particularly those with limited endowments which might not be able to obtain construction capital on the open market.

The Community Service Employment for Older Americans Program will receive a supplemental of $10 million. This is one of my favorite programs in that it offers senior citizens the opportunity to remain active in their communities through part-time community service jobs. This is a very cost-effective program because it provides meaningful work to senior citizens for a relatively small amount compared to the alternative programs of support like SSI.

We provide increases of $1.8 million for the National Institute on Aging and $750,000 for ADAMHA for programs affecting the elderly. The NIA funds are directed to further research on Alzheimer's disease, a growing health problem recently highlighted in this month's report from the Office of Technology Assessment entitled, "Losing a Million Minds." I am also pleased with the small increase in clinical training funds at ADAMHA, specifically targetted on geriatrics, but I think we need to do more in this area, and will look to the regular bill.

The committee provides $1 million for the Curriculum Coordination Centers authorized under the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act, in order to implement our intent in the regular fiscal year 1987 bill.

For categorical higher education, we provide several needed increases, including $1 million for the Black College and University Act, $1 million to restore funds intended for the International Education Program, and $1.3 million for Javits fellowships.

In addition, the committee specifically rejected several of the administration's proposals for undercutting the spending decisions of this Congress, made just 5 months ago.

First, we rejected their proposal to carry over into fiscal year 1988 $334 million of the funds we appropriated last for NIH and $5 million of our fiscal year 1987 ADAMHA appropriation, which would have reduced the funding for both fiscal years 1987 and 1988. In addition, they argued that their proposal was made in the interest of "stabilization" of biomedical research. We haven't yet discovered how many young researchers have been affected by this proposal, but witness after witness this year told us that the uncertainty in funding, not the "stability" proposed by the administration was causing severe disruptions in the field.

In last year's drug initiative, we authorized a substance abuse initiative at ADAMHA. Because the $30 million for this research initiative in the continuing resolution came so late in the year, we also gave the agency authority to spend into fiscal year 1988, as a way of easing their administrative burden. However, we did not grant authority to use this money for 2-year awards, and the report directs ADAMHA to make first year awards in fiscal years 1987 and 1988.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good chapter, and one which the House should support.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Chapter VIII of the supplemental provides $12,511,500 for the legislative branch, a reduction of $5,528,500, or 31 percent, below the budget requests.

Significant items in this chapter include $1.95 million for the expenses of the House Select Committee To Investigate Covert Arms Transactions With Iran, and $8.9 million for the partial cost of the new House telephone system.

Also included is $247,000 for transportation, food and lodging related to House Members and staff participation in the proposed Philadelphia joint session of Congress on July 15–16, 1987, and $252,000 for Capitol Police activities connected with that session.

A request of $3.4 million for additional official mail costs is denied, as the committee has determined that $2.2 million is available in carryover funds from previous years.

The chapter includes language extending to House leadership offices the authority to transfer budget authority among various House accounts as is presently the case with other accounts for management purposes. Language is also provided to increase the number of assistants in the attending physician's office from 11 to 12.

The chapter provides $9.3 million for pay supplementals, a reduction of $18.9 million, or 67 percent, below the budget requests. These funds are to pay partial costs of the 3-percent cost-of-living increase provided to all Federal employees in January 1987. No funds are included in the bill for the quadrennial pay commission recommendations which went into effect in March 1987.

The full request of $45 million in provided for the new Federal Employees Retirement System.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

In addition to the $45 billion in new budget authority already available for rural development and agricultural programs in fiscal year 1987, the committee recommends supplemental appropriations for programs totaling $6.7 billion in chapter X. This is $6.69 billion over the administration's supplemental request, and represents 58 percent of the total new BA in H.R. 1827.

The committee has, once again, rejected the administration's request for permanent, indefinite borrowing authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation [CCC]. We have, however, agreed to restore the full amount estimated by USDA for remaining fiscal year 1987 requirements: $6,653,189,000.

This estimate includes: $700 million for commercial storage, handling, transportation, processing and packaging; $200 million for producer and extended loan storage payments; $870 million for the dairy program; $790 million for advance crop deficiency payments; $500 million for 1987 crop diversion payments; $1.47 billion for commodity loans; $580 million for the conservation reserve; $285 million for export guarantee claims; $440 million for interest payments to the Treasury; $375 million for transfers to the Crop Insurance Corporation; $224 million for operating expenses; and a $1.5 billion operating reserve.

The committee has also, once again, regretfully placed limitations on CCC obligations for several of these programs, and has tapped into the account for nonprogram purposes.

Of the $6.65 billion included in the bill, there are limitations of: $300 million for export guaranteed loan claims; $400 million for the conservation reserve; and $400 million for interest payments to Treasury. These caps may only serve to increase the costs of fiscal year 1988 operations, and are opposed by the administration.

Among the transfers recommended in the bill are $24.7 million from the CCC for salaries and expenses at ASCS and the general sales manager. These were requested by the administration on January 5.

In addition, we have transferred $135 million from the CCC for the additional disaster payments authorized in the House-passed version of H.R. 1157. We have also agreed to fund additional SCS staff that may be required to implement various new farm bill conservation programs by transfer from the CCC; 5 percent of the $400 million in supplemental funds available for the conservation reserve (or $20 million) is transferred for this purpose. We are providing these funds to hire new staff instead of transferring existing personnel, as has been proposed.

In the Northeast, and my home State of Massachusetts, where the President has declared several flooded counties national disaster areas, we cannot afford to have our State office and field staff reassigned on even a temporary basis to other parts of the country.

I will point out that, even with a $1.5 billion CCC operating reserve assumption, we still run the danger of exhausting the CCC account by September 30 with these limitations and transfers.

The CCC is spending $73 million a day on average on Federal commodity programs; $26.5 billion this year alone. The $19.8 billion we provided in the 1987 continuing resolution will be exhausted in less than a month. No other part of our Federal spending has skyrocketed as high of as fast. This is the main reason for the committee's budget waiver request today. And it will most likely be the main reason for our next waiver request, unless we act to reform these farm programs in this session.

Among the remaining $35.8 million in program supplementals recommended by the committee are:

The sum of $10 million for three reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, including one intended to ascertain the position of agricultural producers on mandatory production controls. No request of such studies or investigations was submitted by the administration, and OMB has expressed opposition to funds included for analysis and balloting.

The sum of $16.2 million for the new construction of an agriculture, science, and industry facility at Penn State. No request for these funds was submitted, and OMB has expressed opposition to this project.

The sum of $3 million in unrequested funds for expansion of the boll weevil eradication program into Georgia, Florida, and Alabama.

The sum of $3 million in unrequested funds for a special FmHA grant for the development of the Choctaw Regional Rural Industrial Park in Oklahoma. OMB has also expressed opposition to this provision.

The sum of $1,050,000 in unrequested special project funds for three projects including: $300,000 for shrimp aquaculture research in Mississippi, $300,000 for Mississippi watershed repair; and $450,000 for repairs at the Beltsville, MD, Agricultural Research Center.

The sum of $3,426,000 for the Special Milk Entitlement Program, as requested by the administration.

The sum of $1,500,000 in unrequested funds for the Food and Drug Administration to use in the evaluation, analysis and testing of drugs and vaccines for the treatment of AIDS. OMB has expressed opposition to this earmark.

The sum of $1 million for salaries and expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The committee has also included several legislative provisions in chapter X of the bill. These include language:

Enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to reapportion Hatch Act funds to fund eligible research in the Northern Mariana Islands.

Providing the Secretary of Agriculture with discretionary authority to adjust interest rates on nonsubsidized loans; the administration has consistently opposed such adjustments.

Extending the limitations on loan prepayments of FmHA section 515 rural rental housing loans from June 30 through September 30, 1987.

Restating the language in the 1987 continuing resolution that eliminated the tuition limitation affecting private school eligibility for participation in child nutrition programs.

Providing the Office of International Cooperation and Development with authority to transfer up to $500,000 in existing funds to contract with international organizations for the Associate Experts Program.

RESCISSIONS

The committee did not approve any of the $447.5 million in rescissions proposed by the administration on January 5 or January 28, 1987. H.R. 1287 does not include any of the $2.74 billion in loan program reductions proposed by the administration since January 5.

PAY SUPPLEMENTALS

The committee reviewed requests from the administration for funding $48.9 million in pay increases by transfer from existing accounts. The committee approved only $9.08 million in transfers but provided $33.9 million in new BA for pay increases. We approved all of the $613,000 in increases of limitations on administrative expenses, however our total recommendation for accounts in title II is $33,932,000 over the request for new BA.

RETIREMENT

The committee received budget requests totaling $39.7 million for FERS; all were to be derived by transfer from existing accounts.

We approved only $10 million of the requested transfers, but the full $297,000 requested for increases in administrative expense limitations. Our recommendations in title III total $36,176,000 over the administration's requests for new BA.

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE

The committee has not included any fiscal year 1987 supplemental funds in the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Rural Development, Agriculture and Related Agencies.

However, in title IV the committee has included the authorizing provisions of H.R. 558, the bill which passed the House on March 5, 1987. This language would, upon enactment, result in fiscal year 1987 changes in the programs of the Food and Nutrition Service and the Commodity Credit Corporation, including:

Authorization for State food stamp agencies to conduct outreach programs targeted to the homeless with 50 percent Federal funds.

Increasing the cap on the excess shelter cost deduction and excluding third-party payments for temporary housing from the definition of household income under the Food Stamp Program.

Extending the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program authorization for 3 years.

Authorization of supplemental allotments of donated Government cheese for 3 years under the program to certain States.

The CBO has estimated that these provisions would result in additional costs totaling $387 million between 1988 and 1990. The administration has expressed strong opposition to these authorization provisions.

TRANSPORTATION

In chapter XI, the supplemental provides for programs under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Related Agencies. We have provided $55.2 million for FAA operations, which includes funding for the operation of the air traffic control system and training of increased numbers of air traffic controllers. The committee also has directed the FAA to halt any further closures and consolidations of flight service stations unless the service area will be served by an automated flight service station with model 1 or better service.

For grants-in-aid for airports, the supplemental includes a liquidating cash appropriation of $160 million, plus an additional $25 million of unobligated funds in the supplementary discretionary fund.

The supplemental includes the disapproval of a number of policy deferrals that had been proposed, affecting the rail service assistance program, the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program, the Interstate Transfer Grants-Transit Program, and UMTA research, training, and human resources, among others.

The bill also provides $6.25 million for the rebate of the U.S. portion of tolls paid by commercial vessels using the St. Lawrence Seaway, and slightly over $8 million for operating expenses of the Panama Canal Commission.

Finally, language in the supplemental would prohibit the use of Federal funds for the Advisory Commission on the Privatization of Amtrak.

TREASURY-POSTAL SERVICE-GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Most of the funds provided in this chapter were requested by the administration, and the committee recommends no rescissions.

Chapter XII add-ons include $5.7 million to supplement Secret Service protection of the Pope on his visit to the United States, $22.6 million for the U.S. Customs Service to cover the full costs of the pay increase and the new retirement system, $10 million for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms for personnel and equipment, and $475,000 for the National Archives to catalog and preserve the military records of the Vietnam war. The committee also disapproved a $38.9 million deferral of funds proposed by the administration for the Customs Service Air Interdiction Program.

Requested supplemental funds include $80 million for the IRS to implement the provisions of the new tax law, $5.5 million for the Treasury Department to renovate its annex building, $1.9 million for the Financial Management Service and $79 million for the Postal Service to reimburse the Labor Department for unfunded liabilities. The committee also approved a request for a $61.9 million increase in the limitation on availability of revenue for the Federal Buildings Fund.

The administration objects to two language provisions added by the committee.

Section 503 prohibits the use of any funds made available by this act to implement the provisions of the Executive order mandating a Federal drug testing program. Since the provision only effects funds made available in this supplemental, the language would have no practical effect. Agencies of the Federal Government could use funds appropriated by the continuing resolution or permanently appropriated funds to implement a drug testing program for Federal employees.

Section 505 prohibits the General Services Administration from transferring the Customs House in Boston to any buyer except the city of Boston. The provision does not prohibit the sale of the building, but simply forces the GSA to continue negotiations with the city for this fiscal year. For some time, the GSA has been negotiating with the city, and an agreement is close. The committee expects the GSA to negotiate in good faith to sell this property to the city in an expeditious manner.

Section 504 prohibits any changes in the Customs Service Air Operations unless the Secretary of the Treasury submits a report to the committee outlining the details of such changes. Again, since this provision affects funds appropriated in this act only, the language has no real effect. The Customs Service can use funds made available by this continuing resolution or previously made available by permanent appropriation to make management changes in the program. The administration objects to this provision as well.

In regard to the increased pay costs and the cost of the new retirement system, virtually all of the agencies in this chapter were treated equally. The committee recommends that each agency be provided the full cost of the retirement system and 50 percent of the amount required to cover the pay raise.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

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

Mr. Chairman, while we all hope that we can achieve a major breakthrough in Geneva on negotiations on long-range strategic forces and defenses, it is increasingly likely that in the year and one-half remaining in this administration that will not be accomplished. We do have an excellent chance to reach an INF agreement, but regarding the other negotiations it is now prudent to plan how to best position the next administration, wheth-

er Democratic or Republican, for completing the work on these negotiations begun by the Reagan administration. This requires, in my view, maintaining existing limits on both offensive forces and defensive forces so that future options are not foreclosed.

Last year, this body conducted an extensive debate on whether we should continue a policy that the Reagan administration had followed through its first 5½ years. That is the policy of not unilaterally undercutting the only existing limits that have existed on strategic nuclear weapons, unless and until we have achieved a new agreement making deep cuts. This body concluded that it was in the national security interests of the United States to continue that policy of interim restraint. It was a conclusion that was incorporated into the conference reports on both the defense authorization and appropriations bills for fiscal year 1987.

I want to make it clear from the beginning that this is not a question of ratifying the Salt II Treaty the provision that was added by the Appropriations Committee, by the so-called amendment that I offered, any more than the administration was acting to ratify the treaty by following the policy. It is a policy judgment that addresses the question whether we are better off if both the United States and the Soviet Union keep their strategic forces under 820 MIRV'd ICBM's, 1,200 MIRV'd ICBM's and SLBM's, 1,320 such systems and cruise missile carrying bombers, and do not add warheads to individual systems beyond those spelled out in SALT II. If the President certifies that the Soviets have exceeded these limits, then we would be free to respond under this provision.

We are not addressing the question of a second new type missile in this provision. That is a judgment we will make separately on the question of Midgetman funding. Nothing in the provision puts any restrictions on our ability to respond to encryption. The question is very simply. Should the policy we followed from 1980 to 1986 continue, or should we change courses.

In deference to the administration, however, last year we did not bind the President in the conference agreement. We relied on the good judgment of the administration. We hoped that the President would remember his statement when asked why he had followed interim restraint. That statement was quite simply that, "The Soviet Union has the capability to increase weaponry much faster than the treaty permits, and we don't." The judgment that interim restraint is in the U.S. national security interests is shared by a long list of respected defense experts, including former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff David Jones, former commander of the Strategic Air Command Gen. Bennie Davis, and virtually every recent Secretary of Defense.

Despite this fundamental fact of life, in December the administration acted to have U.S. forces exceed these limitations with the deployment of a 131st B-52 bomber equipped with air launched cruise missiles. Those deployments have continued since that time at the rate of approximately two per month without any offsetting reductions.

As a result, the Appropriations Committe voted by a margin of 35-19 to include these provisions in the supplemental appropriations bill. This was an exercise of our responsibility to raise and support armies and navies and make rules for their government, as provided for in article I, section 8 of the Constitution. This action is in keeping with a long line of congressional steps over the years that have viewed strategic weapons decisions in the context of their impact on arms control. These actions have come down on both sides of the issue, in support of strategic modernization as well as in support of restraint.

To date, the Soviet Union has continued to keep its forces within these numerical sublimits. They have renewed their willingness to continue their actions that to date have resulted in the withdrawal, dismantlement, or destruction of over 1,300 strategic weapons launchers. As a result, some have argued that there is no need to bring U.S. forces back within these limits, because the Soviets will not respond.

Well, I for one am not willing to count indefinitely on Soviet unilateral restraint. I am not comfortable with their potential to add up to 21,000 new warheads by the mid-1990's, according to the CIA. And I'm not comfortable with the prospect of having to spend, according to CBO, up to $100 billion to match such an effort. I worry about the implications of an unconstrained Soviet offensive force on any chance for success of the strategic defense initiative. And I am concerned about what we accomplish in a zero/zero INF agreement if the Soviets could simply offset those reductions with new long range systems targeted at Europe.

Weigh all those factors against the extremely modest contribution that a few additional ALCM-equipped B-52's provide and the scales tip overwhelmingly in favor of continuing interim restraint.

Some will argue that this is not the right time to adopt this provision. They will claim that it undermines our negotiators in Geneva. My response is if this is not the time to exercise good faith mutual restraint, when is the time? How does the elimination of the only limits that exist on nuclear forces improve the atmosphere for their reduction? Our prospect for success in Geneva on long range strategic forces in the time remaining in the administration are limited at best. But our long range prospects will be enhanced in my judgment by a willingness to demonstrate reasoned restraint, and that is what this provision provides.

On the question of defensive limitations we will be debating shortly the issue of application of the ABM Treaty to the strategic defense initiative. These issues go hand in hand and together provide for a prudent transition policy for the next few years.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. Chairman, there are many controversial parts of this bill, many which I really cannot support, but there are some good parts, two of which I would like to talk about briefly at this moment.

I want to extend my thanks to the leadership and to the members of both the Appropriations and the Rules Committees who worked with me to get these provisions in and for keeping them in. Specifically, TRENT LOTT, in one instance, and Congressman BILL YOUNG in the other, were both of great help.

In the one with which Mr. YOUNG assisted me, I would like to particularly point out that we have in this bill provided a section which protects the 815th Reserve Reconnaisance Squadron at Keesler Air Force Base which essentially preserves all of the tracking assets and equipment for tracking hurricanes in the gulf and in the Caribbean and on the eastern coast of this country in the Atlantic.

It is very important for the Air Force to continue this service, because they provide invaluable aid to all of the gulf coast's weather stations by tracking hurricanes which threaten hundreds of thousands of people along the gulf coastal regions and throughout the rest of the Southeastern section of the United States.

Second, is this provision about "TED's"—turtle excluder devices. There is a proposal in NOAA, the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, which would effectively impose upon the shrimpers of the Southeastern United States the mandatory responsibility of buying, acquiring, and installing turtle excluder devices, 40-pound boxes, to put in their nets to kick out turtles when they were caught in the shrimp catch. The problem was for the western gulf waters; these devices have not been adequately studied. They had been studied in the eastern gulf where you have hard, sandy bottoms and clear water. But, in the western gulf, where muddy water and muddy bottoms

abound, there was no determination that these devices would effectively exclude turtles or whether or not there were any turtles to exclude.

□ 1330

So we put a provision in this bill that would set back these regulations for approximately 1 year, and which would compel NOAA and the environmentalists to go back and study the impact of these particular devices in western gulf coastal waters, so that we would avoid any undue hardship to the people who were being adversely impacted by the imposition of these devices, specifically the shrimpers from Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas.

We put this provision in because we felt that it unnecessarily put into effect a proposal which had not been adequately studied, and which could adversely affect thousands of families, many of whom have no other way to make their living, many of whom have been devastated by the oil patch decline. They cannot go out on the oil rigs and make a living, and so if they can't catch shrimp, what can they do?

So it is very, very important that this provision stays in the bill, and that it ultimately becomes law so that these people have an opportunity to make their living. We can go back to the drawing board and protect the turtles with further studies; a year from now, we can come back to the floor of the House, debate the issue, and make a decision which is rationally based on scientific studies done in the western gulf waters. Those studies do not exist now. Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to keep this provision in the law as it is.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said a year from now. What the gentleman means is the next fiscal year, does he not?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. In the next fiscal year, that is correct. The gentleman is correct. But the report language actually speaks in terms of a full year after July 1981. This is the intent of my amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], a member of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, people have asked why the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Justice Department, the Judiciary, and others would need a supplemental bill at this time.

I would like to point out that there are some things that occurred since we passed the regular bill last September or October that require a supplemental. One, of course, is a pay increase which occurred in January. In the part of the bill referred to, we have required them to absorb about half of it.

Also, there has been a change in the exchange rate. The exchange rate has drastically changed. The State Department and others who operate overseas, of course, would have to have a supplemental to offset that.

Also, we passed several new laws last fall. One was the immigration law. Funding it requires a substantial amount of funding. That was not anticipated at the time the regular bill passed, and also the bankruptcy laws which had wide support both in the administration and in the country, and that requires funding.

I want to mention something also about the request in the Small Business Administration for salaries and expenses.

The committee did not approve the requested language change for the salaries and expenses appropriation of the Small Business Administration, which would have extended the availability of $4,116,000 that was appropriated for fiscal year 1987 for small business development centers. This request was part of the administration's plan to phase out the small business development centers over a 5-year period—a proposal which the committee has not approved. Therefore, the committee expects the Office of Management and Budget and the Small Business Administration to make available for obligation the entire $35 million which was originally provided in the fiscal year 1987 continuing resolution, Public Law 99-591, for small business development centers. This amount includes the resources necessary for renewing all of the grants of existing small business development centers and for making grants to qualified applicants for new SBDC's. The committee also expects the Small Business Administration to notify its district offices immediately of the availability of fiscal year 1987 funds for new SBDC's and ensure that these offices move quickly to encourage the submission of all qualified applications.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRENZEL].

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

Mr. FRENZEL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make a brief rejoinder to the remarks that were made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] concerning the arms control provisions that are in this particular document.

First, we are telling essentially the Soviet Union in this document that we are compelling as Members of Congress the President of the United States to abide by a treaty that we all agree the Soviet Union has breached substantively.

Second, this President has done pretty well with the Soviet Union as far as bringing them to the bargaining table by utilizing strength rather than weakness, rather than reductions in military force.

I take particular umbrage with the statement that "We shouldn't count much longer on the unilateral restraint of the Soviet Union."

I think the Soviet Union has made nuclear weapons just about as fast as they have been able to work up nuclear material for those warheads.

I think the present course the administration is taking, that is, showing arms control treaties, at least the SALT treaties that the Soviets have violated, to be just what they are, which is basically agreements and licenses to build nuclear weapons on the Soviet side. That position the President has taken is working, has brought the Soviets to the negotiating table, and I think Congress does a disservice to this effort in keeping these provisions in this particular document.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we have already exceeded our 1987 budget outlay totals by about $15 billion. This bill is going to add $3.6 billion to that amount, compounding our already difficult situation and making, of course, further deficit reduction much more difficult.

What we are doing here, Mr. Chairman, is adding to the baseline and the fact that you add it later through the vehicle of a supplemental does not conceal the fact any longer.

Mr. Chairman, this House and this Congress has missed in its budget resolutions, it has missed computing the deficit by more than a $40 billion average over the past 5 years. It is quite obvious that the House on the subject of spending can be compared to a mad dog. It simply froths saliva and spends more, no matter what the restrictions of our budget resolution.

This is a resolution that justly deserves to be killed. We should vote against it. If it takes a veto, we should support the veto. This is another example of open-handed profligacy, a pure waste in the Congress, and any person who votes for this bill will have difficulty convincing me or anyone else that he or she is interested in reducing the deficit.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], a member of the committee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the Interior and Related Agencies chapter of the 1987 supplemental appropriation includes $39,187,000 in new budget authority. This is an increase of

$16,159,000 over the amount requested. The largest portion of the committee's recommendation is to cover emergency costs related to forest fires, flood and storm damage, and to replace equipment destroyed in volcanic eruptions. A total of $16,397,000 is provided for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and the Geological Survey for emergency costs.

Within the National Park Service an additional $4,631,000 is appropriated, as requested for law enforcement costs. This money will provide additional park police, replace aging vehicles and radios, and provide for protection at special events. The National Capital Area, Golden Gate NRA, and Gateway NRA all benefit from this supplemental.

The committee has recommended two land acquisitions in the National Park Service, totaling $13,910,000. For Congaree Swamp National Monument $11,810,000 is provided pursuant to the recently settled Congaree Swamp eminent domain proceeding, *United States v. 14,770.65 Acres of Land*, Civil No. 77-2046. Under the court order, the Government is obligated to pay for the property and interest is accruing to the owner until payment is made.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to address the committee's intent in the 1987 appropriation that the Forest Service use its inholding account to purchase the Torre Canyon Ranch which is the highest priority of the Forest Service's Pacific Southwest Region.

In titles II and III, the pay and retirement portions of the supplemental, agencies under the jurisdiction of the Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee will receive $48,320,000 for pay costs and $24,934,000 for the new Federal Employees Retirement System. Transfers of $23,248,000 for pay and $12,090,000 for retirement are also included.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good chapter and a good bill. I urge its adoption.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to explain to my colleagues here in the House that several of us have been going through this particular bill looking at the potential that a line-item veto would have given the President to take specific projects and specific decisions to change them.

I find it a little difficult, if I understand the bill, for example on page 125, as I understand section 503, it would block the President from administering or enforcing his Executive order for mandatory drug testing as it relates to Federal employees involved in safety related systems.

I do not understand why the House in a 127-page appropriations bill would be making that decision.

As I look through here, there are a series of new programs that have never existed before, that are not authorized by the authorizing committees. There is a series of specific programs including five highways.

Now, I understand why my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee would like to be a miniature Congress, but I am not sure why the United States should tax citizens across the whole country for specifically designated legislative highways.

So we are going to offer in the course of the afternoon a series of amendments that are in effect a legislative line-item veto that will step by step walk through things that should not be in an appropriations bill and they should not be decided by the House.

There is a specific building in here for a specific university, a great university, but we are not the State legislature of that State. It seems a little ridiculous that a bill of this size we are deciding to build a specific building at a specific campus out of all the thousands of campuses in the United States.

I think this bill is an example of the degree to which we have been concentrating power in one or two committees. They have been making the decisions and they are in effect attempting to run the Government of the United States and make decisions out of a handful of small rooms in the Capitol.

I would hope that my colleagues would look carefully at each amendment and ask yourselves, at a time of large deficits, at a time of rising interest rates——

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

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Georgia.

□ 1340

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I would just ask my colleagues to look at these amendments and ask themselves: we are in danger of sliding into a recession; we have too large a deficit; all of our international allies are begging us to shrink the deficit; we have too much spending in this Government. Does it really make sense to vote for higher interest rates, to vote to kill jobs, to vote to put America in a recession, to vote for a weaker dollar, by taking on in this House the power to decide what highways to build in a minor section of this bill? To decide in this House which college ought to get which building? To decide in this House to punish America's allies in Central America but reward anti-American and Communist governments in southern Africa?

This bill combined in one package is just about everything that is wrong with the liberal welfare state, and I would ask my colleagues to look line by line at the amendments that we will be offering this afternoon and ask themselves if they really want to vote for a bigger deficit, higher interest rates, and a recession.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MCCURDY].

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Chairman, first of all I rise in support of this supplemental appropriation, and also to take 1 minute to thank the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with Central America, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], on the provisions providing assistance to the four Central American nations that are our allies that have emerging democracies, and I think that that position is well stated, and I certainly appreciate his willingness to let me work in crafting some of those provisions.

Another provision of the bill, though, I have to state my opposition to, even though I support the overall bill. Based on the testimony received in the recently concluded hearings I chaired in the Intelligence Committee on Arms Control Monitoring, I do not agree with the nuclear testing provisions because, in my judgment, the state of the art of nuclear test monitoring is such that while under ideal circumstances a seismic event similar to that of a very low-yield underground nuclear explosion can probably be detected, the U.S. Government does not yet have capability to determine with high confidence that such an event was or was not a nuclear explosion.

Such discrimination requires the development of highly sophisticated data readout and processing capabilities in order to differentiate between seismic noise created by nuclear explosions and the seismic noise created by the thousands of other nonnuclear underground events such as small earthquakes and conventional explosions used in mining and earth clearing. Hence, in my judgment under an evasion scenario, we would not be able to verify with high confidence that the Soviets had not detonated a low-yield nuclear explosion above the 1 kiloton level.

I am optimistic that the research and development on the discrimination problem will result in a capability to monitor with high confidence a low-yield nuclear threshold which I would then be prepared to support consistent with maintaining the viability of our nuclear deterrent.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBEST].

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, there is much that can be said about the arms control restrictions in this bill. Primarily, they go against common sense. They undermine efforts at serious arms control where

agreements mean something. They are further evidence of a bungling Congress trying to direct our foreign policy.

But I want to focus on a sentence in a "dear colleague" letter than is being circulated by proponents of the SALT II restriction. The sentence reads, "Arms control negotiations are not bolstered by eliminating the only limits that exists on nuclear forces, they are bolstered by a willingness to demonstrate reasoned restraint."

That sentence says much about the current problems our Nation faces in meeting an aggressive Soviet challenge.

The idea that if only the United States will show restraint, the Soviets will come to their senses and we'll live happily ever after would be comical if it were not so deadly. Do we have to constantly recite the history of Soviet expansion during periods of United States restraint? What additional signs of good will do they need?

It truly frightens me to consider how far we have to restrain ourselves to convince the Soviets under this theory. They are under no illusions as to what kind of Nation we are, and they know full well that we want a safer world. They also know that we may hand them more concessions on our own than they could ever get at the bargaining table.

The Soviets only act to promote their national self-interest and the United States has no alternative but to pursue our own national interests with equal vigor.

Make no mistake. The issue is not complying with an agreement. SALT II does not exist. The issue is the same one we have faced in the 1960's and the 1970's: should we hold back while the Soviets build and build.

The worst thing about this approach is its underlying premise. The ultimate goal for some is a treaty—most any treaty will do. They worship at the alter of parchment.

The ultimate goal should always be the security and safety of our Nation. We must never allow our vision to waiver from that goal. When we lose sight of the real objective, our world perspective gets skewed and we try to argue that we will be safer if we do less.

Let us see the world as it really is and look on the Soviet's goals as they really are, and let us meet our first responsibility which is to defend this Nation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak briefly to an issue stated earlier today by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], and join him in urging the Members of the House to allow a provision already in the bill to remain in. That provision would require a 1-year moratorium on the business of turtle excluder devices [TED] on the shrimpers off the coast of this Nation.

The choice is not between the turtles and the shrimp; the choice is between common sense and haste without reason. The choice is common sense, it seems to me, that we try to find a way to protect the turtles and allow our shrimping industry to continue.

It is not an idle or esoteric question where I am from. Louisiana already has the highest unemployment rate in America. This device—unproven, untested, and in many ways unsound—will sharply increase our unemployment rate.

We are not asking that the turtles be sacrificed; we are asking that the House allow us 1 year to come up with a way to allow the shrimpers to thrive and the turtles to live. It is a good proposition, and I ask the House to stick with us.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, this supplemental contains about $11½ billion in new spending, roughly half of which goes for the farm program. It is money that is desired. It goes for very good programs and good things. But, Mr. Chairman, this bill overtly violates the fiscal 1987 budget resolution, and of course that is exactly the reason why the rule waived that budget resolution, so we could in fact, overtly violate it.

□ 1350

It also quietly undermines and subverts, Mr. Chairman, the budget resolution we passed just a few short weeks ago, because it is going to up the baseline on spending under that budget resolution. The question ought to occur to us here in the House: Can we really afford these good things that this bill proposes to spend for, with 2 trillion dollars' worth of debt and $200 billion budget deficits each year for the last 6. The answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is no.

Should the President sign it if we do pass it? Will he sign it? The answer is again no.

There is worthwhile spending in this legislation. But we must also ask: will it be offset; will we save the money when we proceed to budget reconciliation? The answer is "No."

Yes; we desire many of these things. But are they really urgent? Do they belong in an urgent supplement? Here we are for the third year in a row, Mr. Chairman, intentionally understimating, it appears, our Farm Program expenses, and coming back once again for huge amounts in the supplemental that we should have included in the first place if we were honestly approaching the subject.

I, for one, Mr. Chairman, will not support this supplemental. It is time to be candid with the American people. It is time to be honest. It is time to be responsible. It is not time for business as usual.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. If you read the committee report you will see it contends that the President's request are $12.4 billion and that the committee's bill asks for $11.342 billion. That makes it possible for you to delude yourself into believing that if you find it good enough for Government work, you may have a justification to vote for this bill. However, even that is based on the inaccurate contention that they are doing better than the President. If you vote for the bill on that basis, you are suffering the worst kind of selfdelusion, because it is only in the way the bill is scored.

If you properly score the CCC and make other adjustments in this bill, you will find that by taking the President's offsets into consideration the President's request was a net reduction in expenditure of $344 million, whereas this bill asks for an increase in expenditure of over $6 billion with no recessions.

In addition to that, if you look deep within the bill you will find there is something for everyone who could have an influence over the acceptability of this bill. This is pure pork.

I implore the Members of this Congress who voted for Gramm-Rudman, who voted for the spirit to find offsets for new expenditures, who believed that the process of budgeting should be supplemented with serious efforts to hold the line on spending and exercise restraint in tradeoff decision making, to vote no on this bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1827, the fiscal year 1987 supplemental appropriations bill.

The Appropriations Committee has brought forth a good bill containing provisions necessary to meet pressing national needs and to prevent the Government from running out of money before September 30.

Of particular interest to the people of Arkansas' First Congressional District is the $24.9 million transferred to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service [ASCS] so that agency may pay for increased administrative expenses.

ASCS suffers from a cumbersome administrative workload that is simply

too big for the agency to manage under current conditions.

Because of the farm depression, participation in the major commodity programs is at a record high. Without Government payments, most farmers could not continue farming. The Government check has become essential to American agriculture.

Thus, the management of ASCS has become an important part of the lives and livelihoods of farmers, their families, and their neighbors in farming communities across the Nation.

In some counties in the First Congressional District of Arkansas, farmers begin to line up outside the county ASCS office before 6 a.m. in order to discover answers to questions that have arisen about farm programs.

Additionally, there are reports of Government checks, commodity certificates, and paperwork piled knee-high in some ASCS county offices. And, confusion has been caused from regulation changes and new directives from the ASCS office in Washington.

An administrative nightmare occurred in Arkansas and other States after ASCS issued new directives last summer regarding the $50,000 payment limitation.

Even though the directives were issued weeks after the end of program signup, the State and local offices were ordered to apply them retroactively to farmers who were already operating in good faith according plans previously approved by ASCS county offices.

As a result, many farmers who acted in accord with county ASCS plans payment limitation found themselves tangled in a bureaucratic web of disorder and confusion.

In fact, the changes in law, regulations and directives caused so much turmoil in Arkansas that many county committees are now reluctant to make decisions necessary to administer the Farm Program. Thus, delay compounds confusion.

Because of the sheer volume of work, many county offices have been unable to complete the paperwork required to process the Government payments due to farmers in a timely manner. Thus, added financial problems are placed upon the farmer.

These administrative problems have caused untold economic disruption in the farm community. When the farmer does not receive his deficiency payment in time to pay back last year's operating loan, he cannot meet the credit requirements to receive this year's operating loan; and if he can't get this year's operating loan, he's in big trouble because it is time to plant this year's crop.

The money in the supplemental appropriations bill for ASCS's increased administrative costs represents a first step to help the farmer, but more than money is needed.

In the short term, Congress should act to directly address some of the problems ASCS faces.

For instance, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 1083, the enactment of which would ease the burden somewhat by clarifying the application of the payment limitation to family members by limiting the review of county-level actions by ASCS State offices and ASCS headquarters.

However, over the long run better management of the current farm policy is needed.

I urge my colleagues to enact this bill.

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, again I think it is worth a couple of minutes just to put the issue of the dollars in perspective. It was just 2 weeks ago that this House passed a budget resolution calling for an $18-billion increase in taxes, and in the budget resolution was included a new trust fund that was to be set up that would be held strictly for the purpose of reducing the Federal deficit.

I would make the argument if you look at what has been happening around here for the last 5 years, the Congress has overspent its own budget in the last 5 years. Let me say that again. The Congress has overspent its own budget, forget what the President requested, this Congress has overspent its own budget by $150 billion over the last 5 years.

My colleagues might ask themselves how can that happen. It is happening for exactly the reason of what is occurring here today. We are getting ready to pass, and it is going to happen, we are going to pass a supplemental appropriation bill. One can argue about how much money is in it, but the chairman of the Budget Committee has sent out a letter to all of us indicating that the supplemental appropriation bill is estimated to breach the budget authority ceiling by $2.265 billion.

All I am saying is if you really believed 2 weeks ago that you were setting up a trust fund with $18 billion in new taxes, which I realize is supposed to be for 1988 and beyond, you are not fooling anybody. You are going to spend that money even before it gets collected.

It is about time we faced up to it. We have a responsibility. You are running the show here, but yet you have the ability to tell the American people year after year, oh, it is not us, it is the President.

The reality is you are breaking your own budgets, and you ought to vote against this.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1827, the supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1987.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I am proud to have worked on this bill under the leadership of our chairman Mr. WHITTEN, and ranking member, Mr. CONTE, as well as our subcommittee chairmen and ranking members. This is a fine bill which meets the urgent needs to the country without busting the budget. The President requested $12,448,238,662 in his January budget submission. The committee was faced with the task of meeting the priorities of the President and the Congress and holding the line of Federal spending. At the same time, we had to address $5,684,762,000 of proposed rescission from current funding. Finally, our committee was charged with the responsibility of financing the cost of the new Federal Employees Retirement System and the January 3-percent pay increase effective in January for Federal employees. Faced with this task, the committee was able to develop a bill providing for $11,342,701,666 in new budget authority, $1,105,536,996 less than the President requested. Of that amount, $3,970,310,000 in outlays will occur in fiscal year 1987 from this bill.

The committee addressed many pressing issues of public concern in this bill. The committee rejected proposed cuts of nearly 1,500 Customs Service personnel in fiscal year 1987. Had we allowed this cut to go forth, the Government would have abdicated its responsibility to fight the war on drugs. Furthermore, hundreds of millions of dollars of needed revenue collected by the Customs Service would have been lost to inefficient inspection and control of imports. The committee also addressed the issue of the Customs Air Operations Program. The Customs Service is developing a plan to consolidate its air operations thereby reducing the number of air officers along the southwest border, a critical area in the ongoing drug war. The committee, while supportive of efforts to increase efficiency and effectiveness of the Air Operations Program, requested that the Secretary of the Treasury report to the Congress 30 days in advance of such consolidation to allow for proper congressional oversight.

This bill also addresses other pressing needs of the Nation. We have provided $30,000,000 for the Veterans' Job Training Program established by the Emergency Veterans' Job Training Act of 1983 and extended by the Veterans' Compensation Rate Increase and Job Training Amendments of 1986. This program provides for the payment of 50 percent of the salary of each Korean or Vietnam veteran in training

for up to 15 months if service connected and 9 months otherwise. Since its initial implementation, this program has been extremely successful and the committee, at the request of the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Mr. Montgomery, has approved the necessary funding. The bill also contains the necessary funding for the 1.5-percent cost-of-living increase for veterans' compensation and pensions as approved in 1986.

The bill would provide an additional $50 million through a transfer to the Summer Youth Employment Program in order that 685,000 summer jobs for economically disadvantaged young people between the ages of 14 and 21 may obtain employment. This is an increase of nearly 50,000 over the fiscal year 1986 level of employment. The bill would also provide $20 million for worker retraining activities under the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. This funding is vital to allow our workers left unemployed by the trade imbalance meet the challenges of the changing world economy. If this funding is not provided, job retraining funding would expire this month.

The bill contains $300 million in economic and development assistance to our allies in Central America to meet our commitments to those nations. This funding does not result in new budget authority, but rather through a transfer from existing funds. It is the stepping stone for a successful policy in that region—a policy of peace and economic development—not a policy of war and human suffering. The administration had requested a total of $1,150 billion in additional foreign assistance in fiscal year 1987. The committee, faced with the reality that we cannot deficit finance domestic and defense programs forever, let alone foreign aid, was able to find savings in existing programs and meet $650 million of the administration's request through only $200 million in new budget authority.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has worked hard to develop a bill in light of our ongoing budgetary constraints. We are often caught in the middle—we have growing needs and less means with which to fund those needs. We are constantly under attack from both the left and the right for either doing too little or too much, while at the same time the President chides us for not doing exactly what he wants. I believe this committee and the leadership of our House worked hard to meet the needs expressed by all parties in a fair and consistent manner. This bill accomplishes that goal.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH].

□ 1400

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman I have several concerns about this bill, but I am glad it contains adequate funding for the lawfully mandated national farm programs for our beleaguered farmers and ranchers.

Also I want to point out that this bill contains seeds for the future escape of American agriculture from the decades-old stifling hand of government into a freer market world.

One hopeful provision I am talking about is the $300,000 provided in this bill for a demonstration project about a brand new crop called kenaf, which has enormous potential as a source for newsprint. And newsprint, as we all know, is nearly all imported.

So I am talking about potential not only for boosting farm income and reducing production of surplus crops. Kenaf's potential also is for significant reduction of our trade deficit.

U.S. publishers import about 8.8 billion dollars' worth of newsprint annually. Hardly anyone supposes that U.S. grown kenaf could take over all that market from foreigners.

But, my friends, we could certainly try.

I am so deeply concerned about finding new industrial uses for our agricultural production capacity that I have introduced a comprehensive bill, H.R. 1197, which would establish a National Institute for New Agricultural and Forestry Industrial Materials specially for this purpose.

Kenaf is one of the major new crops that I had in mind when I drafted my bill.

Now in this supplemental, I wish to thank my chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi, for immediately supporting my initiative with this funding proposal for the demonstration project.

It is true that kenaf at present flourishes best in southern climes. But it is also true that we now grow wheat and corn in places which once we thought were totally hostile to these crops.

I will be pressing hard for this demonstration project, or one like it, in Nebraska where we have developed irrigation to a science. With eight million acres of irrigation cropland, Nebraska is second only to California.

We have the capability of genetically engineering plants to grow almost anywhere. In Nebraska, and particularly on its irrigated acreage, we have the potential for carefully controlled production and marketing conditions.

Now, let me tell you a little bit more about kenaf.

The USDA has already devoted over 20 years for research on kenaf. Almost all aspects of commercializing kenaf are complete, which means this industrial crop is about to blossom into an economically viable alternative for U.S. farmers.

Kenaf was successfully grown on a commercial scale in southern Texas for fiber purposes in 1986. It was harvested and processed for shipment and storage. Kenaf demonstrated a superior quality for pulping when compared to wood pulp and the paper derived from kenaf had excellent quality.

Kenaf is an annual hibiscus (herbs, shrubs, or trees of the mallow family with large showy flowers) nonwood fiber that is a relative of okra and cotton. It has been grown in Asia and Africa for centuries as a cordage crop.

Imported newsprint costs about $570 a ton. The U.S. Department of Agriculture already has invested about $10 million in research and recently turned to market development with matching funds of $250,000. Department experts cautiously estimate that U.S. farmers could capture at least $2 billion of the newsprint market by growing kenaf on land formerly devoted to surplus crops.

Currently, about 15.5 million tons of newsprint are used in the United States per year. Experts say the United States could produce about 3.5 million tons of newsprint from kenaf for which around 437,000 acres would be required if kenaf had an average yield of about 8 tons per acre. The best news is that a farmer in warmer, more humid regions of the United States could receive around $40 per acre net profit by growing kenaf. And a little more development could lead to its production in other areas of the country that have adequate water and land.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, those in favor of nuclear testing have convinced the public that testing produces newer, better, more flexible weapons than we have ever had before. That is not true. Dr. Philip Morrison is a physicist at MIT who worked on the original atomic weapons program at Los Alamos with Oppenheimer and the rest of the team that developed the bomb used on Nagasaki. According to Dr. Morrison, testing doesn't make sense because all the important developments in nuclear weaponry were accomplished in the first 10 years after 1946, when the technology was immature. The energy per weight in a nuclear bomb rose by 20,000 percent in that 10-year period, after a series of under 100 tests. Since that time we have conducted hundreds of tests, yet that energy concentration has only increased by only 25 percent. With mature technologies like American weapons systems, any testing we do now is simply tinkering with the novelties of the mechanism, according to Dr. Morrison. It looks good to the public, and politicians who support more testing can make people think that we are getting newer, more sophisticated nuclear bombs because of it, but it isn't true. After Hiroshima, the energy in the bomb increased from

5 kilotons per ton of weapon to 1,000 kilotons per ton of weapon by the mid-1950's. We don't want weapons any more powerful than that. They are already as dangerous and as devastating as nuclear weapons can become.

Another reason that supporters of testing like to throw out is reliability. I'd like to borrow from Paul Warnke, former negotiator at Geneva, who summarized this issue well. "The less confidence that both sides have in the reliability of their nuclear weapons," Warnke said, "the less chance there is that either side will ever use them." Dr. Morrison at MIT would agree with that, and he would add that reliability isn't ever determined by testing. He would tell us that you need to take the weapons apart in the lab to find out if they are reliable, and in the lab is where you rectify them if they are not. When the reliability of the Poseidon missiles was questioned, it was not a test that lead us to check them. Testing tells us nothing about reliability and never has, according to Dr. Morrison.

Where testing is useful is in the beginning stages of developing nuclear technologies. The countries that need to test are those such as India, Pakistan, Israel and Argentina—those countries that have weapons in the early developing stages. If we want more and more countries in the world to have nuclear capability, we can go ahead and keep testing. If we want to slow the pace of nuclear development, we should have a test treaty on the table right now.

Yet what have we achieved toward a comprehensive test ban treaty? Since the mid-1950's, a ban on nuclear weapons testing has been the goal of every President. Dwight Eisenhower said almost 30 years ago: "The people want peace so much that one of these days, governments had better get out of their way and let them have it." Every administration has sought a ban on testing as the cornerstone of its arms control policy. Every administration, that is, until Ronald Reagan's.

The Reagan administration has formally opposed negotiations toward a comprehensive test ban treaty, viewing them as contrary to U.S. interests. In 1981, an Undersecretary of Defense told us how Americans would be able to survive a nuclear attack. "Everyone's going to survive if there are enough shovels," he told us. "Dig a hole, throw a couple of doors on top, and cover it with 3 feet of dirt. Its the dirt that does it." Ridiculous as that sounds, that notion that we could win at nuclear war is what has driven the Reagan administration to tinker with our weapons by testing. According to Dr. Morrison, such tinkering is equivalent to making changes in the model on a sportscar. We do not get better bombs by testing, and those we have are so devastating already that we should never, never think of the possibility of surviving a war that used them.

It has been left to this Congress to shepherd Mr. Reagan's influence on the arms control process. This measure that we are considering today that prohibits funds as long as testing above 1 kiloton exists—that provision of the supplemental is only a small beginning. It is the fundamental basis by which we can swing the public's impression of what nuclear weapons testing means. We should not test anymore, because our testing does not do what the politicians and the defense bureaucracy say it does. They are dangerous enough, and all we can do now is to try—for the sake of our children—to prevent their proliferation all around the world.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MICA). The Chair wishes to advise the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has 3 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the committee report on the bill that we are going to be voting on today has some language regarding the Department of Energy N-reactor in Washington State. The report language reflects an understanding between the committee and the Department of Energy that the Department will not run the reactor unless the recommendations of the forthcoming report of the National Academy of Sciences are met.

I want to commend my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. DICKS and Mr. AUCOIN, and the majority leader, Mr. FOLEY, because I know they have been working very hard to force the Department of Energy to improve the safety of the N-reactor. But, frankly, I do not think that the N-reactor ought to be reopened at all. Certainly it should not be reopened before the Department of Energy has implemented all the various safety recommendations made by the Roddis panel. I know my colleague, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. AUCOIN have very strong feelings about this issue.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership, and for the leadership of my good friend from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN] on this very important issue.

The thing we are trying to make sure of is if there is any reason why the N-reactor should not be restarted, and if the National Academy of Sciences says it is not safe to start that reactor, this committee and the Congress wants them not to do that. The Department of Energy has agreed that that is what their position is. If for any reason, any safety reason this reactor should not be restarted it will not be. The DOE has agreed to it and I think it is a major step in the right direction.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I yield to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. AUCOIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the words of my colleague from Washington State [Mr. DICKS] and also his work and the work of the gentleman, my colleague from Oregon.

I think this provision which is in the bill is indeed, as the gentleman from Washington State has said, a major step forward toward giving an outside entity, which has no responsibility for plutonium production but which has expertise on safety, some real say over the safety of Hanford. But I do think it is only one step, and I agree with the gentleman from Oregon, more steps are needed. I am certainly going to be working with him and with others to achieve that.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleagues for their statements.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman form Washington [Mr. DICKS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DICKS. I will be very brief. It has come to my attention that when I made my remarks I said that the Soviet Union had only taken out 13 weapons. I want to clarify my remarks. The Soviet Union has taken out 1,300 launchers from their inventory because of the requirements in SALT II. I think that is a very significant reduction that would not have occurred if it was not for the fact that we have a policy of interim restraint. As long as we can keep the Soviets reducing, I think that is in our national security interest.

I appreciate the Chairman being so generous in yielding to me again for the purpose of making a correction of my remarks.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, let me get to the point right away:

This supplemental bill is expensive, extravagant, and excessive.

As fiscal policy it is irresponsible and as foreign policy it is dangerous. As a reflection of the seriousness of the Democratic leadership

in trying to come to grips with major budget problems, it is deeply troubling.

The bill exceeds our own budget resolution limits by $3.6 billion.

The bill contains $913 million in spending add-ons not requested by the President.

The bill contains none of the $5.89 billion in rescissions proposed by the President to help reduce the deficit.

The bill provides $425 million for the homeless despite the fact that the program isn't even authorized as yet.

The bill provides $365 million in additional food stamp funding, ostensibly for the homeless. But only 2 percent of the funding would actually go to the homeless.

The arms control sections of this bill are wrong in substance, wrong in timing, and wrong in motivation.

President Reagan has had a responsible arms control strategy during the past 6 years. It is a strategy that calls for deep reduction in nuclear arms along with modernization of the arms we retain.

The Democratic leadership has done everything they can to cripple that policy.

Their proposal to mandate U.S. compliance with certain limitations of the SALT II Agreement—which has never been ratified—is quite simply absurd.

The Soviet Union has already violated, beyond any reasonable doubt provisions of that treaty.

Is there anyone who seriously contends that an agreement which would continue to allow a buildup in Soviet strategic forces is better than a strategy that seeks reduction in all nuclear forces, as President Reagan's strategy does?

Is there any knowledgeable observer of the current nuclear arms scene who believes we should stop the modernization of our forces, precisely at a time when the Soviets continue to modernize their forces? Nuclear testing is absolutely vital to our modernization.

The United States of America and its allies are in the midst of the most sensitive, the most difficult, and the most profound discussions concerning the current proposals for IMF forces in Europe.

Does the Congress really want to jump into these discussions with both feet and say:

We will dictate what the President of the United States should do in nuclear arms policy. We will set the policy, we will define the limits, we will give the signals.

Enacting the Soviet negotiating position into American law will change the very nature of all ongoing strategic negotiations.

Somebody once said that the worst kind of government is one that is everywhere intrusive and everywhere impotent to do good.

That saying applies to the policies of the Democratic leadership as reflected in this bill.

You have your hands in everything, in domestic policy and foreign policy, but all you are doing is making matters worse by violating budget-deficit reduction policy and clumsily intruding into delicate arms-control policy.

This bill is veto-bait, pure and simple.

More importantly, it is a sad and sorry reflection of the Democratic leadership's version of the future. It is a vision of more government spending and less government discipline, of a gradual but inexorable loss of credibility in our nuclear deterrent.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the supplemental. This legislation is a budget buster and it damages U.S. national security.

This is not the time for the Congress to start sending wrong signals on SALT II and nuclear testing. These so-called arms control provisions in the supplemental undercut the President at the very moment when we are making progress on arms control. These provisions are arbitrary and unilateral and undercut the nuclear arms reduction process.

The Secretary of State has just concluded sensitive, high-level talks with the Soviets on national security matters. Although much work remains, progress has been made. We expect progress to continue at the Geneva talks and in this regard, we cannot afford to send the President and his negotiating team to the bargaining table without the full support of the Congress.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, the nuclear arms race is without question the most grave threat facing humanity. For almost half a century, the United States and the Soviet Union have engaged in a nuclear competition that has made us, our adversaries, and the entire world less secure.

As weapons technology has advanced, and industries devoted to nuclear weapons production have expanded, the superpowers have taken a two-track approach in their quest for national security.

On the one hand, the superpowers have diversified and modernized their strategic arsenals, incorporating technical developments to increase the survivability, flexibility, and lethality of nuclear weapons. On the other hand, the superpowers have recognized the need for nuclear arms control to prevent technical and quantitative developments from presenting an inordinate threat.

Every President since Eisenhower has produced an arms control agreement—until Reagan. And every administration up to the present has worked to uphold not only the letter, but the spirit of arms control agreements. According to a study by a working group at the Center for International Security and Arms Control at Stanford University issued in February 1987 "overall, United States and Soviet compliance with the terms of existing arms control agreements has been good."

The Stanford study found that current perceptions of Soviet noncompliance are exacerbated by "the Reagan administration's search for Soviet violations, by the administration's exaggeration of the military significance of alleged Soviet 'violations,' by United States public confrontation of the U.S.S.R., and by lack of sensitivity among the American public to questions about United States compliance."

The Reagan administration has lost sight of the purpose and benefits of arms control. President Reagan has spurned Soviet negotiating initiatives. He has spurned the U.S. Congress, which has passed resolutions calling upon the President for progress in arms control negotiations. And he has spurned the wishes of the American people for progress in arms control and disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, the record of this administration in arms control is abysmal. President Reagan has failed to produce a single arms control agreement. The primary responsibility for foreign affairs and arms control properly resides in the executive branch. But the failures of the Reagan administration have made it incumbent upon the Congress to assume the responsibility for progress in arms control.

There are two provisions in the 1987 supplemental authorization bill that I urge my colleagues to support. These amendments, on maintaining SALT II numerical limits on strategic nuclear weapons, and on limiting nuclear testing to below 1 kiloton, address both quantitative and qualitative benefits of arms control. Both measures are designed to prevent dangerous developments in Soviet nuclear weapons, while maintaining a viable United States nuclear deterrent. Both measures are verifiable using technical means acceptable to the Soviets.

The SALT II Treaty limits the strategic offensive nuclear forces of the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has made a political commitment to abide by this treaty, despite the fact that it has not been ratified by the United States. Not only has the United States failed to ratify this treaty, but the Reagan administration exceeded the SALT II limits in November 1986 with the deployment of the 131st long-range bomber: A B-52 armed with air-launched cruise missiles. The White House spokesman, Larry Speakes, said, "SALT II is no longer operational".

The Reagan administration has exploited every ambiguity to accuse the Soviet Union of violating the SALT II agreement, while conveniently ignoring Soviet destruction of missile launchers in order to remain in compliance with the treaty. Mr. Chairman, the Reagan administration has done more to undermine the treaty than any purported Soviet violation.

If the treaty were to be rejected by both sides, we might face an unconstrained buildup of the Soviet offensive nuclear arsenal. This is certainly not in the national—or international—interest. I urge my colleagues to support the provision of this bill prohibiting the use of funds to deploy or maintain any U.S. weapons that exceed the numerical limits of the SALT II Treaty.

Another provision in the bill puts a stop to qualitative nuclear weapons developments by imposing a severe limit on nuclear testing, paving the way for a permanent nuclear test ban. A comprehensive test ban has been a U.S. policy objective since the Limited Test Ban Treaty was signed in 1963.

The Soviets have shown remarkable restraint in their nuclear testing program. For 18 months, the Soviet Union unilaterally halted nuclear testing, asking the United States to join the moratorium and to resume negotiations on a comprehensive test ban. During the Soviet moratorium, the Reagan administration conducted at least 26 nuclear tests, including experiments for a new generation of nuclear weapons for the President's strategic defense initiative.

Under an arrangement between the Soviet Academy of Sciences and the New York-based Natural Resources Defense Council, the Soviet Union has permitted the installation of seismic sensors in the vicinity of the main Soviet Nuclear testing site in central Asia.

Measurements taken by American and Soviet scientists have demonstrated that a nuclear testing moratorium is verifiable.

Although the Soviets have resumed their nuclear testing program, they have said they will stop if the United States suspends its nuclear tests.

Mr. Chairman, there is every indication that the Soviet Union is ready for serious arms control. The U.S. Congress is ready. The American people are ready. The recalcitrance of the Reagan administration should not stand in the way of progress toward arms control provisions that will make the world more secure.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us gives Congress the opportunity to stabilize both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the nuclear arms race. I urge my colleagues to give these provisions their full support.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to lend my support to H.R. 1827, the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1987. There are a number of features in this legislation which in my mind qualify as urgent. Among them are $425 million for programs to assist the homeless and needed funds for summer youth employment and worker retraining.

There are two specific provisions I would like to lend my particular support to. The first deals with an additional $10 million appropriations provided to the Title V Program under the Older Americans Act providing part-time employment for low-income seniors. On March 10, I wrote a letter to Chairman NATCHER and the other members of the Subcommittee on Labor-HHS to request that this increase be provided as part of this supplemental. In my letter I noted:

> The $10 million I am requesting would represent the first real growth for this program since 1985. While all other programs did in fact receive increases above inflation in the fiscal year 1987 appropriations bill, title V did not. Without an adjustment in the funding during fiscal year 1987, title V will only be able to support a maximum of 63,800 part-time jobs, less than a 3-percent increase from program year 1984-1985.

I am especially pleased that this $10 million is in fact in this legislation and would like to commend Chairman NATCHER, ranking minority member Mr. CONTE and Mr. ROYBAL who serves on the subcommittee but also as chairman of the Select Committee on Aging for their leadership in securing these funds.

As a result, title V will be able to fund a full 65,740 part-time jobs for the balance of fiscal year 1987. These are funds that will be well spent and are urgently needed in our communities. The Title V Program is a proven entity. It serves the low-income elderly by giving them part-time employment opportunities to supplement their income. The program operates in all of our States both with national contractors and State agencies on aging. It is estimated that a full 50 percent of those employed by title V work in programs to help other senior citizens.

Later this year we will reauthorize the entire Older Americans Act. Title V will be essentially preserved as it is now but these funds are needed to help it meet its mandate. In a letter I received today from Cy Brickfield of the American Association of Retired Persons he said: "As you know poverty increased for persons 55 and over during 1985. Employment however can be an effective tool to reduce poverty for older Americans."

His letter also said "We want to thank you again for your effective work in winning a $10 million funding increase for the Title V Senior Community Service Employment Program. Your amendment will provide nearly 2,000 additional positions for low-income older Americans throughout the Nation."

On another point in the bill, earlier this year I had been contacted by many of my constituents concerning the difficulties that the New York State Department of Labor was experiencing due to a cutback in Federal funding. At one point it was estimated that New York would need to lay off over 1,000 employees and be forced to close 16 local employment services offices. Since these employees and these offices were helping others find employment, it was estimated that over 50,000 job orders would go unfilled. I am pleased to see that this legislation includes an additional $100 million in State unemployment services funding, $30 million for the targeted job tax credit program, and $20 million for working retraining under the Trade Act. This legislation also ensures a total of $811 million will be available to provide about 685,000 jobs for economically disadvantaged youth this summer. I commend the members of the Appropriations Committee, and especially my colleague, Mr. NATCHER, chairman of the Labor-HHS-Education Subcommittee in their efforts in attacking one of this Nation's major problems and major barriers to maximizing our national competitiveness—unemployment.

This measure also includes $35 million for the worker incentive program. Last year, New York State WIN Program placed more than 18,000 AFDC recipients in private, unsubsidized employment. This program saved an estimated $41 million in welfare payments, while costing only $20 million to administer. An investment with such high yield, not only monetarily, but also in humanitarian terms, deserves our full support.

I would also like to commend this supplemental's emphasis on education, most importantly the Pell Grant Program. By transfering $287 million from the Guaranteed Student Loan Program excess to cover Pell Grant shortfalls, the committee is not only ensuring the stability of the Pell Grant Program, but also making an important statement in the relationship between grants and loans—our most disadvantaged students should receive grants before being forced into debt. I also commend the increases in vocational education and graduate education. These are two often neglected areas that deserve our attention.

At this time, I would like to raise one additional issue. There is currently some $3 million, which has been appropriated for the commodities program authorized under section 311 of the Older Americans Act, but which will be turned back to the U.S. Treasury without appropriate action by Congress.

This $3 million, appropriated to provide per meal reimbursement in cash or commodities, has not been spent as a result of the fact that Congress initially underfunded this program in 1985 and subsequently over compensated for this error with a fiscal year 1987 appropriation. I believe this money should be made available to another part of the Older Americans Act which also provides meals to older adults—title IIIC2, which provides home-delivered meals.

Currently, we must transfer about 40 percent from Title IIIC, designed for congregate meals, into the home-delivered meals program to meet the demand. It is my hope that I will be able to work with members of their committee to make this much-needed transfer of funds into the home-delivered meals program possible.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1827, the bill to provide supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1987. I, particularly, endorse the inclusion in this measure of a provision denying the use of appropriated funds for the promulgation of a rule providing for the repayment of construction differential subsidy. The Department of Transportation did promulgate such a rule in 1985 which was subsequently vacated by the U.S. Court of Appeals.

Efforts to revive the same rule as it applies to only those vessels who did pay back their construction subsidy evades the import of the court's holding, and would constitute a drain on those who would find it necessary to relitigate an issue which the Congress had difficulty with at the time the original rule was discussed. The haste with which any new rule would be assembled, under the deadline set by the court, is certain to give rise to certain other complications, that would further fragment, an already fragmented industry, and make more difficult the very necessary task of developing a maritime policy that would allow for a logical development of our defense oriented merchant marine.

An example of the type of mischief that could result is evidenced in a notice of proposed rulemaking by the Maritime Administration on this very issue published April 15, 1987. The court order and the prohibitory language contained in H.R. 1827 relates to the three vessels that repaid subsidy under the 1985 repayment rule. The notice of proposed rulemaking, however adds a fourth vessel to be considered among those repaying—for the purpose I would assume, of demonstrating increased revenue potential if the rule is implemented. The fourth tanker, the *Bay Ridge,* repaid CDS in 1981, and has been continuously employed in the domestic trade since that time. The legislation before the House today would not affect that vessel, in any way. Yet the notice attributes $36 million to be derived from the *Bay Ridge,* and does not distinguish that vessel from the others.

The *Bay Ridge* is not subject to the court of appeals order, and consequently is not subject to any action being taken by the Congress in this legislation. As a matter of fact, Congress on three separate occasions has distinguished the *Bay Ridge* from other vessels that were or may have been subjects of general rulemaking on CDS payback. The inability of the Maritime Administration to distinguish the vessels that are either subject to their own rule, or the decision of the court of appeals, further supports the position of the Appropriations Committee that no appropriated funds be employed for the promulgation

of a rule on this subject, unless it is in conformity with statutory standards established by Congress.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, in one of my former careers I was a major league baseball pitcher. One of the major fears you always have to contend with when you are out on the mound pitching in a tight game, is that you'll lose control momentarily and throw a wild pitch and lose the game. It only takes one.

Obviously the last thing you would ever do if you had a 1 run lead and bases were loaded is to throw an intentional wild pitch.

But, Mr. Chairman, this supplemental spending bill we are considering today is exactly that—an intentional wild pitch.

After 6 or 7 years of struggling to get the Federal deficit under control, we are on the verge of winning. We have the deficit on a downward path. We have the guidelines and rules in place to help us reach the goal of a balanced budget in the foreseeable future.

We are finally ahead on the game but this bill blows our slim lead.

It arrogantly bypasses the rules of Gramm-Rudman and tramples our budget process and proves that this body is not serious about ever balancing the budget. The President offered us 73 ways to reduce the deficit. This bill rejects every one of those recession requests that would have reduced the deficit $5.8 billion.

The irresponsible spending levels provided in this bill are bad enough but it doesn't stop there.

After 6 or 7 years of trying to convince the Soviet Union that we are serious about negotiating an arms reduction pact, the administration's finally on the verge of a major break through, yet this bill intentionally undermines our President, our negotiators are trying to work out a meaningful intermediate range nuclear weapons agreement.

It makes no sense for a major league pitcher to intentionally throw a wild pitch. And it makes no sense for the House of Representatives to pass this wild pitch of a bill which undermines our chances of reducing the deficit and our hopes of achieving a meaningful arms reduction agreement.

This bill does more for sea turtles than it does for the American taxpayer, the budget deficit, or arms control.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. Chairman, I have serious concerns about the fiscal year 1987 supplemental appropriations bill in terms of the deficit and the Gramm-Rudman target of $144 billion. I fear that the bill will add to the deficit and continue the past practices of Congress failing to meet Public Law 99-172, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act.

As we all know the Gramm-Rudman bill required that the Federal Government begin to reduce the overwhelming deficit. Let's examine what has happened since passage of this landmark legislation in December 1985.

In fiscal year 1986 Gramm-Rudman required that the deficit not exceed $172 billion. However, the actual deficit hit $221 billion: an excess of $49 billion.

In fiscal year 1987 Gramm-Rudman requires that the deficit not exceed $144 for the current fiscal year. However, according to recent estimates by the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] the deficit will exceed $190 billion: an excess of approximately $50 billion.

If these reckless policies continue, the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] predicts the fiscal year 1988 deficit will top $169 billion, making the 3 year deficit a whopping $581 billion. Serious long-term economic consequences will result if we do not address deficit spending. Previous spending has already led to an exorbitant $10,000 debt being borne by every American.

Future generations forced to pay for current deficits: The most irresponsible action of Congress, in my opinion, is the debt that we are forcing on our kids and future generations. Currently, over 15 percent of total expenditures go to pay the interest on outstanding debt. Incredibly, that means the U.S. taxpayers are forced to pay $150 billion in taxes for the sole purpose of paying interest on the debt.

The supplemental being considered today is outrageous. Passage of this bill sends out a message to the American people that Congress isn't serious about balancing the budget. Congressman LATTA, ranking member on the Budget Committee has stated that current outlays exceed last year's budget by $14.6 billion. The impact of this supplemental bill will add an additional $3.9 billion in fiscal year 1987 outlays according to the report of the House Appropriations Committee, making the total deficit increase over the Gramm-Rudman target $18.5 billion for fiscal year 1987 turn, this directly increases the payments due for debt interest payments.

National debt: In the last 5 years the United States has gone from being the world's biggest lender to the largest debtor Nation. The debt is now over $2 trillion with Federal IOU's equaling 50 percent of the gross national product [GNP]. Next month, Congress will have to come face to face with raising the debt ceiling or face a Government shutdown.

Slows business growth: Foremost among the problems of this borrowing is the prospect of slower economic growth. Business activity slows when the U.S. Treasury's borrowing clashes with the needs of the private sector. Alarmingly, the annual deficit is now absorbing 30 percent of all capital available in the private market. Furthermore, every dollar that Uncle Sam borrows is a dollar that can't be channeled into productive resources by corporations, small business operators and home buyers.

Inflation threat: The debt is also boosting the odds for another inflationary spiral. The reason is that the Federal Reserve may increase the money supply to keep interest rates down, thereby, halting economic recovery. If the economy slows and begins heading toward a recession—productivity falls and the inflation rate goes up.

Dependence on foreign capital: A bigger part of the U.S. demand for cash has been met by a huge flow of capital from overseas investors. In 1985, foreign investors held 12 percent of the Federal debt. In 1986 foreigners held even more of the debt causing the U.S. Government to owe more to foreigners than the U.S. banks and lenders loaned overseas.

A slide in the dollar could prompt foreigners to stop investing in the United States forcing the Treasury to take a bigger share of domestic savings to pay the debt. In effect, forcing a run on the U.S. Treasury causing the Government to go bankrupt.

Closing: In closing, I believe we owe it to succeeding generations to do something to halt the growth of the debt. Future generations deserve a fair chance, one without the burden of out of control debt! Congress must begin to curb the debt by stopping excessive spending—starting with the fiscal year 1987 supplemental bill. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the 1987 supplemental appropriations bill before the House today. This legislation is a budget busting spending bill which will raise fiscal year 1987 spending over its legislated limits no matter how one chooses to calculate them.

Not 2 weeks ago, the Budget Committee came to the floor of the House with a fiscal year 1988 budget which was full of the smoke and mirrors subterfuges we have all come to expect. At the time, the majority strongly asserted its concern about our country's ever-increasing deficit. Today we see what a public, political act of breast beating this was.

This additional deficit with which we are burdening our children and grandchildren will also impact our economy today. It will further tighten the credit market for our businesses, homeowners, and consumers. It is no accident that, on Thursday, April 9, a day on which the stock market performed remarkably well, interests rates soared. That is the day the House of Representatives passed the fiscal year 1988 Budget Resolution.

Furthermore, there is a perfect, demonstrable correlation between the trade deficit and the Federal budget deficit. Yet this body will have to address trade legislation next week to counteract yet another of the myriad ill effects of our gigantic national debt.

There are an enormous number of extraneous items in this legislation—items which are not germane to any spending bill. There are also a number of appropriations in the legislation which are not urgent. Of course, in a fit of honesty, "Urgent" has been replaced with "General." This bill should be renamed the "Omnibus Supplemental Wish List."

This is but an indication of business as usual in this Congress. My esteemed colleague, the chairman of the Budget Committee, tried valiantly to object to waiver of the points of order against this legislation. His objections, and those of our committee, were bulldozed in 4 hours time. I respectfully submit that we put an end to this hypocrisy. I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—decide whether or not you stand for fiscal responsibility. If you do, vote against this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, before us today is an important appropriations measure which is vital to the maintenance of many programs throughout the remainder of fiscal year 1987. This measure appropriates $11.3 billion—$1.1 billion less than requested by the President, but $2.2 billion above the limit set by the fiscal year 1987 budget resolution. The amount by which this measure exceeds the limit set by

the budget resolution is indeed a point of controversy and grave concern to all of the Members of this body, but the fact remains—the appropriations made by this bill are essential to meet unavoidable Government obligations and to fund some urgent high-priority items such as aid to the homeless.

Therefore, in the best interests of my fellow West Virginians, I will support the passage of this measure. A great many concerns expressed by my fellow West Virginians are addressed by this measure. H.R. 1827 includes $425 million to fund programs authorized by the House-passed omnibus homeless aid bill (H.R. 558). The bill includes two arms control provisions—a moratorium on nuclear testing as long as the Soviets do likewise and accept on-site monitoring; and, a prohibition on the use of funds for any weapon that violates the limits of the SALT II agreement. The measure includes those funds necessary to meet veterans compensation, pension, and medical care needs for the remainder of fiscal year 1987. In addition, the measure allows for the settlement of a contractor's claim, involving the Veterans Administration Medical Center in Huntington, WV, from available unobligated funds. The bill also provides funds for worker retraining activities under the Trade Act of 1974, and for the Summer Youth Employment Program.

With regard to these particular concerns, I am especially pleased to note the provision of funding for the homeless as authorized by H.R. 558, the Urgent Relief for the Homeless Act, as passed by the House. Homelessness is a national problem. While it is most visible in urban areas, it exists in suburban and rural communities as well. There are more homeless people in America today than at any time since the Great Depression. In America today, which despite the Federal deficit, debt and unemployment rate, is still called the land of opportunity, this is a tragedy. The pattern has been set and the homeless are growing in numbers. Until this Nation acts in a combined effort to address the problem, the situation will remain and the numbers will increase.

It is clear that this problem is one of enormous proportions which requires a forceful response from both the public and private sector and within the public sector from local, State and Federal agencies. While there is great diversity among the homeless, these people share many problems which potentially can be addressed through utilizing preexisting programs. With adequate funding, preexisting health care and social service programs, including education, job training, counseling and income support programs, can be used to combat and prevent homelessness in America. We realize now that a national coordination of these efforts is necessary if we are to fully address the problems of the homeless population through the use of existing services and providers. In passing H.R. 558, the House realized this need and through that measure laid the guidelines; this funding measure provides the funds necessary to act on these needs.

While most of this funding will be distributed on a competitive grant basis, there are a handful of programs which are funded on a formula derived basis. During consideration of H.R. 558, I obtained tentative figures for the amount which would be made available to West Virginia on three of these programs.

Of the $255 million provided for emergency fiscal year 1987 funds for programs administered by the Housing and Urban Development Department [HUD], $100 million would be for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program. This program provides grants for the renovation, rehabilitation, or conversion of buildings into emergency shelters to expand the supply of shelters for the homeless. HUD distributes the grants to local governments, which can use the grants themselves or distribute funds to private charitable organizations. Up to 15 percent of these grants can also be used for supportive services for the homeless such as job counseling and health services. Under the bill, grant applicants could apply for a waiver of this 15 percent cap on supportive services funding. If appropriated, roughly $739,000 of this money would go to West Virginia. Approximately $523,000 would be at the Governor's discretion, while the following amounts would be allocated to the accompanying major cities: $67,000 to Charleston, $70,000 to Huntington, $32,000 to Parkersburg, and $47,000 to Wheeling.

H.R. 558 authorizes a total of $70 million in additional fiscal year 1987 funds for an existing food and shelter program and for the Community Services Block Grant Program to provide food, shelter, and services to the homeless; $50 million of this would be authorized for the Community Services Block Grant Program, administered by the Health and Human Services Department [HHS]. The $50 million would be reserved for services for the homeless and would be given only to local Community Action agencies that are already providing services, food and shelter to the homeless. An estimated $538,000 of this amount would be distributed in West Virginia.

The remaining $20 million of this $70 million is earmarked for the ongoing Emergency Food and Shelter Program, administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA]. This program provides funds to charitable organizations and local governments that run food and shelter programs for the homeless. Roughly $224,100 of this money would go to West Virginia, with approximately $17,000 at the Governor's discretion. The counties in my congressional district would receive roughly $60,000 of this amount.

Our goal in providing these funds is twofold. First, we must halt the homeless epidemic which can only serve to undermine our national economy. Second and most importantly, we must fulfill the responsibility of the Federal Government to ensure that the survival needs of the citizenry are provided. Just as the Federal Government has a responsibility to protect the country against foreign attack, it also has a responsibility to assure that everyone can be sheltered and fed, at least at minimum levels. While some Government programs should be curtailed or eliminated in the face of budget deficits, giving people a place to sleep at night and the food and health care needed to survive are not "luxury items" in a decent society. The United States, as the world's richest democracy, can surely provide its citizens with the basic requirements for physical survival.

I am also pleased that additional funding of $20 million has been included in the bill for worker retraining activities under the Trade Act of 1974. The Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, excluding job search and relocation, is expected to run out of funds in April due to greatly increased usage of these funds in many States. This funding is of critical importance to those who have lost their jobs because of increased foreign imports so that they may receive the job retraining they are entitled to under the act. It has been a great concern to many in my home State of West Virginia, which still has one of the highest rates of unemployment in this Nation, that those who are eligible for these retraining activities will be left out in the cold because of the lack of funding. The funding in this bill will allow those people to receive the job training they so desperately need and deserve.

Also of great importance to West Virginia is the additional $50 million appropriated in H.R. 1827 for the Summer Youth Employment Program for use this coming summer. West Virginia's portion of these funds would be $558,859, which would bring the total for the state to $7,667,268 for this fiscal year. These funds were included to partially alleviate a sizeable reduction in the number of summer jobs from the level provided last year because of budget cutting. West Virginia was hard hit with a $2 million cut in the program for this summer which would have meant that 4,000 fewer disadvantaged young people would have been working. The funds in the bill will enable many more of this country's disadvantaged youth to participate in this worthy program.

Finally, making mention of the important aspects of this legislation without elaborating on the necessity of the arms control provisions therein, would be an inadequate summation. A ban on nuclear weapons testing has been an arms control objective of every President since Eisenhower. The Reagan administration has formally opposed negotiations toward a comprehensive test ban [CTB] treaty. This is the first administration since Eisenhower's that has not pursued a CTB. President Reagan at Reykjavik indicated that a CTB would be achievable only as a companion agreement to the elimination of all nuclear weapons. This linking of a test ban to total nuclear disarmament has never been the understanding of Congress, nor was it the policy of any previous administration.

There are a number of points in favor of a CTB. A CTB would curb the development of new nuclear warhead designs, especially those of a depressed trajectory nature, which could be used by the Soviets in a first strike. This restraint in development works to the advantage of the United States as a Soviet depressed trajectory weapon would not be vulnerable to U.S. bomber forces.

A CTB could be negotiated quickly. A CTB would freeze the Soviets in a position of inferiority in warhead design. The efficiency of Soviet warheads is about half that of the United States. Without a test ban, the Soviets could continue testing and sophisticate their warheads, challenging our own.

The Soviets have agreed to on-site inspection of possible weapons test violations. This

91-059 O-89-31 (Pt. 7)

would increase verification and compliance efforts. This is a major breakthrough in arms control negotiations. Indicating acceptance of intrusive inspection procedures is a crucial step on the part of the Soviets and represents a precedent that should be taken advantage of and used by the United States to advance arms control negotiations.

This measure also prohibits the use of funds for nuclear weapons that violate the SALT II Treaty limits, provided the Soviets continue to adhere to the limits. For 6 years the administration followed a policy of interim restraint, under which both the United States and the Soviet Union acted to keep their strategic forces within the SALT II sublimits. The President himself stated very simply why such a policy is in our interest when he noted, "The Soviet Union has the capability to increase weaponry much faster than the Treaty permits, and we don't."

Despite this fundamental fact, in December the administration acted to have U.S. forces exceed these limitations with the deployment of a 131st B-52 bomber equipped with air launched cruise missiles. This action was taken even though the Congress clearly stated its conclusion in the conference report on fiscal year 1987 funding that it was in our national security interests to continue this policy.

Nothing has changed in the 6 months since the Congress made this finding that warrants abondoning interim restraint. The Soviets still have more hot production lines for strategic weapons. They still have the capability to deploy 21,000 warheads by the mid 1990's without these constraints on their forces, according to the CIA. And it would still cost us $100 billion to match such an effort according to the Congressional Budget Office.

In fact, to date the Soviets have continued to remain under these numerical sublimits despite United States action. Overall they have withdrawn, dismantled, or destroyed over 1,300 strategic launchers under this policy. But we cannot expect them to demonstrate such restraint indefinitely.

Some will argue that this provision undermines our negotiations in Geneva. I agree with the distinguished gentlemen—Congressmen ASPIN, DICKS, FASCELL, COELHO, FOLEY, AUCOIN, GEPHARDT, FAZIO, HOYER, GREEN, MCCURDY and BERMAN—who sent a letter in this regard to each of us earlier this week: Arms negotiations are not bolstered by eliminating the only limits that exist on nuclear forces, they are bolstered by a willingness to demonstrate reasoned restraint. That is just what this provision provides.

Mr. Chairman, again I say I am in support of this measure. It is necessary to fulfill Federal financial obligations throughout the remainder of fiscal year 1987. It addresses urgent national needs. And, it reaffirms congressional arms control policy.

Mr. BOULTER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will defeat this budget-busting and irresponsible supplemental appropriations bill and give the Appropriations Committee another opportunity to construct a responsible supplemental. There are some areas in this bill which truly need supplemental funding. The Commodity Credit Corporation, charged with carrying out our vital farm programs, must have supplemental funding to carry out the farm programs mandated by Congress.

In order to help manage our Nation's supplies of agricultural commodities, farmers in my congressional district and across the Nation have set aside large portions of their valuable farmland. They have lived up to their end of the agreement made by Congress when we enacted the Food Security Act of 1985. In order for the Federal Government to live up to their end of the agreement, the CCC must have this supplemental funding. The administration recognizes this fact, as evidenced by their request for a similar level of supplemental funding for the CCC.

I am extremely disappointed that the Appropriations Committee has tied this essential funding with so much unnecessary, pork-barrel spending that the commitment we made to balancing our budget in Gramm-Rudman is breached. I am quite perplexed as well with the committee's decision to include irresponsible measures to tie the President's hands during this time of delicate foreign policy negotiations. By including amendments that would undermine the credibility of our nuclear forces, this legislation would seriously damage our ability to achieve arms control agreements providing for equitable and effectively verifiable reductions in Soviet and American nuclear arsenals.

I fail to see the wisdom in mandating United States compliance with the SALT II agreement, which has never been ratified, would have expired had it been ratified, which has been seriously violated by the Soviet Union. I am disappointed that the committee rejected the additional funding requests for the strategic defense initiative, especially in light of the growing evidence of increasing Soviet success in their efforts to create their own strategic defense.

Also troubling is the rule under which this measure was brought to the floor. Members were given no opportunity to amend the foreign assistance section, for example. We were given the choice of accepting the Appropriations Committee's notion of how the foreign assistance money should be allocated, or voting to strike the entire section. If Members will look carefully at the foreign assistance section, they will find that over $200 million in this section will end up subsidizing foreign competitors of our hard-pressed farmers and independent oil producers.

This closed rule gives the appearance of trying to protect Members of the majority from having to go on record as voting for supplemental funding of the World Bank's International Development Association. This is funding which will be used to subsidize the foreign production of agricultural, oil, and mineral commodities in direct competition with our domestic producers. I know that the farmers and independent oilmen in my district do not want their tax dollars being used to finance their competition, and would not appreciate my voting to allocate funding in such a manner. I doubt that any Member of this body can find a groundswell of support in his district for subsidizing Chinese, Argentinian, or Brazilian farmers, while American farmers are suffering severe economic hardship.

I had hoped to offer an amendment to the foreign assistance section which would have given Members the opportunity to put an end to this foolish policy which has done immeasurable harm to our basic domestic industries. I have introduced legislation in the House of Representatives which would require the U.S. representatives to multilateral development institutions to oppose loans which would be used to subsidize the foreign production of agricultural or mineral commodities already in surplus on world markets. This legislation, the Foreign Agricultural Investment Reform Act (H.R. 306) has been passed by the Senate on three separate occasions. Yet the House refuses to give Members the opportunity to vote on the measure. Again in this instance, the Rules Committee did not see fit to allow Members this opportunity. In light of this unfairly and unwisely closed rule, I hope that Members will see fit to vote to strike the entire foreign assistance section—the only other option the rule allows.

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Chairman, before us here today we face the always difficult task of debating and voting on the merits of a supplemental appropriations bill. However, this year's legislation, which contains a funding provision for $135 million in critical disaster relief assistance, is much more than business as usual for mid-Michigan and the State.

It is about upholding a fair and prudent commitment to disaster-stricken Michigan farmers who were devastated by record floods in the fall of 1986. Indeed, without this much needed provision to provide dollar-for-dollar compensation for the legitimate claims of disaster-stricken Michigan farmers, the livelihood of literally thousands of farmers in mid-Michigan would be in jeopardy.

Quite frankly, the prospect of losing this critical funding provision, and thereby crippling entire farm communities in the state and particularly in mid-Michigan, has left me with an extraordinarily difficult choice. Indeed, the vote I have to make here today has left me between the proverbial "rock and a hard place."

To begin with, let me say up front that I deplore the adornment of this piece of legislation with totally inappropriate and ill-advised "policy" provisions. In particular, I protest in the strongest of terms the inclusion of language in chapter II which would commit the United States to numerical compliance with the sublimits of the flawed SALT II treaty. Similarly, I am mystified by the inclusion of language in this bill which requires that the United States observe a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing beginning 90 days after enactment of this bill.

In my opinion, both of these provisions could not have come at a more inopportune time. It is my sincere hope that the inclusion of this language will not tie the hands of our negotiators in Geneva as they seek to reduce the intermediate and short-range arsenals of the superpowers.

Second, I have deep reservations about the fiscal implications of this measure. This bill exceeds established spending limits under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985—Public Law 99-177. And, I note with displeasure the fact that every one of the President's 73 recission requests which would have reduced the total price tag of this bill was rejected.

I firmly believe that if we continue to fail in our efforts to reduce runaway budget deficits and our skyrocketing national debt, the very survival of the United States as a free nation is at risk. I would have liked to have seen at least some of the President's suggestions adopted so that this measure would have at the minimum been in technical compliance with the Budget Act.

However, my reservations notwithstanding, I will supoprt this measure. As a farmer once said to me as he pulled me aside after a recent meeting, "Bill, we live in an imperfect world." Indeed, I could not have said it better myself, and I can think of no better application of that axiom than to the bill before us here today.

In short, although I have grave concerns about several of the misguided policy-legislating provisions of this bill, I will honor my unwavering commitment to Michigan farmers. As the delegation's sole representative on the House Agriculture Committee, I cast my vote in favor of the resolution. Michigan farmers deserve nothing less.

Therefore, although I rise in support of H.R. 1827, I do not do so without registering my loud and clear contempt for what has been done to this bill.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1987, H.R. 1827, as reported by the Appropriations Committee. This legislation provides needed funding for a wide range of federally supported efforts—from $425 million in aid to the homeless to $651 million in foreign assistance, from $6.7 billion for the Commodity Credit Corporation to $1.3 billion for defense programs—while fully recognizing the fiscal constraints imposed by the budget deficit. In fact, the $11.3 billion proposed in supplemental spending is less, by $1.1 billion, than the President's supplemental spending request.

In short, H.R. 1827 is a sound bill. In a thoughtful and responsible manner, it attempts to meet the legitimate obligations of the Federal Government without breaking the bank. I commend the Appropriations Committee for its work in crafting this supplemental appropriations bill.

While I support the bill in general, there is one section of H.R. 1827 which is of particular interest to me and to which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House. Contained within this legislation is needed funding for the Unemployment Insurance [UI], Employment Service [ES] and Work Incentive [WIN] Programs, all of which are vital to the smooth functioning of the labor market and the training, placing, and assisting of our unemployed and underemployed workers.

Last year, Congress dealt a serious blow to these vital employment programs. Despite the Reagan administration's request for a $144 million increase for the administration of the Unemployment Insurance Program, Congress chose to hold funding at fiscal year 1986 levels. Also, Congress held funding at fiscal year 1986 levels for the Employment Service, while at the same time greatly expanding its programmatic responsibilities. Finally, in anticipation of a new, comprehensive job training program, which predictably will not be developed and implemented in time, Congress chose to phase out the WIN Program, the only Federal job training program for welfare recipients.

These funding reductions threaten the ability of many States to adequately meet the needs of the unemployed and those in need of training and/or placement.

Congress made a mistake last year. In its zeal to reduce the Federal deficit, a goal which I wholeheartedly support, the Congress cut indiscriminately; it cut to the point where the integrity of these programs has been seriously compromised. And we all know who the losers will be. Beyond those immediately affected, as many as 5,800 State employment security officers nationwide, it will be our constituents who pay the price if we fail to pass this appropriations bill. As is clear from the evidence, when these funds are cut, it is service to the public which suffers.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

According to an Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies survey conducted during the beginning of this calendar year, the impact on the UI Program will be severe without additional funding:

Twenty-seven States reported that they will leave an estimated 544 positions vacant in order to cover the difference in actual salary rates and the rate provided by Federal administrative funds;

Twenty-eight States reported that the cuts will have an immediate impact on unemployed workers and/or employers in the form of longer waiting time for claims services, delays in issuing payments, fewer offices resulting in longer travel time, delays in processing tax adjustments and protests, and reduced information services to employers;

Thirty-one States reported that the reductions will have a serious long-term impact on service to the public in the form of higher thresholds for fraud prosecution, reduction in the number and frequency of employer tax audits and resulting increases in delinquent employers and uncollected taxes, and reduction or elimination of capital expenditures;

Twenty-six States anticipated backlogs, particularly in the areas of issuing appeals decisions and eligibility determinations; processing initial claims for benefits; detecting and collecting overpayment; tax auditing employers; processing wage records; and handling interstate benefits and filing.

Seven States planned to lay off 466 permanent UI staff; two States hoped to avoid layoffs by offering early retirement plans;

Eleven States planned to close a total of 94 local offices and itinerant service points.

We are offered equally ominous findings by recent Department of Labor performance ratings of the States. In such areas as the percentage of businesses audited, the percentage of businesses notified within 180 days of becoming liable for UI taxes, and the percentage of employers filing wage reports by the end of the quarter in which they are due—all measurements of efficiency and long-run program integrity—there is a clear pattern of erosion from fiscal year 1984 to fiscal year 1986, years in which the UI Program experienced funding cuts. It is too soon to know what the results will be for fiscal year 1987. Judging by what the States are telling us, however, there is little reason to believe that this disturbing pattern will be any different.

What has happened in many States is clear. In order to meet the demands of unemployed workers, States have been forced to transfer funds and personnel out of quality control and into current operations. States have been forced to compromise the long-run integrity of the UI Program simply to maintain service to our constituents.

We all know that this is a sure prescription for disaster. The more we cut, the more the infrastructure of the UI Program deteriorates, and the more money we waste because of poor quality control. The men and women who will loose their jobs if we fail to pass this supplemental appropriations bill will certainly suffer from our unwillingness to appropriate the necessary funds for this program. The ultimate losers, however, will be our constitutents, who will be stuck with a UI Program unable to meet the needs of our rapidly changing economy.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Funding for the Employment Service was also held at the Fiscal year 1986 postsequestration level. The problem here, however, goes beyond the inevitable cuts associated with a funding freeze. Even as we cut real funding, we greatly expanded the programmatic responsibilities of the Employment Service.

As part of the Tax Reform Act of 1986, Congress reauthorized the targeted jobs tax credit, which allows employers to take tax credits for hiring certain "targeted" individuals. However, in so doing, Congress failed to appropriate any additional funds to state ES agencies, which have been charged with the responsibility for certifying which individuals are eligible to be "targeted."

This tactic has bred further disaster. There is now a backlog of almost 1 million applications throughout the country. State ES agencies simply do not have the manpower to process these requests. In New York, we have 150,000 individuals, more than any other State, waiting for the job service to give them the opportunity to work and earn a living on their own.

In addition, State ES agencies have been given further responsibilities, again without any new funding, by the recently enacted immigration bill. Employment Service agencies will have to complete, file, and, in some cases, secure documents in an effort to verify the citizenship of every individual they refer to an employer. This new assignment comes on top of an anticipated increased workload resulting from stepped up enforcement of existing verification requirements—alien and agricultural certification programs.

As the Department of Immigration and Naturalization has yet to issue the specific regulations regarding the administration of the law, we can only begin to guess at the burden this will impose on the already strapped Employment Service agencies. We do know, however, who will ultimately bear the burden. Again, it will be our constituents.

WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAM [WIN]

Finally, there is the WIN Program, which is designed to move AFDC recipients off the welfare rolls and on to the payrolls. In antici-

pation of a new, comprehensive job training program, the Congress last year cut the WIN Program in half, from $220 million in fiscal year 1986 to $110 million in fiscal year 1987 and stipulated that all funds be spent by June 30, 1987.

One could understand the rationale behind the termination of the WIN Program, if indeed there were a massive new job training program scheduled to take effect on July 1, 1987. But there is not, and it is extremely unlikely that Congress will act swiftly enough to enact and implement one by this date. We have thus shut off an opportunity for thousands of poor Americans without offering anything in its place.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

It is Government's responsibility to ensure the smooth functioning of the labor market. These cuts threaten Government's ability to perform this function. Fortunately, the Appropriations Committee has recognized this imperative and included funding for these vital programs in the supplemental appropriations bill.

The committee has recommended that the UI allocation for fiscal year 1987 be increased by $100 million, an amount that will go a long way toward addressing the serious problems we are facing in this program. In addition, H.R. 1827 would increase the fiscal year 1987 appropriation for the Employment Service by $30 million, funds necessary for the administration of the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit Program. Finally, this legislation extends the WIN Program until the end of the fiscal year and allocates $35 million more to cover this expense.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1827 is a fiscally sound measure, one that demonstrates a commitment to effective government. It recognizes that funding for employment programs is an investment in the economic health and well-being of our society and that cutting funds for these programs is both shortsighted and counter-productive. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of our constituents, the men and women who depend on this needed funding, I urge my fellow Members to support this supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, colleagues, I rise to urge that each of you take note of and support a provision within this supplemental appropriations legislation which would prevent the Veterans' Administration from downgrading the VA Medical Center at Walla Walla, WA, from a full-service facility to a poorly staffed outpatient clinic.

This center currently serves an 18-county region of the Pacific Northwest, including seven counties of my own Second Congressional District in Oregon. It has grown over the years into a well-respected, well-used, and trusted provider of health care to thousands of veterans in our three States.

Yet today, VA has suggested that they can save a scant $7 million by closing the inpatient care section of this facility, displacing more than 250 employees, and forcing those veterans who have come to rely on the Walla Walla Center to travel instead to Spokane and Boise.

On one hand, I want it known that I applaud the sincere attempts of any agency of this Government to save money where it can do so. But on the other hand, I think there is far more than money involved to be considered in a change such as this one.

First is the added distance, expense, and discomfort which we would force our veteran population to endure in traveling to Spokane or Boise. I'd hate to think that this Government would save money simply by transferring higher personal or ambulance transportation costs to the individual veteran.

A second element, maybe more important element, is the potential violation of trust of the men and women who have served this Nation so well, our veterans.

The VA medical system is frequently the only one available to many of these constituents, and the VA has not historically been known as the most welcoming or hospitable providers of health care. Yet the Walla Walla Center enjoys an unusual popularity. Its care is exceptional; its reputation is admirable; its potential downgrading has created an outpouring of sentiment from those it has served. I think it would go against the very nature of the mission of the VA medical system to rob our veterans of that trusted facility now.

In its larger form, this supplemental appropriations legislation is seriously flawed, in my opinion, and deserves the most careful attention by every single Member to every single line of proposed spending.

But in its provision to stop the downgrade of the Walla Walla VA Center, this bill is perfect. It is a task to which I've already devoted well over a year, and it's one which this Congress has addressed in the past. If it's necessary to repeat ourselves in Congress before this agency will hear our intentions, this bill does it adequately.

I hope that, regardless of the outcome of this bill, we can see to it that this provision—to stop the change at Walla Walla—can be met. If not here, then through the VA's own instruction.

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1987 as it takes an irresponsible approach to Federal spending and places serious constraints upon our national security and negotiation leverage.

At a time when deficit reduction has become inexorably linked with our economic prosperity, this bill creates $11.3 billion in new budget authority while proposing few offsets of any sort. The resultant $3 billion increase in fiscal year 1987 outlays is a major breach of Congress' Gramm-Rudman-Hollings commitment to reduce deficit spending and forebodes immense difficulties should sequestration prove to become a reality this year. Undoubtedly, there are items in this bill which are needed and which I support, such as increased funding for the Soil Conservation Service and the release of construction funds for Mather Air Force Base. However, the spending contained in this bill must be offset by savings elsewhere in the budget. I find it contemptible—but hardly surprising—that this supplemental appropriations bill fails to follow this responsible approach to budgeting.

I am also concerned with language in the bill imposing a moratorium on nuclear testing and mandating compliance with the numerical sublimits of the second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty [SALT II]. I do not believe that either would serve to further our negotiating efforts at reaching détente and am especially dismayed that such language appears in an appropriations bill.

A prohibition on nuclear testing fails to address Soviet compliance problems with existing arms control agreements, the inadequate verification procedures for all of these treaties, the ever-growing importance of the arms reduction talks underway in Geneva, and the present realities of détente which require a nuclear deterrent for the security of the United States and its allies. I believe we must continue to modernize our defensive capabilities in those areas where an imbalance currently exists, a process for which nuclear testing will be required.

There also exists no need for the United States to comply with SALT II, an arms control agreement which was never ratified and which the Soviets continue to violate by deploying the SS-25 ICBM and incoding missile test information. Even during the Carter administration, the Democratic Senate refused to ratify the SALT II agreement because of serious questions concerning parity and verifiability. This bill unjustifiably interferes with the constitutional powers of the President and the Senate and sends the entirely wrong message to the Soviet Union at a time when the President is vigorously pursuing deep, equitable, and verifiable arms reductions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill, which makes a mockery of both responsible Federal spending and the efforts of our negotiators in Geneva.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this supplemental appropriations bill. As is often the case with legislation considered by this body, this package contains some provisions that are good and some that are very bad. One of the most difficult tasks we face as legislators is wading through a legislative bundle like this supplemental and attempting to determine whether or not the good outweighs the bad.

There are some provisions in it that are needed. For instance, this supplemental contains funding for the Agriculture Department's Disaster Program and for the Commodity Credit Corporation account. We have made a commitment to fully fund those programs, and we should fulfill those commitments.

Unfortunately, there are many other provisions in this package that are not needed, that shoot through the budget ceiling and that should be rejected. This supplemental proposal completely defeats the purpose of a supplemental appropriations bill which is to provide additional money for reasons that were not anticipated or that could not be estimated accurately when the President submitted his budget and when Congress enacted the regular appropriations bills. The measure before us contains additions of $913 million in unrequested program supplementals, rejects all of the President's $5.8 billion rescission requests, and increases fiscal year 1987 outlays by $3 billion.

There is simply not enough money to pay for this package. Federal outlays for fiscal year 1987, which now stand at nearly $1 trillion, exceed the ceiling established in last year's budget resolution by $14.8 billion. The President's request for this bill was actually a

reduction of about $350 million in budget authority. Each dollar of his rescission requests was rejected in committee, and the House is now considering an increase in budget authority of $6.6 billion above the original request.

In this time of budget austerity and concentration on deficit reduction, we must work to prioritize more than ever. The additional spending and the irresponsible fiscal policy exhibited in this bill is reason enough to vote "no" on this supplemental.

Even more disasterous than the unnecessary spending, however, are two provisions in the defense section.

Here, on an appropriations bill, the House is mandating compliance with an unratified treaty that would have expired if it had been ratified. Yes, in this House fact is indeed stranger than fiction.

I am disturbed by the arms control amendments on two levels. First, on a constitutional level, I shudder to think how our Nation's history would have been changed if the House of Representatives had limited our negotiating positions in the many challenges we have faced. This kind of interference is against the intention of the Founding Fathers and contrary to the processes that have made our Government work for 200 years.

On another level, these restrictions go against basic common sense. Our first responsibility in this body is to promote our national interest.

It is not in our national interest to put restraints on ourselves because of an unratified treaty that would have expired if it had been ratified and whose artificial limits have no known relationship to our national security.

It is not in our national interest to make a mockery of serious arms control by ignoring Soviet violations of those sections that they think are to their benefit to violate and then expect us to unilaterally comply with the leftovers. If arms control is going to have any real meaning for the future, there must be no doubt that a violation of one section renders the entire treaty worthless.

It is certainly not in our national interest to pretend that unilateral restraint, wishful thinking, or gestures of good will do anything to make the Soviets a more willing negotiator.

The standard we must use is: "Will this action make the United States more secure?" rather than "Will this make it easier to sign a treaty with the Soviets?" Our national interests must always come first.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this vote is a test of our character—the first of several we'll have this year because floating around here are an endless number of proposals to limit ourselves. The way we meet this test will say a lot about where we are headed as a nation. I hope that we will not sit back relying on the good will of aggressors, but will take the responsibility for our security and our future in our own solid grip so that we can carry our liberties forward to the next generation. I hope my colleagues will vote for our Nation's security and against this bill.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this bill's provision to limit nuclear testing at a threshold of 1 kiloton.

Today, Mr. Chairman, United States and Soviet negotiators are meeting in Geneva to discuss limitations on short-range and intermediate-range nuclear weapons. In light of these talks and of the progress recently made by Secretary of State George Shultz in his trip to Moscow, placing a 1-kiloton threshold limit on U.S. underground nuclear tests now would be ill-timed and ill-advised. I caution my colleagues that such actions could compound the difficulties our negotiators face in an already complex series of negotiations.

During the Secretary's trip, Soviet officials suggested the United States and the Soviet Union conduct a nuclear test on one another's territory. Under the proposal, the United States would set off a nuclear device at the principal Soviet nuclear testing facility while the Soviet would do the same at the Nevada test site. Since each side would know the size of its own device, each side could calibrate its seismic monitoring systems to determine the accuracy of its measurements. This proposal has been agreed to in principal, and represents a big step forward in nuclear tests verification. Further, the information obtained would be critical in verifying the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty. These agreements may be under consideration by our colleagues in the Senate in the near future. Our actions today could stifle this important initiative, and I urge that we weigh the transient value of symbolism with the benefits of concrete progress.

Mr. Chairman, like all Americans I echo the President by remaining committed to a national security policy which includes a strong deterrent to aggression and an active pursuit of deep, equitable, and verifiable reductions in Soviet and American nuclear arms. However, adopting the moratorium provided for by the bill under consideration today simply does not meet any measure of real progress toward a more secure world.

Like the President, we all look forward to a world free from nuclear weapons. Such would be the legacy I would like to leave for my new granddaughter. But the way to ensure that we reach such a world is by being prudent, skeptical, and tough negotiators, not given to providing our adversaries unilateral advantages.

For that reason we must make sure our negotiators are not undercut by what we do here today, and as important we should consider what the future of our testing capability will be.

Mr. Chairman, the Soviets have just recently ended a unilateral nuclear test moratorium of some 18 months in duration. Shortly after ending the moratorium they were able to resume testing at a steady rate of at least one a month. This should demonstrate to all those who advocate this provision to unilaterally limit the size of our tests, that the Soviets will maintain a capability to resume testing should they decide to break the treaty. Indeed, they have demonstrated the political will to keep their test site at a high state of readiness, a readiness that guarantees that they could, and will resume testing shortly after breakdown of a treaty.

The United States must be prepared to do what is necessary, even with a treaty, to maintain the Nevada test site at a high state of readiness. In the jargon of the nuclear theorists, we need to guard against a Soviet breakout from a test ban treaty. In English, we cannot be lulled into a state of complacency because we have a sheet of paper called a treaty. Too much is at risk, too many lives are at stake, too much freedom is on the line, to leave it to the Soviets to honor their agreements. We don't wish the worst case, but we must guard against it. And I might add, if we keep vigilant and do not let our testing capability atrophy we will go a long way toward ensuring that any agreement reached will be honored.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1827, the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1987. Unfortunately, I must oppose this bill even though there are many important items contained in it to commend. Included in this bill is $147.8 million to begin implementing the urgently needed Immigration Reform Act passed last year. CHAMPUS, the civilian health and medical program of the uniformed services, is slated to receive $382.5 million. This supplemental appropriation also includes $80.2 million in compensation and pension benefits for our veterans and another $30 million to defray training costs and provide incentives for employers to hire veterans.

There is also a very important provision in this bill to the residents of my district in California. Language in the bill directs the Department of the Interior to transfer $570,000 of unobligated balances from "Teton Dam Failure, Payment of Claims" funds, to the United Water Conservation District in California. This money was to be used as a Bureau of Reclamation small projects loan for the Freeman diversion project, which impacts both my district and that of my colleague, Congressman LAGOMARSINO. This project is sorely needed to stop saltwater intrusion into the aquifers of the Oxnard plain, one of the richest agricultural areas in the Nation.

It is extremely unfortunate to me, therefore, that this bill has been written with criteria that are so objectionable as to create a situation wherein I must vote against its passage. A major problem with this bill is that it exceeds the 302(b) allocation for discretionary new budget authority in fiscal year 1987 by $3.9 billion. At a time when our Nation is literally drowning in red ink, when the latest Congressional Budget Office estimate for the fiscal year 1987 budget deficit is now over $173 billion, we simply cannot invest another $3.6 billion.

Beyond the irresponsible fiscal policy that this bill represents, there are also two arms control provisions that have no business being included. Just today, our team in Geneva began a new round of negotiations with the Soviets. As we stand on the brink of significant and stabilizing arms control agreements with the Soviet Union, the last thing the Congress should be doing is passing arms control provisions that undercut the position of our negotiators in Geneva.

On balance, the bad parts of this bill to our Nation far outweigh its many benefits. As a fiscal conservative, as well as an advocate of true arms control, I simply cannot support this bill. I will continue to work, however, on seeing to it that those provisions which I believe are important, and which I have mentioned, are carried out through separate legislation or administrative actions.

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1827, the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1987 is a budget-buster, and I opposed it.

A supplemental appropriation is a catch-all bill. It is a hodge-podge of a little bit of everything. It includes funding for programs that were created or expanded after the regular appropriations bill has passed, and for programs that were underfunded during appropriations process.

Every spring, Congress goes through the torturous exercise of drafting and passing a budget. Hollow claims are made that Congress has, at last, lived up to campaign promises and other commitments to reduce the deficit and move toward a balanced Federal budget. That is followed by a procession of appropriation bills which are supposed to meet the constraints of the budget. But when the fiscal year ends, the deficit is always much higher than budget said it would be. Members who ought to know better, naively ask—and Members who do know better, slyly ask—"How did that happen?"

It happens because every year we pass supplemental appropriations that completely ignore the congressional budget resolution. H.R. 1827 is no different. H.R. 1827 calls for spending in excess of the ceiling set in the fiscal year 1987 budget resolution; it would add another $3.9 billion in outlays to the fiscal year 1987 projected deficit of $174 billion—a deficit which is already well above the Gramm-Rudman target of $144 billion; it will add $837 million to the fiscal year 1988 budget, most of which was not included in the fiscal year 1988 budget resolution which we passed less than a month ago. In short, H.R. 1827 demonstrates to the American people that the House of Representatives is not serious about reducing the deficit.

In all fairness, I must say that there are items in H.R. 1827 that I support. But there is more bad than good.

Many areas where the President had recommended cost savings are ignored. Other initiatives, such as a study to privatize Amtrak, and a program of drug testing key Governmental employees, are prohibited by the bill. Then there are items, which, at a time when we are trying to control Federal spending, have to be questioned. Some of the more dubious items include: $16.2 million for a new building on the Penn State University campus; $3 million for a rural industrial park in Oklahoma; a $5 million gift to Australia for their bicentennial; $758 million for foreign aid; $50,000 to commemorate the centennial of the birth of Dwight Eisenhower; $13.9 million for the acquisition of a park in Washington State, and $9.5 million for the activities of the House of Representatives. These programs and expenditures may have some merit, but while, in an effort to reduce the deficit, we are asking the American public to make sacrifices, I cannot not vote for them.

I am also very concerned that provisions of this legislation infringe on the constitutional prerogatives and powers of the President in the area of foreign affairs.

To keep our economy strong, we must end the ruinous cycle of huge budget deficits. We have taken steps, which I have supported, toward a balanced Federal budget. However, H.R. 1827 is a giant step backward, and I cannot support it.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1827, a bill providing supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1987.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 1827 primarily because of the two critically important arms control provisions it contains. These amendments are essentially identical to two amendments adopted by the House last summer to the fiscal year 1987 defense authorization bill.

The first amendment enforces the three numerical sublimits on the SALT II Treaty so long as the Soviets continue to comply with those sublimits. No fiscal year 1987 funds could be spent on deployment or maintenance of weapon systems in excess of the sublimits established in the SALT II Treaty. Since the United States exceeded the SALT II limits last fall, the amendment mandates that the United States will have to dismantle sufficient systems to bring the force level back into compliance with the sublimits.

The second amendment establishes a moratorium on nuclear warhead testing of over 1 kiloton so long as the Soviets refrain from such testing and agree to in-country monitoring. The prohibition relates to the use of fiscal year 1987 funds only, and would take effect 90 days after enactment. The testing limitation would not apply if the United States and the Soviet Union agree to significant limits on nuclear explosions, through a treaty or accord.

Mr. Chairman, the House has already expressed its will on these subjects when it passed them last summer. However, in deference to the President in advance of the Reykjavik summit, the House watered down the SALT II provision and dropped the testing moratorium. Neither action seemed to make the slightest difference in the President's performance at Reykjavik. To be generous, he was woefully unprepared, uninformed, and outmaneuvered. Even without these provisions in force, he acted as if his hands were tied.

It is time once and for all for Congress to pass tough binding arms control language.

The SALT II provision provides an opportunity to restate congressional insistence that the United States not abrogate an arms control treaty in our national interest.

The SALT II provision contributes to United States national security by forcing the Soviets to dismantle or destroy hundreds of nuclear systems and delivery vehicles. Without such limits, the Soviets could increase with impunity the number of warheads in their arsenal; and they are much better equipped than we are to rapidly build up their offensive systems.

Finally, the SALT II provision is an important symbol of the U.S. commitment to a major arms control treaty. There can be no better way for the United States to demonstrate its credibility and sincerity in the present arms control negotiations with the Soviets than to readhere to the SALT II sublimits. In fact, such adherence on strategic arms provides the basis for agreement on other types of nuclear weapons, particularly intermediate and short-range weapons.

The nuclear testing moratorium is simply the best way to slow and perhaps stop the arms race, since it would preclude the development of a third generation of nuclear weapons. It also likely will stop Soviet testing, since the Soviets have said they will stop when we do.

The testing moratorium provides for in-country monitoring and restrictions to one test site, both of which would contribute significantly to accurate verification.

It is unnecessary to detonate a nuclear weapon to ensure the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, contrary to administration claims. In fact, only 5 percent of U.S. nuclear tests are conducted for the purpose of testing weapon reliability.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, these amendments represent a commitment to our national security through arms control and in fact will contribute, not impede—as the administration argues—an arms control agreement in Geneva. Such protestations by the administration are merely an excuse for inaction. Congress has complied with the President's wishes before on arms control. The results have been negligible. Now is the time for us to stand tall.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1827, the supplemental appropriations bill of 1987, includes a request from the Immigration and Naturalization Service for funds that it intends to use in enforcement of the employer sanctions provisions of the Immigration and Reform Act of 1986.

The act is, without question, one of the most sweeping social reforms Congress has enacted. For the first time in this country there will be a multi-tiered approach to combat illegal immigration. There is great hope for the promise it offers and great dread for the failure it could be.

Whether this reform is successful will be largely determined by employers. The employer sanctions provision is based on reporting and self-enforcement. These employers cannot fullfil their obligations under the act unless and until they know what those obligations are. The act provides the model; the regulations are the instructions without which the model can't be built. The regulations are still uncompleted. We have at this moment the absurdity of a law that employers are supposed to enforce without knowing the requirements of the law.

On June 1, every employer in this country will be subject to criminal and civil sanctions for failure to comply with this act. There is a 12-month period where only a citation will be issued for a first offense, but if the second violation ocurs on June 2, a penalty can and will ensure. Without public education, this fundamental provision cannot work and without this provision as an essential plank, the reform will fail. Recognizing the detrimental effects unfounded fears would have on the program, Congress provided for a 6-month education period.

Because of unexpected, though understandable and perhaps even unavoidable delays in receiving bids and other difficulties in interagency coordination, contracts for the most comprehensive aspects of the public information program were let only 2 weeks ago. After adding normal lead times to produce an extensive campaign and assuming there are no hitches, the public education period will begin roughly 2 weeks before sanctions begin.

The early education period Congress envisioned will not occur.

This week, I discussed with the other Member's body a proposed amendment to delay imposition of sanctions for 120 days to allow the INS and others to continue and enhance their efforts to educate both employers and prospective employees of the law about what the sanctions are, and to a great extent, what they are not. The "reprieve" would've lasted until October 1, at which time the citation period would've begun as usual. It would not have affected any other provision of the law and it was not intended to weaken any aspect of the law. On the contrary, it was and is my belief that a 120-day delay would in fact strengthen implementation and calm some of the chaos that is erupting among employers.

Unfortunately, although many Members I spoke with agreed the idea had merit, no one was willing to reopen—even in this most limited way—an act which caused so much emotional turmoil when it was considered in this body. I can appreciate that fear, but, it is unfortunate and the consequences for those will struggle to comply with the law will be even more unfortunate.

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of a provision which was included in the House Appropriations Committee's bill, the fiscal year 1987 supplemental appropriations, H.R. 1827. This provision would prohibit the promulgation of a new rule by the Department of Transportation which is identical to a rule recently overturned by the U.S. Court of Appeals. The proposed rule would permit certain U.S. tankers, those built with construction differential subsidies that helped them compete with foreign ships, to repay those subsidies and allow them to compete with unsubsidized U.S. tankers in the Alaska oil trade.

The Federal Government has, for many years, recognized the need to preserve a strong U.S. maritime fleet for peacetime and national emergency use. We have supported the fleet with a variety of assistance programs designed to make U.S. vessels more competitive with subsidized foreign fleets. The promulgation of this rule would undermine the stability of the U.S. maritime fleet and jeopardize U.S. Defense preparedness because of the anticipated loses of smaller more militarily useful tankers through title XI defaults and, the loss of qualified merchant seamen and women.

The Department of Transportation instituted an identical rule in 1985 in hopes of generating revenue to offset the public debt. Instead of accomplishing this worthy goal, DOT's actions resulted in over $55 million in net losses from title XI defaults. If a new rule is promulgated, an additional $70 to $200 million in title XI defaults are expected to occur, wiping out budget gains and resulting in substantial budget losses. In addition the Department of Transportation anticipates that hundreds of jobs will be lost.

I urge Congress to retain this provision blocking the CDS payment rule because of its negative budget impact.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 148, the following amendments are considered as having been adopted:

First, an amendment to strike out the paragraph beginning on line 5, page 32 through line 8;

Second, an amendment to strike the colon on line 13, page 121 and all that follows up to the period on line 15; and

Third, an amendment to strike the colon on line 8, page 123 and all that follows up to the period on line 10.

No amendments changing or affecting the subject matter of either sections 5 or 6 of chapter II of title I are in order except amendments to strike each said section, which shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent of the amendment and a member opposed thereto.

Chapter IV of title I shall be considered as having been read. No amendments changing or affecting the subject matter of chapter IV are in order except the following amendments, which shall be considered in the following order only and which shall be considered and debated as provided in House Resolution 148:

First, the amendments by Representative EDWARDS of Oklahoma, or his designee, printed in House Report 100-61.

Second, an amendment to strike out said chapter IV.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—PROGRAM SUPPLEMENTALS

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

The sum of $62,500,000, to be derived from $27,500,000 appropriated pursuant to Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591 for commercialization of the land remote sensing satellite system and $35,000,000 appropriated pursuant to the same law for the polar orbiting satellite system, is hereby reprogrammed for a two spacecraft land remote sensing satellite system under a plan which provides for the cost of the second satellite from funds from users or other sources other than funds from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The release of such funds is subject to the funding plan being approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

At such time as funds are appropriated to carry out Sec. 118 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the funds transferred to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in accordance with subsection (h)(3) of such section, shall be used to carry out the provisions of subsection (d) of such section at the Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory.

None of the funds appropriated for the Department of Commerce in fiscal year 1987 shall be obligated or expended to promulgate or implement the March 2, 1987 proposed rulemaking on Sea Turtle Conservation; Shrimp Trawl Requirements for waters described in the proposed rulemaking as western Gulf of Mexico offshore, western Gulf of Mexico inshore, and Louisiana inshore, zones 10 through 21.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly, if I might, about the section on page 3, lines 1 through 7, which is the sea turtle provision which was discussed during general debate by the two gentlemen from Louisiana, Mr. LIVINGSTON, its author, and Mr. ROEMER.

Lest they panic, wherever they may be, I do not intend to move to strike this section, but I do want to say a couple of words not so much about the substance or the merits or demerits of the proposition as it appears in the bill, as I would about the procedure, which I think is an inappropriate one altogether.

I speak as the chairman of the relevant authorizing subcommittee with jurisdiction over the Endangered Species Act, which is the act in question, when speaking of species such as the sea turtles here, some of which are on the threatened and endangered species list.

□ 1410

I also speak, at least I presume to be speaking, for those remaining, beknighted Members of this House who are sufficiently naive to assume that there is still some function for the legislative and authorizing committees of the Congress. I realize that is a dwindling number of us, but I think that something, nonetheless, should be said.

Members should know that had the rule under which this bill is being considered not waived all points of order, that this provision, these seven lines, would have been subject to a point of order on the ground that they constitute legislation in an appropriations bill. Clearly, they do so constitute. Clearly, a waiver was necessary to protect the provision and the Committee on Rules, notwithstanding the request of this Member that that waiver not be granted, nonetheless chose to protect the language.

Let me say again that I do not propose at the moment to discuss the merits or demerits of the substance, but let me say this about those of us who are tempted from time to time, and I include myself, in all candor, amongst them, to turn to the Committee on Appropriations on the supplemental bill or some other vehicle for assistance in a matter on which we are frustrated, looking elsewhere around this House.

I would suggest that the times in which that tactic are appropriate are times when there is an urgent situation before us and there is no timely and appropriate legislative vehicle to turn to.

That, I would say to Members, is not the case here. Members should know that the rule proposed by the National Marine Fisheries Service, which would require the use of turtle-excluding devices on shrimp trawling gear would not go into effect for several months, and that at this moment, there are ongoing negotiations between all the parties to the dispute in an honest and very serious attempt to reach a compromise, which, if successful, would moot the need for these provisions.

Members should also know that the Endangered Species Act needs to be reauthorized this year, that our subcommittee has had a full day of hearings on that, one-half of which was devoted to the question of the sea turtles and that our subcommittee has scheduled tentatively a markup of the reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act, at which time an attempt to resolve this question would be altogether in order on the appropriate legislative vehicle.

I simply would like to say to Members that I think we should proceed with some caution as a general proposition in turning on our every whim to the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Appropriations to shortcut the standard legislative process when such a shortcut is not at all necessary.

As a matter of fact, I would have been tempted to move to strike the provision, a motion which would have been in order under the rule, were it not, First, an enormously complex subject which I hope will be resolved prior to the day when this bill may become law, and given, second, the length of the odds that any of us will live to see the day in which this bill becomes law.

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

Mr. STUDDS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the gentleman is not going to introduce the necessary amendment to try to exclude the turtle device that is recommended by the National Marine Fisheries. Is this correct?

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, what I said a moment ago was that I do not intend to offer an amendment to strike this language from this bill at this time, but that it is my hope that we will have through the normal process, either through the negotiations seeking a compromise between the shrimpers and the environmentalists in the gulf itself or through the normal authorizing legislation and authorizing committee, to resolve this as it ought to be resolved.

I did not address the merits of the case.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I am happy to learn that the gentleman is not going to offer the necessary amendment to exclude it because I happen to think, with all due respect to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts regarding the need for the possibility of these excluded devices, I happen to think that the National Marine Fisheries made a dramatic and costly, possibly an error, in their assumption of turtle-excluding devices.

Mr. STUDDS. Let me just say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that I did not at all address the question of the merits of the issue.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MICA). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $10,450,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", $5,499,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division", $299,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys", $887,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, United States Marshals Service", $405,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988: *Provided*, That in the appropriation language under this heading in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, add at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the provisions of title 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Director of the United States Marshals Service may collect fees and expenses for the service of civil process, including: complaints, summonses, subpoenas and similar process; and seizures, levies, and sales associated with judicial orders of execution; and credit not to exceed $1,000,000 of such fees to this appropriation to be used for salaries and other expenses incurred in providing these services."

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For an additional amount for "Support of United States Prisoners", $9,630,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

In the appropriation language under this heading in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, delete "$29,637,000 of which $23,266,000 shall remain available until expended" and substitute the following: "$29,637,000 of which $22,791,000 shall remain available until expended".

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

In addition to amounts made available under the head "Salaries and expenses, oversight of bankruptcy cases", for the expansion of the United States Trustees Program, as authorized by Sec. 115 of the "Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act of 1986" (Public Law 99-554), $16,436,000: *Provided*, That deposits to the Fund are available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $3,989,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Drug Enforcement Administration", $776,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988: *Provided*, That in appropriation language under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 1987, as included in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, delete "five hundred seventy-five" and substitute "1,030".

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $147,793,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988: *Provided*, That in appropriation language under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 1987, as included in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, delete the phrase "(not to exceed four hundred ninety, all of which shall be for replacement only)" and substitute "(not to exceed 1,796, of which 490 shall be for replacement only)".

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $548,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS

For an additional amount for "National Institute of Corrections", $15,000.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $61,750,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988.

ACQUISITION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

For an additional amount for "Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad", $12,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds shall be available subject to the approval of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees' policies concerning the reprogramming of funds contained in House Report 99-669.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For an additional amount for "Contributions to International Organizations", $268,831 for payment of the United States

assessed contribution to the Interparliamentary Union: *Provided*, That in the appropriation language under the heading "Contributions to International Organizations" in the Department of State Appropriations Act, 1987, as included in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, delete the phrase that reads "of which $130,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall become available for expenditure on October 1, 1987".

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For an additional amount for "American Sections, International Commissions", $600,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988.

THE JUDICIARY

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $45,645,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988.

DEFENDER SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Defender Services", $2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $98,000.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $1,017,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL SHIP FINANCING FUND

For payment to the Secretary of the Treasury for debt reduction, $1,375,000,000, to remain available until expended, and for payment of interest on said amount to the Secretary of the Treasury, $73,000,000, to remain available until expended.

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

GRANTS AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Grants and expenses", $33,195,000, to remain available until expended.

COMMISSION FOR THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION AND COOPERATIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission for the Study of International Migration and Cooperative Economic Development as authorized by Title VI of Public Law 99-603, $275,000, to remain available until expended.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Dwight David Eisenhower Centennial Commission as authorized by Public Law 99-624, $50,000, to remain available until expended.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL PROVISION

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, rule, or regulation relating to the Small Business Administration, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall, with respect to small business concerns involved in the fishing industry, declare the recent Texas Gulf Coast-related red tide contamination a disaster for purposes of section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)). Such declaration shall be made not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. Disaster loan assistance shall be provided pursuant to paragraph (2) of such section to such small business concerns.

For purposes of this provision—

(1) the term "recent Texas Gulf Coast-related red tide contamination" means the contamination of customary fishing grounds by red tide, the closing of (or reduction of catch limits in) customary fishing grounds due to excessive harvesting on such grounds prompted by red tide contamination outside the nominal boundaries of such grounds, and the contamination of such customary fishing grounds or significant reductions in the normal populations of fish resulting from heavy rainfall, flooding, or the runoff waters thereof, which has occurred along the Texas Gulf Coast since September 1, 1986; and

(2) the terms "fish" and "fishing industry" have the meanings given such terms in sections 23(1)(B) and 23(1)(C), respectively, of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 650(1)(B), 650(1)(C)).

For purposes of paragraph (2) of section 7(b) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(2)), eligibility of individual applicants shall not in any way be dependent upon the number of disaster victims in any county or other political subdivision.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $8,098,176, of which $598,176 shall be used for purchase of Pakistani Rupees from the special account for the Informational Media Guarantee Program to carry out the provisions of section 1011(d) of the Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1442(d)).

RADIO BROADCASTING TO CUBA

For an additional amount to carry out the provisions of section 7 of the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1465(e)), $993,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Army", $255,452,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Navy", $40,600,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Marine Corps", $36,520,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Air Force", $157,800,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Navy", $50,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE AGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Defense Agencies", $382,500,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Army Reserve", $15,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard", $10,000,000.

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Aircraft procurement, Air Force", $313,700,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be obligated or expended unless authorized.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army", $3,300,000.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy", $14,000,000, for Manufacturing Technology: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be obligated or expended unless authorized.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force", $19,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be obligated or expended unless authorized.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE AGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense Agencies", $4,400,000.

DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for "Developmental test and evaluation, Defense", $13,900,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 1. Section 9073 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1987 (Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9073. The test authority provided for in section 618 of Public Law 99-145 and section 8083 of Public Law 99-190 shall remain in effect until such time as the system provided for by section 614(a) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1987 (Public Law 99-661) is implemented for both Department of Defense military and civilian employees.".

□ 1420

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

Mr. Chairman, we are about to reach a part of the bill that has some arms control limitations in it. I want to register my sorrow, my anger, my dismay, that at a very sensitive time in the negotiations with a very difficult adversary in Geneva, where we have a first-rate professional team trying to hammer out some arms control agreements that has Europe on the edge of

its chair, and has all of us hoping and praying something that will advance the cause of peace can be accomplished, what are we doing here today?

Well, we have the defense intellectuals going to micro-micro-mini manage arms control. We are going to legislate limitations on our negotiators.

It is as though we stand behind them at this life or death poker game, and we do not just wigwag the Soviets what cards we are holding. We reach in and pull the cards out of our negotiators' hands.

We want them to play with a deck with 25 cards. We have to go through three sets of negotiations: The media, and Congress, and then the Soviet Union.

Why do we do this to ourselves? Why? It is just incredible.

First of all, let us talk about the nuclear sublimits. Let us talk about SALT II, an unratified treaty. And why was it not ratified? It would not have had the votes to pass, and President Carter pulled it back because the Soviets invaded Afghanistan.

Today, we are going to ratify a part of that treaty by what is in this bill. We are going to insist that our Government observe numerical sublimits that are in a part of the SALT Treaty. It is interesting why you just select that.

This is a treaty, and it is not a treaty. It is a proposed treaty that has been massively violated by the Soviet Union.

They have produced a new weapons system, the SS-25, that is a violation of the treaty.

They have encrypted the telemetry, so we cannot tell what we have and what they are doing, a violation of the treaty. They have violated all the other treaties, and so what is our response? Shackle the hands of our negotiators? How silly, and I say that with keen regret.

How do you ever get the Soviets to comply with the treaty if you do not reserve some flexibility to our country to respond? Why prevent us from responding?

Well, it is nonsense, and then I move to the other foolish, improvident, unwise, silly limitation of forbidding us to test any nuclear weapons above 1 kiloton.

That is not arms control, because it does not reduce anything. It weakens our deterrence. It is asymmetrical, and a weakened deterrence is a threat to world peace. We have had more reductions in weapons and in explosive power under testing than under any treaties.

As a matter of fact, we have reduced the number of nuclear weapons by one-third since 1967, not due to SALT I or ABM or SALT II, or Helsinki or Yalta, or any of those great treaties that we make with the Soviet Union but due to testing.

We have tested and modernized, made them smaller, more accurate; and we have reduced the number. We have reduced by three-quarters in the last 20 years the explosive power because of testing.

Now, I would think in an age of *Challenger*, where we lost the lives of some astronauts because there were not adequate tests, that you would demand tests. We are always criticizing the Defense Department. They did not test this tank. They did not test this plane. They did not test this satellite; but, by God, nuclear weapons, we are not going to test.

We are going to watch them get old and degrade and deteriorate, and say that is arms control.

It is nonsense. As long as you rely on nuclear weapons as your deterrent, ask Europe, folks. You better have them safe. You better have them reliable, and you better have them effective.

Once more this Congress, the majority party, puts handcuffs and leg irons around the defense of this country and our negotiators at Geneva. Why? To bash Reagan?

I think it is such nonsense. How do you keep our scientists working, testing when there is nothing to test?

We are forbidden to test. We will lose them. They will go into the skateboard industry or teaching somewhere, but you will not keep your team together, that God forbid the day comes that you might need them.

I just cannot see why you want to magnify Soviet conventional advantage by legislating restrictions on our side.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. MICA). The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] has expired.

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

I want to pick up from what the distinguished gentleman from Illinois just said, because I think every Member of this House ought to read this document.

What you have got on pages 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 is the Democratic caucus of the House of Representatives defining this legal statutory language, the foreign policy of the United States, and defining it in a level that none of the Founding Fathers provided for.

We talk about this being the 200th anniversary of the Constitution, and none of our Founding Fathers would have accepted 435 Secretaries of State in the House writing in, for example, page 18, line 11:

> The term "designated test area" means an area within the Soviet Union or the United States which—
>
> (A) is known to be composed of strong-coupling rock; and
>
> (B) is located within the boundaries of a single existing nuclear weapons testing site in such country.

Now, I would guess that of the 250 or so Democrats who will routinely vote for this thing, 240 who have no idea what this means, have never talked to an expert, do not know whether it is appropriate, but will automatically vote yes, because that is part of the policy of the party right now.

Item after item in this particular section is the unilateral crippling of the United States. There is nothing in here that cripples Gorbachev, because you do not have the power. There is nothing in here which affects the Soviet Empire, because you cannot.

The gentleman who is sitting in the Chair right now has seen firsthand what the Soviets have done at our Embassy. All of you have had the opportunity in recent weeks to see the nature of the Soviet Empire, and what is the response of the Democratic caucus? Is is to impose on the appropriations bill a piece of statutory language which has nothing to do with appropriations.

This is purely an excuse to cripple America first, to send the signal to the Soviets that no matter how much they insult us, or to quote George Shultz, no matter how much they invade our sovereign territory, no matter what they do to us, there are always people in the Democratic caucus willing to make sure we tie America's hands, no matter what the Soviets are doing.

The Soviets are in Afghanistan today. The Soviets are building nuclear weapons today. The Soviets are playing their games, and what is the Democratic Party in the House doing?

It is systematically weakening the capacity of the United States as a country to lead the Western alliance.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting back here listening to the gentleman, and I agree with every word he said.

Can you answer this question? What are we getting from the Soviets for restricting ourselves to numerical sublimits, no matter they have broken out a new weapons system, encrypting? Are we getting anything, or are we getting a big zero?

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, that there is sadly a faction particularly in the Democratic Party in this country which does not care what we get from the Soviets.

It cares what we give up. It never questions Moscow; it always attacks Washington.

In other words, trading something for nothing is a good idea. They give away something for insult. The Russians insult us; they give them something.

The Russians put bugs in our Embassy. The Russians laugh at our State Department, they give them something.

Mr. HYDE. I am reminded of an old law that I once composed. Ignorance is salvageable, but stupid is forever.

Mr. GINGRICH. That may be a Chicago position, but I cannot comment on it.

I wish every Member would look carefully at the kind of blind self-crippling games we are now playing for partisan ideological purposes that have real impact on the real world, and ask yourselves, is an appropriations supplemental bill really the place to define the foreign policy of the United States, and to weaken American negotiators?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Within the funds appropriated for operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 1987, and pursuant to section 403(a) of title 10, United States Code, funds may be used for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 3. None of the funds appropriated for the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1987 shall be obligated or expended to deactivate or implement procedures for conversion or deactivation of the 815th Air Force Reserve Weather Reconnaissance Squadron, Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, or for the deactivation of the 36th Tactical Airlift Squadron, McChord Air Force Base, Washington.

SEC. 4. None of the funds appropriated for the Department of Defense in fiscal year 1987 are available for remuneration of any individual or entity associated with fund raising for the restoration of the Battleship Texas: *Provided*, That the grant for the restoration should be made to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department vice the Battleship Texas Advisory Board of the State of Texas.

SEC. 5. (a) None of the funds provided for fiscal year 1987, within 60 days of the enactment of this Act, may be obligated or expended for the deployment or maintenance of—

(1) launchers for more than 820 intercontinental ballistic missiles carrying multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles (MIRVs);

(2) launchers for an aggregate of more than 1,200 intercontinental ballistic missiles carrying MIRVs and submarine launched ballistic missiles carrying MIRVs;

(3) an aggregate of more than 1,320 launchers described in paragraph (2) and heavy bombers equipped for air launched cruise missiles capable of a range in excess of six hundred kilometers; or

(4) a number of MIRVs on an individual ballistic missile in excess of the limitations included in the SALT II agreement, its agreed statements and common understandings;

unless the President certifies to the Congress that the Soviet Union, after the date of enactment of this act, has exceeded the limitations included in subsections (a) (1-4). Such certification shall be accompanied by a report, in both classified and unclassified versions, providing information upon which the President bases his certification: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply—

(1) launchers of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine launched ballistic missiles equipped with multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles are launchers of the types developed and tested for launching intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine launched ballistic missiles equipped with multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles; and

(2) air launched cruise missiles are unmanned, self-propelled, guided, weapon delivery vehicles which sustain flight through the use of aerodynamic lift over most of their flight path and which are flight tested from or deployed on aircraft.

(b) Within 30 days of enactment of this Act, the President shall notify Congress of his plans for carrying out the provisions of section (a).

SEC. 6. FISCAL YEAR 1987 NUCLEAR TESTING LIMITATION.

(a) LIMITATION.—Effective 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, funds appropriated for fiscal year 1987 may not be obligated or expended to carry out a nuclear explosion with a yield exceeding one kiloton, or a nuclear explosion that is conducted outside a designated test area, unless the President certifies to Congress—

(1) that the Soviet Union, after the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, has carried out a nuclear explosion with a yield exceeding one kiloton;

(2) that the Soviet Union, after the end of such 90-day period, has carried out a nuclear explosion outside a designated test area; or

(3) that the Soviet Union has refused to accept and implement reciprocal in-country monitoring arrangements to take effect not later than the last day of such 90-day period and extend through the remainder of fiscal year 1987.

(b) TERMINATION FOR CERTAIN NEW AGREEMENTS.—The limitation on nuclear explosions in subsection (a) shall cease to apply if supplanted by an agreement, accord, or treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union establishing significant limits on nuclear explosions by such countries that is negotiated after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "in-country reciprocal monitoring arrangements" means arrangements between the United States and the Soviet Union to supplement national technical means of verification through the emplacement by each country of seismic monitoring stations on the national territory of the other so that the seismic monitoring network of each nation will be capable of detecting and identifying nuclear explosions with a yield exceeding one kiloton at known nuclear weapons test sites of the other nation and at any other site of the other nation that currently has the capability to accommodate decoupled nuclear explosions with a yield exceeding one kiloton.

(2) The term "designated test area" means an area within the Soviet Union or the United States which—

(A) is known to be composed of strong-coupling rock; and

(B) is located within the boundaries of a single existing nuclear weapons testing site in such country.

□ 1430

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

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this moment to respond to the criticism that we just heard from the other side on the question of the efficacy of the limitations included in the SALT II aggreement which have just been adopted by the Committee of the Whole as we act on the supplemental appropriations bill.

I want to make it very clear to my colleagues that I never heard any of this criticism about this policy when the Reagan administration, for 5½ years exercised interim restraint. Even though Ronald Reagan, while campaigning for President of the United States said that he felt that SALT II was fatally flawed, when he became President, when he heard the advice of his National Security Advisers, the Joint Chiefs, the head of the Strategic Air Command, he found out one very important thing: That the Soviet Union had the ability to add more offensive capability to their force structure than we, the United States, did. We could not keep up with their deployment rate.

Because of that, the President said, "We will exercise a policy of interim restraint." Between 1981, when he took office, and 1986, it was the policy of the Reagan administration to abide by the limits in the SALT II agreement as long as the Soviet Union did the same.

I want to make it very clear that this served our vital interests. The Soviets have withdrawn 1,300 launchers because of the restraint required to stay within those sublimits on SALT II. I think that it is still in our national security interests to exercise restraint during this time when we have our negotiators in Geneva. The Soviets have made it clear that they are willing to continue to abide by the sublimits in SALT II.

I think it is very critical, that we exercise that restraint as well. I think it is in our national security interest to do it.

Remember something: If you are for the President's strategic defense initiative, the last thing you want is an acceleration in the offensive arms race. The President himself has said that it is his policy that we should have deep reductions in those offensive weapons.

I would just say to my friends and colleagues, I think that continuing the policy of interim restraint is in our security interest. It makes sense. I want our negotiators to succeed. I hope very much that we get a strategic agreement of 50-percent reduction and we can work out a way to proceed and have arms control dealing with INF, offensive strategic weapons, and, at the same time, dealing with the very

important question of the ABM agreement.

But let us not tear up existing agreements until we get the new ones. The last four Presidents, two of which were Republican, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Ford, were at the forefront of arms control. Their work should be preserved, and that is what we are trying to do here by maintaining these limits in the SALT II agreement.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to my good friend from Illinois. I know that this is a dark day for him, but I want him to know that we believe that we are going to get an INF agreement and that we are going to make some progress in arms control.

Mr. HYDE. I would tell my friend that it has been a whole dark era since last November.

Mr. DICKS. I think this is the wrong time to discuss the Iran-Contragate affair, but if the gentleman insists, we can go ahead.

Mr. HYDE. I will be happy to talk about that too, if you will get me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply ask my friend: How do we get the Soviets to comply with the SALT II Treaty that they have already violated? Does the gentleman agree they have violated it?

Mr. DICKS. Let me take back my time; I think I have the thrust of what the gentleman is concerned about. He is concerned about violations.

We have a way of dealing with violations and that is the Standing Consultative Commission. An entity that has been underutilized, maybe it is the nicest way I can say it, by the Reagan administration over the last 6 years.

There is another thing we can do. As the chairman of the Armed Services Committee on the Senate pointed out a few weeks ago. We can take intelligent, proportional responses. The gentleman mentions encrytion of telemetry. We can encrypt as well the radio signals off of our missiles. We have got a second new type, that is called Midgetman. I frankly believe that we can deal with them on the question of the Krasnoyarsk radar.

Let us deal with the violations in a rational, intelligent way. Let us not tear up the agreement that we have worked so hard to achieve.

(By unanimous consent Mr. SCHEUER was allowed to speak out of order.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I have been appointed by the Speaker to be a member of the House delegation to the 77th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union which will be held in Managua, Nicaragua, from April 27 to May 2.

I have been asked by the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Mr. PEPPER, to represent him at the IPU's executive committee meetings on April 24 and April 25 and will be departing for Managua later this afternoon. For this reason, it is likely that I will miss some of today's legislative business.

While I regret this fact, I believe it is important that the U.S. Congress be represented at the IPU executive committee meetings.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to respond to my friend from Washington State because I found his comments very confusing. Let me walk through what I heard which I am sure is a little different than the gentleman intended to say.

The gentleman said, "First of all, in the late seventies, liberal Democrats weakened our defense so much that even if we wanted to go ahead and build up, the Russians would build up faster than we did."

Mr. DICKS. I do not believe I said that.

Mr. GINGRICH. If you want to take notes, I will be glad to try to find time, if the Chair will give it to us, to discuss it.

The gentleman did; he said, "When Reagan came into office, he found that the Soviet capacity to build new weapons was so much greater than our capacity that prudence involved not letting them get started with building new weapons faster than we could."

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman will yield, I would argue that we are in the same position today after 6 years of the Reagan buildup.

Mr. GINGRICH. The answer of the Democratic Party to that reality today is to offer a defense budget number in the budget lower than your own Armed Services Committee members wanted; lower than the Reagan administration. So we started the eighties weaker than the Russians. We have still not caught up, and your party's answer is to stay weaker.

□ 1440

Then the gentleman went on to say, if I might add, if I understood the gentleman——

Mr. DICKS. At least we had a budget. The gentleman's party did not even offer one this year.

Mr. GINGRICH. Then the gentleman went on to say, if I might add: "The Soviets have made it clear that they are going to follow the sublimits of SALT II."

Now in the first place, I am perennially amazed at the willingness of some of my friends in the Democratic Party to believe the Soviets, who systematically lie.

In the second place, there is no existing agreement. SALT II was never ratified and under our Constitution it is not a binding agreement.

The gentleman went on to say: "We believe we are going to get an agreement on missiles."

I would suggest two points, and then I will be glad to yield; one, if the gentleman honestly believes that we are in the middle of negotiations, why would we cripple our own country in the middle of negotiations? If the gentleman honestly believes we might get an agreement, why would we give away on the floor of the House what could be negotiated at Geneva?

Two. The gentleman went on to say, "Well, we can deal with the Krasnoyarsk's radar, or we can deal with encryption."

Why would you lock into the American legislative process binding law which could easily take 2 or 3 years to change?

Is it not precisely in the Founding Fathers and the Federalist Papers in the Constitution clear that precisely because foreign relations change rapidly you should not bind your own Nation and cripple your own Nation by locking into law?

Finally, let me just say to my friend, what the Russians have said is simply. They want the right to break the treaty wherever it helps them and they will agree to abide by the treaty wherever it helps them.

What the gentleman is now saying is fine, we will lock into law that America will abide by the treaty precisely where it helps the Russians, and by the way, we will not do anything in law, because you have nothing in this bill, you do not legislate any punishment for the Russians, you do not mandate encryption, you do not mandate how to respond to Krasnoyarsk's. Everything which would hurt the Russians is out of the bill. Everything which would hurt America is in the bill, and then you put it into law.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

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

I think it is interesting that the gentleman from Washington talked about the standing consultative committee and said that if we have problems we can work things out with them.

They have done nothing with regard to encryption. They have done nothing with regard to Krasnoyarsk's. In fact, the Soviet Union violates the SALT agreement hoping that they can through the standing consultative committee find out what type of technology we use to discover the violation so that they might defend against us, seeing through that window a second time and discovering future violations.

Let me quote from Jimmy Carter with regard to the possible violations of SALT. He said:

The Soviets know that if we ever detect any violation of the SALT agreement that that would be a basis upon which to reject the treaty in its entirety.

Instead of rejecting the treaty in its entirety, the liberal Members of this Congress want to lock in the President on a treaty with regard to which every single Member of Congress agrees the Soviets have violated. I have yet to meet a Member of Congress who says that Krasnoyarsk is not a violation of the SALT agreement.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington, if he would like.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, all I would like to say to the gentleman is that the SALT II agreement was the policy of the Reagan administration for 5½ years. I think it was the correct policy. I think we should stay with it. I think by exercising restraint at this point in time we keep the Soviets under those limits.

The three gentlemen standing are three of the greatest advocates for SDI there is. There is one easy way to overwhelm SDI. It is an offensive breakout by the Soviets, where they have more capability to do it. It is not in our defense interest to start and provoke a defensive arms race, so I think by exercising restraint on our part, we keep them exercising restraint on their part. It lays the groundwork for a better climate for achieving the deep cuts we would like.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. HEFNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, could we have some idea how long we are going to be on this particular section?

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would just say to my good friend from North Carolina that it is the gentleman's party which puts this section in the bill and that many people may wish to comment on a matter this profound that the gentleman's party has put in the bill. I could not say for others who might want to talk at a considerable length of time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from North Carolina will yield, I will not add to the burden of time, I just want to make one comment in response to my friend, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, the fact that the Soviets can produce more than we can, if that is so, that is really a tragedy and we ought to do something about it besides taking refuge in page 14 of this bill.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we ought to do a lot about it, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. HYDE. This gentleman has the time.

Mr. DICKS. The gentleman yields.

Mr. HYDE. Second, the argument for redundancy, what happens to that? I have heard for years, we can bomb them to the Stone Age. They can bomb us. We do not need any more bombs. All of a sudden we are taking some apprehension at the fact that they can outproduce us in more bombs. What happens to the argument of redundancy?

Third, if the ABM Treaty was such a wonderful document 5 years ago or 6 years ago and President Reagan said he was going to informally observe it, that is fine, but it has been shredded and turned into confetti by the Soviet Union. It seems to me that changes the equation. Our response to that has to be the ability to break out of this unratified massively violated already by its terms expired treaty when and where we want to, not when the Soviet Union wants to. That is my complaint with the gentleman's position.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me read one paragraph, and then I will yield. I cannot imagine any Member of this House, outside of the very Select Subcommittee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services, who has any notion whether or not the United States should have on page 15:

An aggregate of more than 1,320 launchers described in paragraph 2 and heavy bombers equipped for air launch cruise missiles capable of a range in excess of 600 kilometers.

My point is just that it is madness for the U.S. House of Representatives to get involved at this level of self-limitation of our potential of change, given the length of time legislation takes.

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

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, one thing I want to make certain the gentleman understands is that this is a mutual restriction. If the President certifies that the Soviets have gone beyond any of those sub-ceilings, all he has to do is send up a certification to the Congress and he is freed from these limits; so it is a question of mutual restraint. We will go the extra mile, as President Reagan said during his first 5½ years. We will exercise mutual restraint.

I think it is in our security interest to do it. The Soviets have greater capability to break out and to add both warheads and launchers. So why would we do it, especially when we have had I think the last four or five Chairmen of the Joint Chiefs all say that this agreement is in our security interest.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, because our response to their breaking the treaty by encrypting or by producing a new weapons' system, the SS-25, is not to go to the empty unproductive standing consultative commission, but it may be to add another B-52 with some cruise missile on it; but the gentleman will not let us do that. We have to start encrypting or building new weapons' systems. Give us the flexibility to respond to their buildup.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STOKES

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STOKES: On page 18, after line 18, add the following new section:

"UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 7. (a) Nothwithstanding section 9126 or section 9133 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1987 (as contained in section 101(c) of the Joint resolution entitled 'Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1987, and for other purposes,' Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591), only funds specifically authorized by the Congress in accordance with section 502 of the National Security Act of 1947 may be obligated or expended for intelligence or intelligence-related activities.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), all intelligence and intelligence-related activities for which funds were appropriated in the Defense Appropriations Act, 1987 shall be considered specifically authorized by Congress pursuant to section 502 of the National Security Act of 1947.

"(c) It is the sense of Congress that certain intelligence or intelligence-related activities referred to in subseciton (b) and identified by the Committee on Appropriations and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives should be the subject of reprogramming actions agreed upon by the appropriate Committees of Congress."

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, the defense portion of the continuing resolution for fiscal year 1987 contained two

general provisions—section 9126 and section 9133—which among their other effects waived the requirement of section 502 of the National Security Act of 1947. Section 502 requires that all funds spent for intelligence or intelligence-related activities must have been authorized and appropriated for the purposes for which they are expended. Apparently, the conferees felt such waivers were necessary because the continuing resolution appropriated funds for intelligence and intelligence-related activities in excess of authorized levels in some cases, and in the absence of an authorization in others.

When the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence became aware of section 9126 and section 9133, it immediately began a dialog with the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee in an effort to make several representations of great interest to the Intelligence Committee:

First, that section 502 is an essential element of congressional oversight of intelligence;

Second, that sections 9126 and 9133 had the effect, which were unintended by the conferees, of waiving the provisions of section 502 for all intelligence and intelligence-related activities during fiscal year 1987, whether or not they were authorized;

Third, that this result was of serious concern to the Intelligence Committee, and should be corrected; and

Fourth, that except for two activities, the committee had no quarrel with the unauthorized appropriations adopted by the conferees.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, has been very appreciative of the Intelligence Committee's concerns. He has agreed to restore the application of section 502. Together, we have agreed to the authorization of all fiscal year 1987 unauthorized appropriations except the two activities of great concern to the Intelligence Committee.

As to those two activities, the Defense Subcommittee and the Intelligence Committee have agreed that they should be restructured in one case of an aircraft reconnaissance system and reallocated in the case of a technical collection system. Both systems are listed in the classified schedule of authorizations for H.R. 2112, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988, under the title, "Unauthorized Appropriations for Reprogramming, Fiscal Year 1987." H.R. 2112, which was ordered reported today by the Intelligence Committee, contains a provision similar to the amendment I have offered.

Mr. Chairman, both these activities should be the subject of reprogrammings. The particulars of how the two committees agree these reprogrammings should be structured are reflected in the discussions they have had with appropriate intelligence officials.

□ 1450

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CHAPPELL] for any comments that he may have on the amendment.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the comments of the gentleman from Ohio. I want to express my appreciation and that of our subcommittee for his spirit of cooperation and his willingness to work with us in trying to work out a very difficult matter.

The chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and my colleague on the Committee on Appropriations has offered a proper amendment, I support the amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the minority members of the subcommittee are very much aware of the amendment, as the chairman has stated, and we have no objection at all to this amendment.

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the ranking minority member of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join in saying that we have no objection to this amendment, and we do support it.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CHAPPELL] in a colloquy concerning the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Florida knows, we have just learned the Army Ammunition Command has plans to take away the Mark 84 bomb production workload from the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant.

You've been there, Mr. Chairman, so you know that the Mark 84 workload on the plant's "B Line" is their bread-and-butter workload.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, it is reported that the Army is also considering taking away the 5-inch projectile work from the McAlester AAP.

Does the gentleman from Florida agree that the Army should not proceed with any plans to reduce or remove the Mark 84 or 5-inch projectile workloads at the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant?

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Oklahoma has raised a very legitimate concern about the proposed reductions in workloads at the McAlester AAP. I agree that the Army should suspend any such plans to alter workloads at the McAlester AAP until we have had time to review the matter.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it the intent of the gentleman from Florida that none of the funds in this bill, nor the regular Department of Defense Appropriations Act for fiscal 1987, should be utilized to reduce or remove the present workload at the McAlester AAP?

Mr. CHAPPELL. The gentleman from Oklahoma is correct. None of the funds in this bill, or any other act previously enacted into law, should be utilized to reduce the workload at the McAlester AAP.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think that it might be well to return to the discussion of a few minutes ago about the section of this bill that deals with the arms limitation language, because I think that some of the majority need to understand why some of us on this side of the aisle feel a little concerned about the way that we legislate around here, particularly in matters as weighty as this, and I do not think that either side of the aisle can doubt that when we put language into a bill that essentially establishes a brand-new foreign policy position for the United States, that that is in fact a very weighty subject.

Yet what we have brought to us today is a bill that not only takes that position, but then allows no amendments whatsoever to the product that has come out of the Democratic caucus.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, my question is, Why did the gentleman not move to strike it out then? He could have striken that entire section if it disturbed him so much. Why did he not move to strike it out?

Mr. WALKER. Because that is another factor of the way the majority legislates. In other words, we are given a chance only to either accept it all or reject it all, never to modify, never to have a chance as a body to work with this language and find out whether or not there may be acceptable ways to deal with it.

My guess is that the reason why they do not allow us to have any chance to deal with this language is because the last time they brought these kinds of bills to the floor, they

ended up kind of embarrassed, because there was language that was brought onto the floor and there was debate on the floor that ended up showing that they do not have a very viable position, so that this time when they come to the floor, what they now say is, "We won't even allow any amendments to the section." It seems to me that that is a major concern.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I will get my own time a little later, but I just wanted to say that the last time we brought this to the floor we were not embarrassed at all. These won by very strong majorities, and in fact we would have pursued them further, except we felt that it was important for the President to be able to go to Reykjavik, and in good faith and bipartisan good spirits we withdraw these. But they were not embarrassing to this side. In fact, it was with strong bipartisan support that they passed. We were offering the opportunity to strike the entire thing out if it were so desired, and these read exactly as they did after we amended the bill last year.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I realize that the Democratic caucus—and the gentlewoman is very, very generous—I mean, they really do feel strongly that the minority ought to be given real rights. I mean, we are given about the same rights here as Soviet Union rights, because what we are granted is the opportunity to vote up or down on one subject, much as they have a chance in their processes to vote up or down on one candidate from one party.

I would suggest if we were really going to be fair around here and we were really going to do this right, that we would simply allow the minority to have its chance to deal with this language. If this language is so great that it cannot even be subjected to any debate, then I suggest that maybe it has some merit to it not to allow amendments, but I suggest that there are some things in here that we might want to discuss a little bit, and maybe perhaps we ought to have some amendments too.

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

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

Mr. AUCOIN. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this inquiry of the gentleman: Did the gentleman, if he objected to the rule and the manner in which he was able, or if he says so, unable to deal with the arms control provisions of this bill, did he go to the Rules Committee and ask for any different rule with regard to these provisions that he finds objectionable? Did he ask for greater latitude in terms of amending this bill? I think the record is that the gentleman did not.

Mr. WALKER. I think that that is exactly right on this particular bill. I would also say to the gentleman, however, that I go to the Rules Committee often, and I find very often that the Rules Committee does not bother to take minority considerations in, and I do not think that there was any chance that the minority was going to be given the right to amend this section of the bill.

Mr. AUCOIN. But the point is that the gentleman did not go.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's being concerned about the procedure that he has mentioned. I thought that he might also be aware that this is a supplemental appropriations bill. It certainly is not a legislative vehicle.

□ 1500

It is not something upon which a major policy decision ought to be made.

Even more than that, I thought I would point out to the gentleman, if he really wants to increase his ire, that during the consideration of this particular section by the Appropriations Committee, there was a time limit of 10 minutes on each side. So this momentous decision was made by the Appropriations Committee with a time limit of 10 minutes on each side.

I think the gentleman's point is very well taken.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman.

I would simply say to my colleagues that if we are going to make a major policy decision in this House that says trust the Soviets and blame America first is our foreign policy, then I would suggest that it deserves some real debate and we are, in fact, making that decision in this bill. It is not getting real debate because the majority caucus in this body has decided that no debate should really take place on this language.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am just more than just slightly amazed, although I suppose I should not be, at the remarks from my friend from Pennsylvania at the way he describes the two arms control provisions that are in this bill, which passed this House with broad debate a year ago. They are identical to what they were a year ago and they did not just get 10 minutes debate in the Appropriations Committee this year. But when the gentleman describes that as trusting the Russians and blaming America first, I find that to be the biggest bunch of rubbish I have heard in a long time.

Who we are trusting in these provisions, if the gentleman will read this bill, is an elected official in this country that the gentleman supports, the President of the United States. Under the amendment of the gentleman from Washington which brings the United states into compliance with SALT II, if the President, your President, Mr. WALKER, certifies to the Congress that the Soviets have broken out of the subceilings that we impose on our own arsenal, then all bets are off. It is up to your President. You should trust him.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCOIN. You support him, you should trust him.

I will yield to the gentleman in a minute because he yielded to me and will be glad to yield, but first I would like the gentleman to look at page 17. Turn to page 17.

Mr. WALKER. I have it here.

Mr. AUCOIN. If the gentleman will look at page 17 and read page 17, he will see that under the testing provision, which is the other major arms control provision in this bill, once again the President is given the authority to certify whether or not the Soviet Union has broken out of the 1-kiloton test cap. If he says to the Congress, and I would assume the gentleman would trust his President, if he says that the Soviet Union has broken out, then all bets are off in terms of U.S. adherence to the 1-kiloton test as well.

So I would say to the gentleman he ought to trust his President.

I would further say to the gentleman that on the question of testing, if he really wants to stop the arms race, the testing limitation is the way to do it. If you want to stop, Mr. WALKER, if you want to stop the Soviet Union from developing, through additional nuclear testing, depressed trajectory submarine launched missile warheads, which would have the ability to absolutely annihilate our bomber leg of the triad, then of course the gentleman should have made a motion to strike the provision dealing with the cap on the testing.

We put that cap in, because we do not want the Soviets to develop that capability. We put that cap on testing in there because we do not want the Soviets to improve their accuracy, their reliability, the lethality of their arsenal against our American targets.

We do not want any cheating so we said, Mr. President, if you certify that

the Soviets, who have said that they would go along with a 1-kiloton moratorium if we had one, if you certify that they have broken out, then you are permitted to break out as well.

I do not know why the gentleman does not trust his President. It is not trusting the Soviets; it is not blaming America first.

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

Mr. AuCOIN. I yield to the gentleman. But I would like the gentleman to answer my question as to why he does not trust his own President.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I do trust my President.

The point is I do not trust the fact that you have handcuffed the President as to what he can certify. I have read you bill too and what you say is the President certifies to Congress that the Soviet Union, after the date of enactment of this act, so we are going to accept the fact that the SS-25's are already in place in violation of the SALT agreement, and we are going to accept the fact that the telemetry, the encrypted telemetry is in place so that the President cannot certify anything about those because you prevent him from doing it. So, therefore, you are handcuffing the President in what he can certify under the bill.

You are also limiting it to the subsections that you believe the Soviets have not yet violated. But you do not say anything about subsections of the bill that they may already be violating and so, therefore, may violate again in the future.

Mr. AuCOIN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman has not——

Mr. AuCOIN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would have to say the gentleman is talking about the SALT II provision in the bill. What the gentleman forgets is that if we break out of it, break out of the SALT II ceilings, as the gentleman from Washington stated, we permit the Soviets to do the same thing too on the subceilings, on MIRV'd missiles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AuCOIN] has expired.

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

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Chairman, the problem with that is if we break out we allow the Soviets to break out, and they have the ability, as the gentleman from Washington described, to reconfigure their missiles.

I would like the gentleman from Pennsylvania to pay attention for just one second. If he studies the Soviet arsenal he understands one thing about the most lethal weapon that the Soviet Union has in their own arsenal, and that is the SS-18's. That is their finest and most accurate missile. It is today equipped with 10 warheads and it can be easily retrofitted with 14 warheads. If we break out of the subceilings we permit the Soviets to do the same thing, and if they would go to 14 on each of their SS-18's, their finest missiles, we would suddenly have a missile gap opening of something like 1,300 warheads.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AuCOIN. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I find the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania most intriguing. He talks abut handcuffing the President, that the President cannot break out until the date of enactment. The fact is that prior to the date of enactment the President is unrestrained, and after the date of enactment if the Soviets violate the President is equally unrestrained. So that argument on its face is specious.

Second, there are those who view arms control as a continuing favor that the United States does for the Soviet Union. Absent from the discussion is any appreciation, understanding or admission of the fact that the Soviets have had to, under SALT II, reduce far more warheads than we have.

Their argument, as far as I can follow it, revolves around the question of the SS-25, and the telemetry encryption. Both of those questions are ambiguous, but let us assume for the moment that the Soviets have violated them. The proper place to deal with that question is in the Standing Consultative Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AuCOIN] has again expired.

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

Mr. AuCOIN. I continue to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. The Soviets, interestingly enough, have recently told Mr. Shultz that they would be happy to see in the Standing Consultative Commission the highest delegation that we could send to deal with the highest delegation they could send. And Mr. Shevardnadze, in a meeting he had with us, suggested that two great powers with all of the scientific capabilities at our hand should be able to resolve these technical questions, and I agree.

But on the other hand, are these technical questions that have been unresolved, which is their balance for taking away and ignoring all of the positive, all of the important changes that SALT II has provided us. This is not balanced. This is absurdity and the gentleman from Washington pointed out before that for 5½ years this administration was aware of the encryption of telemetry, was aware of the production of the SS-25, and followed the SALT limits because it was in U.S. interests to do so. We are not doing a favor for the Soviet Union when we reduce the number or warheads aimed at the United States.

□ 1510

We are doing a favor for the world and for our own country, striking a blow for sanity, for limiting what would ordinarily have been a period of unrestrained buildup on both sides.

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

Mr. AuCOIN. I yield to my colleague from the State of Washington.

Mr. DICK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would never think I would hear my colleagues on the other side say, trust the Soviet Union, trust the Russians. They will not add any more offensive capability.

Mr. Perle presented this to the House Armed Services Committee. How ironic it is, trust the Soviet Union, take off the offensive limits, let them buildup their forces as much as they want to overcome the President's SDI. I think it is outrageous that we would give up the one limitation that we have on the offensive arms race that is more important to our country than it is to the Soviet Union. It gives us safety and security. That is why I am offended by this.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have some agreement here. There is no amendment pending. Some of us will have to stay here until we finish this bill. I hope we can get our colleagues to cooperate. You are not resolving anything. It is a big issue, but there is no amendment pending and I ask your cooperation to let us get through with this bill. We can come back to this debate after we get through with the rest of the bill. I ask for cooperation at this time. Otherwise, we will have to move to limit debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will point out that the reading of sections 5 and 6 has been completed and a new section 7 has been added by amendment. There is no opportunity or possibility under the rule for any further action today in Committee of the Whole on either one of the sections that has been debated at some length now.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I am asking for cooperation.

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

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, the American people have always stood fast for a peaceful and prosperous world. We take a back seat to no one in that regard. I know that you, Mr. Chairman, and the vast majority of this House agree with me on this.

Mr. Chairman, for the past 6 years, our President has sought to negotiate strategic agreements that he believes might prevent war. There is now a feeling in the air that his strength and persistence in protecting the interests of the free world are about to lead to new understandings that will neither betray our democratic ideals or our willingness to defend them. While supporting his efforts, we in this House must not allow our earnest desire for a peaceful world to cloud our vision and lead us to statements or actions that, instead of helping our President in this endeavor, rob him of the very strength that makes such understandings possible.

We all know that an agreement with the Soviet Union that betrays the security of the free world will not stand up to the scrutiny of the American people. As exciting as this moment may seem to some of us, we have to remember that the American people will sooner or later review any strategic agreement brought home by the President. As we have seen in the past, they will not stand for any agreement that allows the Soviet Union to cheat or welsh on its solemn promises. It was for this very reason, Mr. Chairman, that the SALT II agreement never stood a chance of ratification in the Senate. As we see in this bill, however, there are those who would strive to rescue this failed SALT II agreement, those who would ignore the tremendous Soviet violations of the SALT II guidelines, those who would bind this President and this Nation to a process in which bad agreements are negotiated but not ratified, in which Soviet violations are seen but not punished.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have shown time and again that they will not agree to this, and I can't blame them.

Those who would preserve this failed process now want to expand it to yet another strategic area. This bill not only requires our President and the American people to forgive Soviet violations of SALT II, it lays the groundwork for a nuclear test ban that the Soviets are bound to scoff at.

The President knows better than all of us here, I suspect, the many ways the Soviets could cheat on a nuclear test ban. He knows about the seismic activity common to that area, that would confuse or verification, he knows about past Soviet refusals to provide necessary geological information, and I suspect he wonders about all of those so-called peaceful nuclear explosions throughout Soviet territory that over the years have fractured the local rock strata and created underground cavities in ways ideal for hiding nuclear tests in later years.

Mr. Chairman, this President has shown time and again that when the interests of the free world are at stake, he can take the heat. That's why, for over a year, he let the Soviet Union and, yes, some here in our own country, portray him as the bad guy for not agreeing to a sloppy test-ban moratorium. All that time, he kept insisting that the Soviets stop playing to the cameras and start talking turkey about mutual verification. Now the Soviets are doing just that, so why are we in the Congress determined to step in and show the Soviets that playing to the cameras pays off after all?

Mr. Chairman, don't be fooled by the language of these provisions. They send a very clear message to the Soviets—you are violating SALT II, but out of our concern for peace, we will look the other way. Out of that same concern, we will now undercut our President's good efforts in the area of nuclear testing, and when in the future you violate an inadequately supervised test-ban treaty, we will turn a blind eye to that also.

Mr. Chairman, let's support the President. Don't agree to these measures that would do so much harm to our efforts for really good strategic treaties.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take up with my colleagues on the Democrat side some of the contentions that they have been making regarding the President's capability to certify Soviet noncompliance and thereby disregard sections of this bill. Incidentally, in response to the chairman's concern that we should move on to other matters, I think it is extremely important, now that we are on the eve of a major arms control agreement with the Soviet Union, to at least discuss issues such as these provisions that in my estimation handcuff the President.

I will yield as soon as I make my first analysis of these particular provisions.

We all agree that the Soviets have encrypted telemetry. That means they have hidden their own technological capability from the United States in violation of the SALT agreements.

We also agree that Krasnoyarsk radar is a violation of the agreement.

Mr. Carter, when the agreement was signed, said, and I quote, "I would not sign nor present to the Congress or to the American people any treaty which in my opinion could not be adequately verified from the first day it is effective."

Now we have verified that there have been Soviet violations. When one side violates an agreement and it was understood when this agreement was put together that the other side has the right to withdraw from the agreement or to similarly infringe on the agreement, Congress shouldn't bar our President from exercising his options.

The point that the liberal Members of Congress have made with respect to this provision is they are directing that the President ignore the Krasnoyarsk radar, and they are also directing that the President ignore the encryption of telemetry. What they are saying is, "We want you to forget about these violations by the Soviet Union, as long as the Soviet Union says within their sublimits on launchers and vehicles, then we will stay within that part of the agreement."

So they have agreed that the SALT treaty has been ruptured. They think there is one portion that still has some viability, and what they are saying is even though the Soviets have deliberately broken the agreement in this area, we want to move to another area and try to preserve that area. I think that is handcuffing the President.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me support what the chairman of the committee is saying. In all fairness, there was an opportunity to remove these sections from the bill if you found them so unfair. No one went to the Rules Committee and asked for it, and no one took up the rule. We are now on another section and people want to move on.

But I think also the points that the gentleman keeps wanting to make are incorrect. He keeps misconstruing what we are trying to do. We are talking about a proportional response. We are talking in SALT about the sublimits, period. And the sublimits benefit us so much that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and President Reagan went along with the sublimits for a long time because if you break out, the Soviets can take more advantage of that than we can.

Mr. HUNTER. I appreciate the gentlewoman's statement.

Let me respond, take back my time, with regard to proportional response. Jimmy Carter said "the Soviets know that if we ever detect any violation of the SALT agreement, any violation, that would be a basis on which to reject the treaty in its entirety." I would suggest to the gentlewoman that President Reagan should have the same rights as President Carter obviously reserved to himself in making these comments.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. President Carter did not get reelected.

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

Mr. HUNTER. Let me yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I did want to note the impressive spectacle of the gentlewoman from Colorado marching so firmly behind the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I am sure he will count on that for future days.

But I would like to say at this point that I think some of what we are getting here is a little displaced anger. A lot of my friends in the conservative wing of the Republican party are really unhappy at George Shultz and not that crazy about Ronald Reagan these days because he is the one talking about an arms control agreement with the Russians. Some of our friends, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY] pointed out have this misconception of trying to reduce the enormous amount of money the world spends on arms and trying to make it a little less likely that we will have some of them go off is a favor that we do the Soviets. Many of us think it is mutual. But I would point out that the major ones—you know, you are arguing both sides. On the one hand you are telling us "don't interfere with Ronald Reagan, he is on the eve of an agreement." If he is on the eve of an agreement, he must live in the Land of the Midnight Sun because this man has been on the eve of that agreement since sometime in 1982. But on the one hand you are mad at your side because you may have an agreement, and then you are mad at us because we are stopping you from having one. Pick an argument and make it.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me reclaim my time.

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. Let me say there is misplaced anger, and I have never seen so much anger on the side of the Democrats than when this President is apparently ready to make an arms control agreement. I see gentlemen standing up and saying "We have to act now, we have to save the world for arms control." Ronald Reagan is going to achieve arms control because he has moved from a position of strength, not a position of weakness. Now, when we went for the zero option and originally offered that, there were cries from the left side of the Democrat Party that this was ridiculous, it could not possibly work, and it was a sham offered by Mr. Perle—just for the purpose of throwing the ball back in the Russian court.

It apparently is going to work. The Soviets are going to agree to the concessions that were demanded by President Reagan from a position of strength. And the Democrat side should celebrate that particular event today instead of trying to tie his hands when he is going to be successful, for themselves and for America.

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

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, yes, I am glad we are getting movement.

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

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman for continuing to yield.

I appreciate his conciliatory spirit in this and in furthering the discussion.

Yes, I am glad we are moving toward an agreement although many of the arguments we have heard against an agreement have come from the other side. We have the Novak-led wing of the Republican Party that yells at George Shultz because they are really unhappy with the President. The point I would make, and I would make two points: first of all, we are moving toward a limited agreement. I would like to see broader agreement. And I would hope that Ronald Reagan would reach a broad agreement but I think we are as likely to see this President get as broad an agreement as——

Mr. HUNTER. Let me just comment to the gentleman that this will be the first time that we have actually achieved reductions of existing inventory in an agreement.

Mr. FRANK. If the gentleman will yield back to me, I am for that. I do not regard it as a favor to the Russians. I will say this, the suggestion that these amendments will somehow mess up that process are absolutely antihistorical because I think it is very clear in the record that the leadership taken by the House of Representatives majority over the objections on much of the other side in pushing for some of these arms control measures, they have been part of the landscape. Both the Soviet Union and the United States——

Mr. HUNTER. May I take back my time?

Mr. FRANK. The gentleman does not want to hear this last point, and I can understand why, because it is damaging to him, it is part of the landscape.

Mr. HUNTER. I will allow the gentleman to make his last point.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to my friends on the left I am fascinated by your argument. On the one hand you are glad Reagan is negotiating, and on the other hand you distrust him so much you want to cripple him with legislation. On the one hand the legislation is so vital we have to put it in the supplemental bill; on the other hand, it does not really do anything. I mean, be honest, you are crippling the United States of America by putting in law, putting in law binding the country legally to do things in foreign policy which none of the Founding Fathers would have accepted. It is fundamentally wrong for the U.S. House of Representatives to cripple its own country while going into negotiations.

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

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I thank the gentleman for confirming that his view of the legislative process is that it is crippling and we are trying in a binding way to set forward in both Houses which will have to enact this that we should set forth a policy.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNTER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman from Georgia equates legislating national security with crippling the President, a bizarre notion——

Mr. HUNTER. Let me take back my time for 1 second.

Mr. FRANK. The gentleman is an Indian giver. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for saying that—it is an unfortunate ethnic characterization.

Mr. HUNTER. It is crippling for this reason: It is a statement by the Congress, I would say to my friend from Massachusetts, this language is a statement by the Congress to the Soviet Union that we do not care about two major violations in the SALT agreement that we made, one was Krasnoyarsk and the other was encryption of telemetry.

□ 1520

Mr. FRANK. The President said he does not want to test. The gentleman says the President is going to get these broad-scale agreements. He is going to get some narrow agreement. I do not think we would be at the point where we might be getting agreement if the President had not felt the pressure of the enactment of this House.

The gentleman from Georgia thinks it is crippling. I think it has been enabling. I think it has been the pressure that they knew what was coming that has emboldened the President to defy those of his own party who are unhappy that he is finally moving toward the limited amount of arms reduction.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

I would simply conclude by saying that this is a very dangerous provision and I would ask the Committee on Appropriations to very seriously consider ever putting this type of language in a supplemental bill again.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in apology, as well, to the chairman of the full committee [Mr. WHITTEN], but feeling that it is important for us to continue, if only for a little while longer, the discussion just so that we do not miss this opportunity of having an explanation presented as to why these amendments are included.

We thought that if the minority had made an objection to it, that would have afforded an opportunity for the American public to have heard the explanation, but in the absence of that, rather than now have it be mischaracterized, as obviously it will be to the public in forums other than the debating on the floor of the Congress, I think it is important for us to continue because there is no more important issue with which we will be dealing this year than the issue of nuclear testing.

I rise on that issue just to make this point. The point is that the President is making it very, very clear that he does not want to see any limits on nuclear testing at all, under any circumstances. Zero.

He will talk about a few hundred intermediate nuclear weapons in Europe; he will be more than willing to discuss that, and for the Soviet purposes, it is mutually advantageous to arrive at that kind of an agreement, but there are 50,000 nuclear weapons that exist between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The United States and the Soviet Union, on separate tracks right now, are developing new deadly first-strike weapons that will put this world in an even more deadly position than it is right now. For all of the good will which we ought to extend to Mr. Gorbachev and Reagan on their negotiations on the intermediate weapons in Europe, let us not forget that that is only 2 percent of the weapons in the world, and it deals with existing technologies, and it does not talk about all the strategic weapons, the submarine-based weapons, the strategic weapons based in our country on the Soviet Union, the bombers. It does not deal with the new hydrogen bomb-pumped x-ray laser weapon which is being developed under our Nevada test site. It does not deal with the new hard-kill warheads which we are trying to develop so we can dig out bunkers in the Soviet Union to hit their command and control stations.

It does not deal with the kind of counterpart weapons which the Soviet Union is developing at the same time. It deals with 2 percent of the weapons.

We give credit to the President for making those kinds of gestures toward the Soviets that might make an agreement in that area possible, but let us not forget at the same time that there is an even more deadly and dangerous threat which is offered to this world, which is that if SDI is ever developed, exploding hundreds of hydrogen bombs above our own atmosphere as a shield to protect us from incoming Soviet rockets—if you can imagine that as a defense, that we explode hydrogen bombs above ourselves, then the world will be a much more dangerous place.

The U.S. Government has argued that we cannot verify a testing ban because the Soviets are not trustworthy. And then what do we hear from the Soviet Union, we will allow for onsite emplacement of United States equipment in our country if you will allow the same kind of equipment in your country.

The answer from our Government is that they might test behind the Sun; they might test during earthquakes; they might test in any number of other equally preposterous fashions, and in that way, somehow or other, it is impossible for us to negotiate a treaty.

For us in Congress, we have had enough. We want an end to the arms race. And while on one track, it is proper for us consistently to praise the President, on the other hand, it is also possible for us to make note of the fact that 98 percent of the rest of the arms race has gone on unabated. If the game which is going to be played is that we are going to receive some kind of cupie-doll consolation prize of an INF treaty and the price that we have to pay for it is that we have to accept a never-ending, ever-escalating arms race because, under no circumatances can we consider a nuclear test limitation between our two countries, then it will have been too high a price to pay.

What we want to make very clear at this point is that we do, in fact, want to praise the President, and we do not want to handcuff him in Geneva or any other place where he is willing to meet with Mr. Gorbachev to sign an INF deal, but at the same time, we want to let him know that we encourage him and we urge him to, in fact, go further because his time is now and his moment in history is now.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], who is very, very bright and very, very able, but I think he was being a little too cute.

I think the U.S. Congress should establish general policy. I think the U.S. Congress should decide all sorts of things. There is enormous power vested in the Congress.

My specific objection on Central America and on arms control is when the U.S. House starts to get involved in the execution of foreign policy for perverse reasons, if I might explain.

The legislative branch is by definition a slow and cumbersome and confusing body. It takes a long time. The real world can change with terrifying speed.

To wrap into law, not at the suggestion of the President, not at the joint negotiations with the Soviets, but at the unilateral ideological position of the left wing of the Democratic caucus, to wrap into law language which you imposed on the committee, language which you believe in but which has not been ratified by the Senate and which experts specifically say relates to a treaty the Soviets have violated ties you up in this way: I just think it is incredibly dangerous in the modern age for the U.S. House to write foreign policy into law.

I suggest to my good friend, if you read the Federalist papers, if you read the debate in the 1790's among the Founding Fathers, they were very, very vehement that the No. 1 lesson of the Articles of Confederation was not to allow the legislative branch to directly involve itself in foreign policy, and for the life of me, hearing our good friend from Massachusetts act as a liberal Secretary of State is fine if this guy wins the Presidency, but it is wrong otherwise.

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I gather that I must have misunderstood. I assumed that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] was one of those who had fought the Panama Canal Treaty. I must have been wrong.

He must have been one of those who thought that even if they disagreed with President Carter's position, the House had no right to try to take a position on that specific.

I disagreed with those who might have said that.

The motion that the elected officials of both Houses may not, through the appropriations powers, say, "No, stop funding that shooting. No, do not engage in that major nuclear outbreak," I think limits democracy.

I think the arguments ought to be substantive. Frankly, what we get into today all too often is fake proceduralism.

□ 1530

People come and they talk about the rule. There may be five Members in here who are genuinely opposed to closing rules and who are genuinely in favor always of everything being amendable. I can think of two of them, and I will leave room for three others. The rest of us tend to be for closing a rule when it is better for us substantively and opening it when it is not.

I think that is entirely legitimate as long as we do not try to claim that we are being principled on a procedural matter when we are being driven by substance.

Similarly on foreign policy, there were Members on the conservative side who got very specific on the Panama Canal Treaty. They had that right. I disagreed with them substantively but not procedurally.

If a majority of both Houses believe in good faith that a President is wrong on foreign policy, he may be right or he may be wrong, but if we believe this President is wrong in his refusal to do a nuclear test ban, we have no option, and I think it is a mistake to try to proceduralize this. I think when you have good-faith differences as to whether or not we should be financing a war in Nicaragua or whether or not we should have a nuclear test, democracy says that we will go through the normal legislative process and we will win or lose, but attempts to proceduralize substantive issues, I think, short-change the debate over substance that the public ought to have.

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, this is a question of the two greatest powers on the planet, this is a question of nuclear weapons and strategic weapons, and what I am suggesting is that the world changes much faster than the capacity of the U.S. Congress to legislate, and that we are beginning the process of crippling the United States by adopting a series of rules into law which it would take a long time to change. That is what I think is so fundamentally substantively wrong in the way we are approaching it. This is a major issue.

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, all I can say is, in the wake of the Tower Commission's report on the shambles this administration inflicted on national security policy regarding Iran and also in Nicaragua because it refused to abide by some sensible things Congress had put forward, I cannot accept the argument that we are always better off if Congress stays out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] has epxired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KYL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for getting the additional time.

I rise mostly in defense of the Founding Fathers. I do not see the gentleman from Georgia here who has engaged in some of the more pop analysis of what they are doing when they gave the Congress of the United States the power to control spending for the military.

The gentleman is no doubt aware, is he not, that the Founding Fathers had as their examples the 17th and 18th century despots who used their power, monarchs mostly, to engage their countries in war?

The Founding Fathers were so concerened about granting authority to an executive that they decided to divide that power. They decided to divide the power, because they did not trust the executive, because the whole history of monarchs had been replete with wars that people did not want, so they vested in the hands of the legislature the appropriate authority to withhold from the executive the ability to make war with money.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, in March 1962 President John F. Kennedy said:

> Some may urge us to try it (a nuclear test moratorium) again, keeping our preparations in a state of readiness * * *. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution.

Although 25 years have passed since Kennedy uttered this statement, it is clear that a nuclear test ban is still very much impossible of execution. Thus, as we consider the 1987 supplemental appropriations bill, and, in particular, the provision to limit nuclear tests to 1 kiloton, let us first consider the consequences if Congress approves this legislation.

Unquestionably the credible nuclear deterrent that the United States possesses would be severely undermined if this test ban language is approved. The entire premise of our current defense is based on potential adversaries being convinced that we can deliver a devastating response to any nuclear attack therefore, for our nuclear force to remain a credible deterrent, it must be reliable, effective, and survivable.

The only way to date to insure reliability, effectiveness and survivability is through adequate testing. A nuclear explosion is extremely complicated physical process which is still not fully understood by atomic scientists. The use of supercomputers alone to predict the outcome of a nuclear test is not acceptable, as these computer forecasts often differ from the actual results of the test. In addition, the data from weapons tested at a partial yield—such as the 1 kiloton limit—could be equally misleading. According to officials at Los Alamos National Laboratories, "it is technically more difficult to certify weapons tested at only a partial yield." Thus, with testing restricted to 1 kiloton, we are faced with an imprecise prediction of our nuclear weapons capability at best, or a total failure at worst. Our existing nuclear capability is based on 1950's and 1960's technology. For a credible deterrence, it is crucial that we continue to modernize these weapons systems. Such modernization is dependent on sufficient testing. Likewise, we must have confidence in the effectiveness of older weapons. In several documented incidents, DOD or DOE discovered reliability problems resulting from the lengthy storage period of older, established missiles, such as Polaris, Poseidon, and Minuteman I. These problems would not have been uncovered without adequate tests of the nuclear weapon itself.

The survivability of the entire spectrum of our nuclear deterrent against enemy attack would also be suspect without adequate testing. Key communication elements and satellites used for both military and civilian purposes would be subject to the effects of a nuclear blast. Shock waves, enhanced radiation or electromagnetic pulse from an attack could render these vital systems useless. However, through adequate nuclear testing, integral components of our defense can be designed to work, in the hostile environment of a nuclear explosion.

The possession of a credible nuclear force is the prime instrument of modern deterrence. As such, we must not impair our capability to defend ourselves by relying on untested, thus, unreliable nuclear weapons systems.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the provision in this bill requiring continued U.S. adherence to the SALT II treaty.

The fundamental reason for maintaining SALT II compliance is simple: it serves American interests. It has served our interest for nearly 15 years and it can continue to do so. SALT II stems the growth of the Soviet arsenal, it adds greater predictability and stability to the United States-Soviet strategic competition, and it provides a foundation for achieving more comprehensive reductions in Soviet strategic offensive arms. We should not be abandoning those accomplishments so carelessly.

The administration mistakenly argues that alleged Soviet violation of some parts of the

treaty have rendered SALT II useless. The argument ignores the fact that the Soviets have dismantled over 1,000 nuclear weapons to remain within SALT II—far more than the United States has been required to dismantle. It ignores the fact that the treaty contains vital provisions which allow us to determine the extent of and any changes in the Soviet arsenal. It ignores the fact that the Soviets have adhered to the core limits on the number of weapons allowed. And finally, it ignores common sense which tells us that some limits on the expansion of Soviet arms are better than none.

This bill requires the United States to remain within the central numerical sublimits of SALT II only so long as the Soviets also adhere to those limits. The administration agrees that these sublimits have not been violated. Without question these ceilings have capped the growth of the Soviet arsenal; without them the Soviets will be free to deploy more and more offensive arms. If we can sustain the SALT II treaty, we can keep the cap on.

Mr. Chairman, the administration's actions regarding SALT II belie its rhetoric. If Soviet violations were truly the reason for abrogating the treaty, the administration would have done two things. First, they would have taken the Soviets to task in the Standing Consultative Commission—a private bilateral forum created for the resolution of treaty disputes. Instead, at last fall's special SCC meeting on SALT, the administration used the opportunity to notify the Soviets that the United States would no longer discuss violation issues related to SALT II.

Second, the administration would have conditioned the decision to abrogate the treaty on the Soviets refusal to rectify their alleged treaty violations. Instead, the administration started the debate by labeling two of the three noncompliance problems irreversable—thus guaranteeing that the disputes could not be resolved. Violations clearly won't be resolved if the treaty is abandoned.

No one in this Chamber believes negotiating treaty disputes with the Soviet Union is easy. But neither should any one believe that a United States decision to abandon SALT II will move the Soviets to stricter adherence. On the contrary, what we may be left with are the shreds of a treaty which once controlled the growth of nuclear arms.

Mr. Chairman, abandoning SALT II is not in our national security interests, and it is not in our fiscal interests either. The Soviets currently have eight new weapons systems in various stages of development. I, for one, am not convinced that absent any restraints they will not deploy some or all of these new systems—systems U.S. military planners and U.S. legislators will feel compelled to respond to.

The Congressional Budget Office and the CIA estimate that with only a modest effort the Soviets could deploy 21,000 nuclear warheads by the mid 1990's. We could counter this build up with 850 more MX missiles, 36 more Trident submarines with missiles, or hundreds more cruise missile carrying bombers. I do not need to remined my colleagues of the cost of these weapons—it is truly staggering. In addition, advocates of SDI must recognize that any increase in Soviet offensive forces makes deploying an effective defense that much more difficult, and that much more expensive.

Yet even if the Soviets deployed more nuclear weapons and we responded with more nuclear weapons, this country would not be any more secure. We must therefore ask whether we should resume an unconstrained arms race again or not.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the President's efforts to secure a new arms agreement with the Soviets—on intermediate nuclear forces and on strategic weapons. But I fail to see the logic in abandoning existing limits on ofensive nuclear arms before an alternative is in hand.

I urge my colleagues to support continued United States compliance with the SALT II numerical limits so long as the Soviets adhere to the same restrictions.

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to express my strong support for the arms control provisions contained in the supplemental appropriations bill.

The bill contains two of the arms control provisions contained in the defense authorization bill passed by the House last summer. The bill prohibits the use of the fiscal year 1987 funds for conducting nuclear tests with a yield greater than 1 kiloton, if the Soviets also stop testing and agree to enforced verification within the Soviet Union.

Also, the bill bars the use of funds for deployment or maintenance of any weapon that violates the numerical sublimits set by the SALT II treaty, unless the President certifies that the Soviet Union has exceeded these sublimits.

Mr. Chairman, last year, House conferees decided to drop the arms control provisions contained in the fiscal year 1987 Defense authorization bill to allow the President room to negotiate with the Soviets during the Iceland summit. Regrettably, very little was accomplished during the summit to assure us that the administration was serious about reaching an arms control agreement. We cannot continue to wait for the administration to fulfill their promise to pursue a meaningful arms limitation agreement with the Soviets—we need to made a decision today to end the arms race and begin to work together to establish and adhere to a policy of arms limitations and reductions.

Congress has long been interested in working to establish a more secure and trusting relationship with the Soviets. Our Nation has negotiated some meaningful and reasonable arms control agreements. We now need to take the next steps to expand these agreements and to seek compliance with them, rather than finding ways to avoid them.

A mutual test moratorium on nuclear weapons represents a good faith step in the right direction. The Soviets have resumed their testing after a 18-month moratorium, but they have indicated a willingness to halt testing if the United States will join them in a mutual moratorium.

We have no guarantees that this will always be the case. We need to use these opportunities when they are available to us. Most experts agree that the United States leads the world in nuclear weapons technology. What do we have to lose if we agree to freeze the Soviet's weapon technology with their blessings?

The SALT II treaty includes numerical sublimits which apply to certain categories of launchers and warheads. Until recently we have observed these limits and removed systems that exceeded the limits.

Last November, the administration exceeded the numerical sublimit set by SALT II by deploying an additional B-52 bomber equipped with cruise missiles. That action accomplishes absolutely nothing for U.S. national security, but it severely undermines efforts to achieve meaningful arms control. We don't need the extra weapons, and we are farther than ever away from a relationship of mutual trust and understanding with the Soviet Union.

The administration tells us that the Soviets have violated seven arms control treaties and that this is the reason for the recent violations of SALT II by the United States. Regardless of whether this is the case or not, the United States has not acted responsibly by engaging in treaty violations. We have an obligation to strengthen our existing arms control agreements, not weaken them. How an we hold the Soviets accountable to their treaty commitments, when we willfully violate our own?

Experts agree that the Soviet Union is far better positioned to rapidly expand its nuclear force than the United States if the SALT II limitations are scrapped. Violations of this type set the stage for the Soviets to develop newer and more sophisticated weapons, a situation that clearly is not in the best interest of the United States.

The recent Soviet proposal to limit intermediate-range nuclear weapons together with their willingness to uphold both the nuclear test moratorium and the SALT II treaty limitations is an offer that we should not take lightly. If we sincerely want to put an end to the arms race, and work toward a reduction of nuclear weapons in both countries, we need to take this opportunity—there are no assurances that we will have this chance in the future.

Mr. Chairman, the administration continues to undermine the arms control treaties that we have worked hard to establish. Recent requests by the administration for money to fund SDI has raised new concerns over ABM Treaty violations. Fortunately, Congress has the ability to influence the direction that the arms control issue will take at this point. The administration can make a political decision, but they need funds to back it up.

I hope that my colleagues sense the urgency of this important decision that we are about to make. I encourage them to support the arms control measures called for in this bill.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I support both the major arms control provisions of this legislation, and oppose efforts to delete them.

The legislation provides for a moratorium on testing of nuclear weapons over 1 kiloton, so long as the Soviets do not engage in such tests. I have long supported a comprehensive test ban, and believe it would lead to an atmosphere in which balanced arms reduction negotiations would have an enhanced chance of success. I believe that a mutual moratorium, though less desirable than a negotiated

ban, would offer many of the same advantages.

I support the test ban provision as an overture for a comprehensive moratorium, but I am not confident we will achieve that result. Recently, the Soviets have resumed testing, and have offered an exchange in which they would conduct a test at our Nevada site, and the United States would conduct a test at the Soviet test grounds. That proposal, and associated arms discussions, merit close attention, and should be pursued. A full test moratorium, however, would be preferable to these restrictions.

I also support the provision mandating resumed adherence to the numerical sublimits of the unratified SALT II Treaty. I share the serious concerns of many of my colleagues about apparent Soviet violations of several nonnumerical treaty provisions. However, I still believe that continuing to adhere to the sublimits which we have until recently observed will keep us in an acceptable strategic balance with the Soviet Union, and will prevent a new round of weapons procurement that will be expensive, unnecessary, and perhaps dangerous.

The SALT II provision is especially timely today. Late last year, the United States added a strategic bomber that exceeded the sublimit on that delivery capability. The Soviets are reported to intend to exceed a sublimit by launching a missile-bearing submarine this spring or summer. I am concerned that if we do not act to maintain existing observed limits, we will face a breakout of weapons-building.

The administration frequently claims that congressional interference in arms control matters harms ongoing discussions. I do not believe that these provisions should have that effect. I fully support U.S. efforts to negotiate new agreements, and cast today's votes in a spirit of support for any potential progress. I also believe, however, that failure to capitalize on any possible mutual suspension in testing, or a decision to discard force levels that are in balance and have been observed, would be a significant move in the wrong direction. For that reason, I support these measures.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose any effort to strike the test pause provision from this bill.

We in the House approved a similar testing measure last year by a wide margin, but we gave it up in order to free the President's hands in Reykjavik. Freed from any congressional constraints, however, the White House didn't budge on nuclear testing limits. They only reiterated their opposition to a comprehensive test ban treaty. And as a result, the Soviets ended their 19-month unilateral testing moratorium, and no limits on a major component of the arms race were achieved.

The Soviets contend that they will stop testing again if the United States will join in a moratorium. The testing provision in this bill challenges that promise. This provision bans United States nuclear tests above 1 kiloton only so long as the Soviets refrain from such testing and agree to in-country monitoring. It is mutual and verifiable.

If the United States and Soviet Union agree to stop testing now, we can retain our advantage in spohisticated and efficient warheads.

If the United States and Soviet Union agree to stop testing now, we can retain the safety and reliability of our nuclear stockpile. Approximately 95 percent of our current reliability tests are already conducted without detonating a nuclear device.

If the United States and Soviet Union stop testing now, we could keep technology from outpacing arms control and prevent both superpowers from developing even more damaging yet superfluous nuclear weapons.

Mr. Chairman, the American people overwhelmingly support a ban on nuclear testing. So do many weapons experts and former defense officials. Given this administration's determination to continue building nuclear weapons—even at the expense of valuable and security enhancing arms control agreements—it is time for Congress to act.

I urge my colleagues to retain the provision to ban United States nuclear tests above 1 kiloton so long as the Soviets agree to the same restrictions.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the provision included in the fiscal year 1987 supplemental appropriations bill to bring the U.S. strategic nuclear forces back into compliance with the SALT II agreement.

I commend the efforts of my good friend and colleague and the author of the SALT II amendment, Mr. DICKS, who has been tireless in his efforts to encourage the administration to comply with the nuclear force sublimits included in the SALT II agreement.

For 6 years, the administration complied with the SALT II limitations. For 6 years, the administration recognized that compliance was in the best interest of our own national security. And, since 1979, the Soviets complied with the treaty limitations as well, and they complied at some costs to their own nuclear arsenals.

As has been pointed out here earlier today, in the past, the force limitations in the SALT treaties forced the Soviet Union to withdraw, destroy or dismantle almost 1,400 nuclear systems—systems that could otherwise still be targeted on the United States. And, in the future, adherence to the SALT II limitations would force the Soviet Union to dismantle an additional 500 to 600 delivery vehicles.

Despite the Soviet's record of compliance and despite the inherent stability generated by observance of the treaty, in December of last year, the administration unilaterally moved to exceed the SALT II limitations with the deployment of a 131st B-52 bomber equipped with air launched cruise missiles. This action was taken even though the Congress had spoken out on the issue and despite the fact that Congress agreed not to include the limitation in the continuing resolution only as a gesture of unification before the president went to Reykjavik. We stated very clearly in the report that it was our intention that the administration observe the SALT II limitations.

Soviet SALT II Treaty violations warrant a response, but abandoning SALT is not the right one. Without the restrictions of SALT II, the Soviets could respond with an unbridled escalation in the number of offensive strategic weapon systems. If challenged, the Soviets could far outpace our own weapons production and deployment capabilities. The Soviet's have four operating ICBM production lines compared to our single production line. Without SALT, the Pentagon has estimated that the Soviets could more than double their present warheads by the mid-1990's—to 20,000. The CIA puts that figure even higher at 21,000.

As President Reagan has acknowledged, "the Soviet Union has the capability to increase weaponry much faster than the treaty permits, and we don't."

Clearly, it's in our own national security interests to adhere to these numerical sublimits.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, while I oppose many provisions incorporated in this supplemental, there are features of this bill that I do support. Provision is made for startup loans for the United Water Conservation District's Freeman Diversion project in Ventura County, CA.

I would also like to express my support for the full funding for VA compensation and pension benefits programs. The many fine contributions veterans of the U.S. armed services have made to the continuation of our free and open society must be recognized and properly rewarded. Included in this bill is $30 million for the Veterans Job Training Act. This job training program helps defray the costs of training veterans and provides incentives to employers to hire and utilize certain veterans. I know that this has been a very successful program in central and southern California and this additional support will ensure the continuation of its beneficial contributions.

I also support the inclusion of the United States gift to the Australian bicentennial "in recognition of the many years of friendship and cooperation" between the two countries. Knowing of Australia's contributions to many American projects and world's fairs, this is a modest but very well-meaning "thank you."

NUCLEAR TESTING MORATORIUM PROVISIONS IN SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the nuclear testing moratorium provisions in the supplemental appropriations bill because this attempt to legislate arms control is based on faulty assumptions and does not serve the best interest of our Nation.

Legislating a moratorium on nuclear testing through restricting funds is a no-lose proposition for Moscow. Such action would condone Soviet violations of existing testing agreements, constrain United States modernization efforts, hurt other arms control initiatives, and dangerously damages the United States strategic deterrent and strategic stability. The Soviet Union, meanwhile, continues with its nuclear testing program.

The underlying need for nuclear testing is credibility. We need to make sure that our weapons work the way they are supposed to. Because deterrence is based on the premise that the United States will respond in kind if attacked, the potential foe must have no doubts that our nuclear forces are credible—that they will work as advertised. In addition, these weapons must be reliable, modern, survivable, and secure. Uncertainty in any of these four aspects leads to instability.

The experts have confirmed that no significant tests can occur at one kiloton or through supercomputer simulations. According to the

Los Alamos National Laboratories, a global leader in nuclear weapons design, it is "* * * unquestionably technically more difficult to certify weapons tested only at partial yield * * *." It is impossible to certify them at 1 kiloton. The Director of Los Alamos has said that it is possible in cases of testing at reduced yields to make mistakes that are catastrophic, involving total failure rather than imprecise prediction of the higher yield. We must avoid such situations.

There are four primary reasons why the United States needs to test:

Reliability and maintenance: The confidence in the reliability of nuclear weapons decreases the longer they are stored. There are several instances when we discovered reliability problems and had to rely upon tests to find the solution. An example of this was the problem with the Polaris ballistic missiles that armed U.S. submarines in the 1950's and 1960's. Without the use of testing to discover the problem and then resolve it, we would have been relying on "duds" for deterrence! So long as we do not have a strategic defense and must rely on mutual nuclear annihilation for deterrence, we must continue testing to ensure the credibility of that deterrence.

Modernization: Several of our current programs, necessary to maintain the nuclear balance, would be affected by a testing ban or 1 kiloton limit. The Trident II warhead testing could not be completed and progress on the small ICBM would be highly problematical since MX warhead design modifications could not be validated. As the Soviets continue to disregard arms control agreements and illegally field new weapons like the SS-24 and SS-25, we need to meet these new threats. Further limiting of nuclear tests would jeopardize our ability to meet America's new security needs. This moratorium would preclude the development of advanced concepts, thus eliminating the capability to avoid technological surprise and options for responding to an evolving Soviet military threat. Soviet nonnuclear developments, which would not be constrained even if they were to comply fully with a test ban, can affect our deterrent capability.

Survivability: Because of the hostile environment in which nuclear weapons are expected to operate, tests must be conducted to ensure that they can survive such things as enhanced radiation, electromagnetic pulse [EMP] and shock waves.

Safety and security: We must ensure that our nuclear weapons are safe to handle and secure from either premature detonation or theft. Only one-third of our stockpiled weapons have the most modern safety and security features. Incorporating such features, which are integral to the warhead, requires new warhead designs and actual testing to ensure that weapon yield and reliability are not degraded. Congress rightly insists on the most stringent testing requirements for safety and effectiveness of our nonnuclear systems. It does not make any sense to have lesser standards for the nuclear systems upon which the United States and our allies must rely for the forseeable future.

The nuclear testing issue cannot be viewed independently, as if it were in a vacuum. The Soviets have tried to present it this way by ignoring its relationship to other arms control issues. Nuclear test bans are directly tied to arms control measures, they are not arms control. Not one nuclear, chemical, or conventional weapon would be eliminated or reduced by a test ban! In reality, a test ban is a form of unilateral disarmament, or nuclear freeze. Until we are able to further limit or reduce our nuclear arsenals in an equitable and verifiable fashion, nuclear testing bans are detrimental to our national security.

Our negotiators in Geneva are opposed to these attempts to legislate arms control. The Soviets have blatantly violated many arms control agreements including the Limited Test Ban Treaty. By unilaterally adopting a testing moratorium, we are rewarding them for cheating and are sending the signal that it is OK for the Soviets not to adhere to the agreements they have signed. Such a posture puts our negotiators in a very difficult position and could seriously jeopardize our ability to reach any equitable arms control agreements in the future. As you know, the United States and the Soviet Union are getting much closer to an arms control agreement. Why ruin these recent, positive initiatives?

The key to success with the limited testing bans and a future comprehensive ban is progess in other arms control issues and an improvement in verification guarantees. The United States has always taken the lead in proposing verification measures. Most recently, President Reagan invited the Soviets to monitor a United States test and evaluate the use of the new CORRTEX hydrodynamic measurement system. The President also indicated that if the Soviets were willing to join us in an agreement for effective verification including the use of CORRTEX, we would be prepared to move forward on further testing bans. I clearly remember what happened the last time we had an unverifiable ban in the 1960's, the Soviets unilaterally, without warning, broke out with a massive testing series. This extensive series of Soviet tests obviously required many months of secret preparation, all conducted while the United States faithfully honored the moratorium. I urge my colleagues to remember the words of President Kennedy in 1962. He said:

> We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium.

Based on the Soviet track record of violating signed agreements, we must have credible, equitable verification methods. This legislation does not provide any.

I am committed to making sure that our national security comes first. I have consistently supported efforts to make mutually beneficial progress in nuclear testing and arms control issues. The proposed testing moratorium and testing limits are based on faulty assumptions and do not fulfill our national security objectives. They could adversely affect the current, heightened arms control negotiations. In fact, this legislation positively addresses more of the Soviets needs than our own! I strongly urge my colleagues to review the facts and oppose the nuclear test ban provisions.

SALT II PROVISIONS IN SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the provisions in the supplemental appropriations bill that would require United States adherence to the SALT II sublimits by prohibiting funds for strategic offensive systems exceeding the numerical sublimits. This attempt to legislate arms control is based on faulty assumptions and is not in the best interests of our Nation.

It is important to remember that the SALT II Treaty was never ratified and would have now expired.

It is clear beyond a doubt that the Soviets have violated SALT II and other arms control agreements and are continuing to do so. Examining SALT II alone, there are at least four clear major violations. The Soviets are: Producing the SS-25 ICBM; exceeding the strategic nuclear delivery vehicle limit; encrypting telemetry; and concealing the association between a missile and its launcher. Any one of these violations could be grounds for cancellation of the agreement. In 1979, President Carter stated that a violation of any important part of the agreement, as each of these noted violations are, "* * * would be a basis on which to reject the treaty in its entirety." SALT II is much more than arbitrary "sublimits". While many Members of Congress have chosen to narrowly focus on this one part of the treaty, they have blindly ignored the other, more important parts. When presenting the SALT II agreements to the Senate, the Carter administration emphasized the importance of these other parts, like the prohibition on encrypting telemetry. As President Carter told us before a joint session of Congress, "A violation of the encryption provisions would be just as serious as a violation of the limits on strategic weapons themselves."

This legislation calling for one-sided arms control through selective compliance with SALT II undercuts the United States response to Soviet violations and compromises the ability of United States negotiators in Geneva to gain effective verification provisions in new agreements.

This legislation cannot meaningfully restrain Soviet forces nor can it bring the Soviets back into compliance with its past commitments. It can hurt our own and our allies' national security and future arms control agreements. First, it keeps us from continuing the strategic modernization we need to maintain a credible defense against the growing, unchecked Soviet threat. In planning our forces, we have to look at the real threat this country and its allies face. It makes no sense whatsoever, to base our national security on a flawed treaty that was never ratified, that has expired, and that the Soviets knowingly and willing violate anyway. Second, this legislation can send exactly the wrong signal to the Soviet leadership, who are now engaged in serious discussions with us about not the limitation but the reduction of nuclear weapons in Europe. If we are unwilling to maintain deterrence or take appropriate actions in response to Soviet noncompliance, our credibility at the arms negotiation table will be endangered and our ability to secure fair, equal agreements will be seriously lessened. The passage of this legislation will not help our current arms control efforts, it will hinder them—it will signal to the Soviets that Congress is not behind the American negotiators! Furthermore, by ignoring Soviet noncompliance, we signal to them that not only

can they violate arms control commitments with impunity, but they can pick and choose which provisions of bilateral agreements they wish to honor. Such an arrangement would effectively give the Soviet Union a "line-item veto" over our arms control agreements.

The big buildup some people are predicting without SALT has been going on under SALT and continues. The Soviets right now, under SALT, have a huge buildup scheduled. Unilateral American adherence to sublimits will not affect the Soviets plans, it will only hurt our national security. SALT II has codified a vast increase in Soviet strategic forces allowing them to almost double its inventory of strategic ballistic missile warheads and could further increase these numbers substantially under SALT.

While the Soviets have been disregarding SALT II, the President has "gone that extra mile." We retired two older Poseidon submarines so that a new Trident vessel would not exceed any of the SALT II limits. Before deploying the 131st missile armed B-52, the United States gave the Soviet Union ample opportunity to make a jesture showing their commitment to the SALT agreement. Instead, the Soviets made no policy changes and continued to improve their arsenal at our expense. The Soviets must be shown that we are serious about our defense and keeping arms control agreements mutually beneficial.

This fundamental flaw of SALT II, coupled with Soviet violations, clearly indicates the need for a different approach. To get the Soviets to bargain seriously toward deductions, we need to keep our flexibility. That means we need to keep our program for rebuilding our defenses on track—including the other 50 Peacekeeper missiles. Our modernization program is not only essential to keeping the peace, but it's the strongest incentive the Soviets have to agree with us on real reductions that can be verified and that the Soviet Union will comply with.

The President's policy is to continue to exercise restraint in meeting strategic needs and anticipates no appreciable numerical growth in the U.S. strategic forces. Assuming no significant change in threat, the United States will not deploy more nuclear delivery systems or strategic ballistic missile warheads than the Soviet Union. Our policy continues to be one of restraint and pursuit of arms reduction. Soviet actions to exercise restraint and take other constructive steps will be taken into account when the next modernization milestone is reached.

Today's focus should be on current efforts looking for real, verifiable reductions in nuclear arms, not on SALT II, a relic of the past which only allowed controlled building, not reductions. With the proposed legislation, Democrats are again focusing on the past and trying to hold onto ineffective, flawed and obsolete policies. I am more concerned with obtaining a real, mutually beneficial, working arms control agreement than blindly supporting an ineffective piece of signed paper. We can't tie one hand behind our back at this critical moment. Unequal, one-sided restraint is not real arms control. We need to support current efforts moving toward genuine mutual restraint and real reductions. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this SALT II provision.

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

Mr. Chairman, the thing that bothers me so much about this debate, and whether we want to talk about the Federalist Papers, or whether we want to deal in a lot of discussion that is theoretical, we have to talk about what is going on today.

Ronald Reagan is on the verge of being able to negotiate an agreement that is truly historical.

If we go back to the two arms control agreements that we have here, the ABM and the SALT II Treaty, and if you read both of those agreements, the ABM Treaty, and if you read SAM NUNN's comments about the ABM Treaty, they were put together, and it was said that the ABM Treaty would stand as long as forces were essentially balanced, and one side did not attempt to build massive amounts of strategic nuclear weapons, like the Soviets have done.

What SAM NUNN says in his analysis of the ABM Treaty is if the Soviets continue to do this, we are probably going to have to break out of the ABM Treaty, so here we have an ABM Treaty that was supposed to encourage greater stability.

We have one of the great thinkers in defense spending saying we may have to reach the point where we may have to break out of it. In regard to the SALT II Treaty, there is a situation where we negotiated, in a sense, approved the SALT II Treaty, it was all based on one thing: The deep reductions in nuclear weapons were going to occur after we approved the SALT II Treaty.

That has not happened. There have been no reductions but there have been increases in the nuclear stockpile. We have Ronald Reagan coming into office in 1981.

We have this President who comes in in 1981. He says, "I want to make us strong, and I want to get some reductions," so Ronald Reagan may in fact be the first President in my lifetime who is actually going to negotiate an arms control agreement that is going to result in an elimination of an entire class of nuclear weapons.

We are talking about eliminating intermediate range nuclear weapons, and we are talking about a possible agreement eliminating short range nuclear weapons.

We are talking about the possibility of reductions in conventional weapons in Europe, and it looks like all of this is going to happen.

It is not based on something that will happen in the future. It means we could actually have deep reductions in nuclear weapons for the first time in my lifetime.

What do we want to do? We want to attach language to a supplemental appropriations bill that is telling one of the great arms negotiators how to negotiate.

It does not make any sense. If Reagan was not making any progress, I would say, "Hey, attach your stuff." But, he is making progress.

Let me say to my friends that the gentleman from Washington was over there. He heard that there is reason to be optimistic.

The gentleman from Oregon agrees with that. Why attach more language to this bill when we are on the verge of being able to actually get significant deep reductions in nuclear weapons?

This is not the time to do this. This is not the time to tell him how to negotiate. This is like pulling a rug from under him; and if you talk to your negotiators over there, they will all tell you the same thing.

Let us have some latitude. Do not tell us how to negotiate.

This is a bad approach, and I know that the chairman of this committee does not want this language to be in there. This got put on there.

He would rather not have this kind of language on there. I move we vote this thing down, give the President of the United States, one of the great arms negotiators, who could actually in my lifetime really yield an entire elimination of a class of nuclear weapons, give the man a chance.

He is on the verge of doing something nobody in your party, or no one in our party, has been able to do since really the nuclear age, so let us give him support rather than pulling the rug from under him.

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

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in these amendments that has anything to do with intermediate nuclear forces.

We hope that the President gets an agreement on that subject. The gentleman is absolutely wrong.

Mr. KASICH. There is one thing wrong with that.

Reclaiming my time, there is language in there on test ban. The President is working on test ban over there.

They are trying to come up with some agreement, and here you are, sticking language in here, telling the President how to negotiate on test ban.

They are negotiating on test bans. We do not need to be telling them what to do. He is working on test ban.

Do not try to tell him. Do not put him in a corner and tell him how he is going to negotiate.

Mr. DICKS. I do not think he is working too hard on that.

Mr. KASICH. He sure is. They are talking about it all the time.

For the first time on test ban, we have reached the point where they are going to get an agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, has expired.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the gentleman from Texas withhold his motion so that I may be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas withdraw his motion?

Mr. ARMEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman, so that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] may be granted 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] that he may be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

□ 1540

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARMEY moves that the Committee now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by expressing my regret for taking this action particularly the chairman and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee; two gentlemen for whom I have the greatest respect. Your work is diligent and it deserves respect. I do not take an action like this lightly. I certainly take it out of no lack of regard for the gentlemen in question.

What we have seen here, Mr. Chairman, is an extended debate over issues and propositions regarding international affairs, defense policy, arms negotiations; discussions that should not take place with respect to an appropriations bill.

This bill is a serious business with respect to fulfilling the spending needs of our country and our country's government. I believe the Appropriations Committee should be exempted from the pressures that must come to bear to put these kinds of legislative issues into the bill and then subsequently the pressures come to bear for the Rules Committee to make waivers of the House rules so that we can bring a bill to the floor that does not comply with the House rules and legislates in an appropriations bill.

On the other hand, once that is done and the bill comes to the floor, it is not reasonable for us to expect those people who, through their expertise, through their interest, through their concern, have worked long and hard on the relevant authorizing committees to do the work of their committee's jurisdiction. It is wrong to have that work preempted by someone who has the special ability to move their work into the appropriating committee without proper procedures.

Regarding those members who have so seriously taken their work on their respective authorizing committees; it is wrong to expect them to stand down from the debate. This body should not suffer as we have done today through a protracted debate on subjects that are not the concern of the Appropriations Committee.

We cannot reasonably expect this debate to soon terminate. We will be here for a great deal of time and, quite frankly, out of the most sincere motives of the people participating in the debate.

For that reason to be realistic, and in consideration of the people on the Appropriations Committee, but still in regard to the work of this House, I have made this motion.

I might also mention that I understand those who went to the committee to ask for the inclusion of this legislation and then subsequently to the Rules Committee to ask for the waivers. I understand their desire to have salt with their pork, and they probably will get that. But I cannot, in good conscience, allow the procedures, the rules, the protocol and the sense of this body to be so thoroughly compromised by this practice. It has become so common that we rarely, if ever, get a spending bill on the floor, through the Appropriations Committee, that is not stricken by this kind of special interest politics. This kind of procedure avoids taking the work through the legitimate committees of jurisdiction where we find the expertise, where we find the expertise on the part of the staffs, where we find the information base by which the work should properly be done, and where, in fact, we could get the kind of conscientious and thorough-going work that would give us good legislation instead of legislation that might only reflect the clearly biased preference of a handful of individuals in disregard to that committee's rights and that committee's jurisdiction.

I will ask the body to vote "yes" on this motion. I hope as we pass this motion that the Appropriations Committee will then be able to return to their committee room and seriously get about the business of appropriations which is their business, which is their expertise, which is their legitimate concern and to do that without being imposed upon as they have been in the case of this legislation.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, in the first place, may I say to my colleague from Texas that I appreciate his statements about the committee and about the members of the committee.

Let me call your attention to the fact that our Committee on Appropriations can only recommend. There is legislation in this bill; frequently there is. Ninety-nine times out of 100 it is because the legislative committee has agreed this is the best way to handle it.

Some items in this bill, where there is a difference of opinion, are at the insistence of the leadership. The other thing is that this is a bill not a law. I think all the debate here leaves the impression that what we do is final. Whatever you leave in this bill is far from becoming the law because it goes to the other side and the other side, in turn, makes changes. Last year, they never did get time to pass all the regular bills. We had to include them as a part of the continuing resolution. As I tell them, everything good is under my name and everything bad, too.

We did follow the rules on our side. We had hearings and, we had debate. We passed 11 of the 13 bills in the House and we went to a conference. So we did have a sound basis for what was included in the continuing resolution.

Now, the point I make is, let us consider that the Appropriations Committee is your arm. We recommend to you what to do. You cannot do that unless you give thought to what it is for. So we are clearly in our rights to debate as we please.

What I am asking you to do, let us not needlessly prolong it at the expense of the others here who want to get through. You can talk all day and it would not solve what happens in Europe that is connected with any arms agreement. So everybody is within his rights; the gentleman from Texas is within his rights.

I tell you, the Appropriations Committee annually has about 5,000 witnesses and spends hours and hours in hearings. We have a long background, and we should consider all these things. But for now; we should get through in the next 5 of 10 minutes on this issue so we can get through the rest of the bill.

This is including everybody; I have no disregard for anybody. I have a high opinion of everybody here. But all of this is within the rules. If the rules let you make an exception, then that exception is under the rules too. So as long as we stay within the rules, any of us are within our rights; just do not drag it out.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's point, and as I said when I began this I do so reluctantly.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman because I do appreciate it.

Mr. ARMEY. If indeed I could share your faith, your confidence, your belief that we will have seen the last of this debate, I might not have felt compelled to make my motion, but quite frankly, I believe this debate will last all day and I think again, as I said before, out of the most sincere concern for the people who are involved.

Mr. WHITTEN. If we debate it much longer, it will delay the decision while they read this debate.

Mr. ARMEY. It is still my belief that if we pass this motion that you will be able to go back to your committee and bring a bill to the floor that does not have these diversions.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will defeat this motion orally and proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman form Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device and there were: ayes 151, noes 261, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

AYES—151

Archer
Armey
Badham
Baker
Ballenger
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Chandler
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Coughlin
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
Davis (IL)
de la Garza
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Fawell
Fields
Frenzel
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Grandy
Gregg
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hiler
Holloway
Hopkins
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Kolbe
Konnyu
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Latta
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lukens, Donald
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Penny
Petri
Porter
Ravenel
Rhodes
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Saiki
Saxton
Schaefer
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Skeen
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauke
Thomas (CA)

NOES—261

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Chappell
Clarke
Clay
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
Davis (MI)
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Frost
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grant
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harris
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lowry (WA)
Luken, Thomas
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Panetta
Patterson
Pease
Perkins
Pickett
Pickle
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Richardson
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schumer
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Upton
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Weldon
Whittaker
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NOT VOTING—21

Annunzio
Bartlett
Boulter
Collins
Courter
Daniel
Dorgan (ND)
Ford (TN)
Hatcher
Jones (TN)
Kemp
Leach (IA)
Livingston
Martin (NY)
McDade
McKinney
Pepper
Rostenkowski
Scheuer
Taylor
Wilson

□ 1600

Messrs. HALL of Texas, ROE, and REGULA changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. WHITTAKER, FRENZEL, MARLENEE, and KONNYU changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RAHALL). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER III

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Using funds previously appropriated in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act 1987, Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, the Secretary of the Army is directed to undertake the following studies: Ohio River Water Development Study, between Rivermile 40-491, Ohio; Maumee Bay State Park, including preconstruction engineering and design, Ohio; St. Johns County, including preconstruction and design, Florida; Jacksonville Harbor, St. John's River and Intracoastal Waterway Study, Florida; St. John's River Study, Florida; and Water Resources Based Economic Development Computer Model (to continue design and testing) and, in addition, $350,000 for the purposes of studying and evaluating at an estimated cost of $850,000 alternative disposal sites to the currently active San Jacinto disposal area on Galveston Island at full Federal expense; the Secretary of the Army is also directed to undertake environmental studies and submit recommendations to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate on the advisability of modifying project operation and maintenance requirements, assuming that the current disposal site will no longer be available for extensive Federal use in the near future.

□ 1610

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I imagine none of us in this Chamber expected a full-blown arms control debate today, but here it is. We have it, and let us make the best of it.

I noticed one of our distinguished Members on the other side holding a rump press conference in the Speak-

er's lobby. There were about 10 eager press people wanting to know the course of events today. I had a very important person from CBS ask if we were going to continue this because she was facing a 5 o'clock deadline. So it seems that the great news media of the strongest nation in the free world is watching, and that means the whole world is watching. Let us go back and cover some ground here on why this Chamber is attempting to tie the President's hands again when the President appears to be putting the Soviets in a position where they are begging us for a treaty, instead of the majority leadership of this House begging for a treaty.

The President had one rescission request after another in this supplemental, over 5 billion dollars' worth. We considered some of them, but only looked at them briefly. We dismissed every one of them and then added $6.6 billion to this supplemental. Now we have not only government by continuing resolution, which is sure going to make this an exciting year later, but we have also rejected 5 billion dollars' worth of rescission requests by our President. We have added $6.6 billion; we are running our Government by supplemental, and later this year by continuing resolution.

On my Foreign Affairs Committee the other day we were informed that quite possibly we will not be allowed to vote on a foreign aid bill in this House, that if something does come out of committee it will probably suffer the fate of all the appropriation bills last year. It will be rolled into another nearly $500 billion continuing resolution.

We again have a supplemental before us. Let us use this time in a valuable way to discuss what we are doing to the President of the United States and his arms control negotiating team, which only this morning convened in Geneva. I heard with my own ears, saw with my own eyes on CNN the Soviets saying, "We will have a treaty this year," and the American negotiator said, "Good; let's get at it," and the two of them walked in to begin this day, the first day of renewed negotiations. And here, this House is rejecting the President's requests to cut spending with multibillions of dollars still in deficit, yet we are still going to put these restrictive arms control messages within the supplemental. This only weakens the United States position, and emboldens the Soviet negotiators to be less than forthcoming. We do this only a few days after our great Speaker and our majority leader and whip, and the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, plus 5 or 6 Members who serve with me as permanent observers of the whole Geneva arms control process, have returned from the Soviet Union. Why then do we not show the good sense and wisdom to say, wait a minute, let us get all of these wrong signals out of this supplemental and show the President the same courtesy we showed him on the eve of his departure for Reykjavik.

There were some Members on my side of the aisle that left some t's uncrossed and some i's undotted during today's debate. They wanted to pick up where they had left off on some of this vital national security discussion on arms control. I think that we are not even close to an end of debate here.

We have listened to some fascinating analysis of the intention our Founding Fathers and their opinions written in the Federalist Papers when they discussed the power to raise armies and to fund wars given to this Chamber. It was as though the Constitution gave Congress the power in article II, section 2, that has been reposed in the Commander in Chief. It is the President who will make the initial decision of where we will move to secure our national security. We are now rewriting the Federalist Papers and saying that all of those powers are reposed in this Chamber here and that the President should take all of his leads, on antisatellite weapons, SDI, and other defense programs from us. We even want to direct, on an article by article basis, the arms control process. Perhaps the President might as well come down to this Chamber daily to hear directly from this Chamber on how best to do the job for which the American people elected him?

Mr. Chairman, this obviously was not the intent of our Founding Fathers. In this the historic 100th Congress, in the 200th anniversary year of the Constitution we should not be legislating the President out of his job.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. RAHALL). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

The Corps of Engineers is directed to proceed with the Fairfield Vicinity Streams, California, project under the provisions of section 117 of Public Law 99-190.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. GINGRICH

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. GINGRICH: On page 19, line 21, strike out "construction, General" and all that follows through line 12 of page 20.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the amendments en bloc, and notwithstanding the fact that they involve paragraphs of the bill that have not yet been read by the Clerk.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1620

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, this is a new procedure that we are trying to start on our side of the aisle for a new circumstance we find ourselves in.

The Office of Management and Budget has looked at the supplemental bill. It has offered a number of places where the Reagan administration feels rather strongly that if the President had a line-item veto it is likely he would veto that particular section.

A number of my colleagues have said over the years, "Well, it is the President's choice. It is the President's decision, the President should be involved."

There are two things here involved that House Members can vote on. One is in a series of amendments we will offer through the course of this bill on increases in spending or on particular gimmicks for spending that are inappropriate if you are really concerned about the deficit and you are really concerned about interest rates and you really want to help avoid a recession.

The second is a question of appropriate government. The question I would raise on this particular amendment, and I say this with all respect to my colleagues who are concerned about these specific projects, but is it really the job of the Congress to make a series of $50,000, and $100,000, and $125,000 decisions. Should we really be in the process of micromanaging at this level?

Furthermore, there seems to be a disagreement. I have talked with our very esteemed friends on the committee. Their counsel assures them that nothing in this particular section is involved in cost allocation. The Office of Management and Budget disagrees.

I would simply suggest that the prudent, cautious thing to do is to strike this language. It would force Members to go back to the Corps of Engineers to argue on the merit that out of all the possible things that money could be spent on that these projects ought to be the things it is spent on. But if we are going to go through a 6-, or 8-, or 10-year process of trying to tighten up on spending, I think every Member can understand the reason that each of us would like to make our particular projects legislatively untouchable, and I think we can also understand as citizens why it is probably not correct for the U.S. Congress and one or two subcommittees of that Congress to decide, out of limited funds, how the entire country should be managed.

So I would urge my colleagues if you are going to say later on that we are going to control spending, if you are going to say later on that we ought to have a more efficient Government, if you are going to be concerned about interest rates and the value of the dollar and the recession which looms

right around the corner, if you want to create jobs instead of kill them, that we ought to look at step-by-step, line-item by line-item spending. I would say to my friends on the Committee on Appropriations that I know that is going to make this year and next year very long on the House floor. I know it is going to take a lot of time. But I would simply suggest that when we get multibillion dollar, 127-page spending bills that cover everything in the Federal Government, that you should come to the floor expecting that the President and his friends will try systematically to find those places where we can save a few million here and a few million there and to try to cut spending rather than raise taxes.

Let me say one last thing: I particularly appreciate why those of our friends who have been very open about their desire to raise taxes, would feel comfortable voting again and again for more spending. They have a solution to America's future. They would vote for higher spending and higher taxes; they would pay for the bureaucracy they would create. But for those who want to have it both ways let me just suggest over the course of today and in future appropriations bills you will have a series of opportunities to register exactly how you think we should run an efficient Government and to decide whether you want to vote for efficiency and less spending or whether you want to vote for congressional micromanagement, pork barrel, and far more spending.

I thank the Chair.

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

Mr. Chairman, if any of us are looking to this proposal as a means of balancing the budget or solving the deficit problems, be reminded that we are talking about less than 10 millions of dollars, less than 10 millions of dollars and not one of those dollars is in this bill. There is not one nickel of that $10 million or less involved in this bill. These are moneys that have already been appropriated in the 1987 bill. They are moneys which are earmarked for specific projects. They are moneys that were clearly designed to be paid out of last year's appropriations and we find that the administration simply now feels that they need specific direction in the bill. We had told them what to do in the report. That was not sufficient. So what we are doing here is simply putting it into the bill so that it will be clear that they should go ahead and spend these moneys.

So we are simply saying in this bill to spend the moneys like we told you to spend them last year. That is all this bill does.

Now, let me mention one specific. We spent a lot of time in this House on projects such as the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. We resolved that problem and we said that we would take certain moneys each year and pay back to the States for the properties which we bring into a project such as the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. So that is all this does, it meets the obligations of legislation previously passed. It has nothing to do with the up or down expenditures in this bill.

So we ask you to defeat the amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the penultimate word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes, but I just want to point out to the House that the issue here is really the issue of whether or not you believe in cost sharing in these projects. OMB, in analyzing this particular language, has come to the conclusion—and we have doublechecked—that the committee's action will exempt specific water projects from applicable cost sharing as authorized in Public Law 99-62.

So while we would agree with the gentleman from Florida that indeed these projects were previously authorized, what is happening here is you have $10 million worth of spending which is not going to come under cost-sharing provisions.

Now, we understand that the committee has a different interpretation of that, but the fact is that if we are serious about the fact that the President ought to be taking the lead in trying to cut down on spending, the President's OMB has now made a decision with regard to this language that this would in fact add on spending because it does not meet cost-sharing regulations. I would hope that the House would decide to stick with what we had decided to do previously and that is reduce some of the obligations of the Federal Government by assuring local cost sharing.

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

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

Mr. CHAPPELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear to the gentleman and to the Members of the House that this does not affect cost sharing. This has nothing to do with the exemptions otherwise provided on cost sharing. This does not exempt any project, has nothing to do with that. As a matter of fact, this bill specifically says it applies only to those that are already appropriated and simply puts in bill form that which we had already put in language and which this House has almost unanimously agreed on.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for that. I guess our problem is that in most of these things we end up with a fight among the attorneys. In this case the President's attorneys are going to tell him that in fact this language does permit these projects to go forward without cost sharing. So we really are talking about something which increases the obligations of the Federal Government.

The question here is on a line-by-line basis, do you in fact want to save some money?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I totally concur with the statements made by my distinguished colleague from Florida. He is absolutely correct. There is no new money in these projects. I can tell you what the story is on the projects. They were appropriated in the O&M account in 1986 and 1987, OMB directed the Corps of Engineers not to proceed with them. The money is there. This fundamentally is a fight between the Corps of Engineers and OMB with the authorizing and appropriations committees.

There was not cost sharing at the time these projects went into effect. The Corps of Engineers was directed not to proceed with the projects.

□ 1630

They did not proceed. We are telling them now that they must proceed. That is what is happening here. No new money; no violation of any statute. It is simply the Congress upholding its constitutional responsibility to direct where the money will be spent.

The choice here is this. Let me make it very clear so that the gentlemen are not confused. The choice here is this: Shall the Congress direct these expenditures or shall OMB? That is your choice. The money is there. They are not going to take it away. You are not taking it away. The money will remain there and it will be spent by OMB and the corps, if not directed by this House and by the Senate.

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

Mr. TRAXLER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, who has, otherwise, usually some interesting amendments.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask this because I am curious. We have been trying to work this out working backward.

I think the gentleman has put his finger on a second point that every Member of the Congress ought to consider. If we are in a period of limited budgets, if all of us need, on behalf of our districts, to ask of the Corps of Engineers and OMB to build things, could the gentleman tell us where the projects are that my amendment strikes and who has the highest level of passion and whether, in fact, this is purely a fight between OMB and the corps or whether, in fact, this is in part a fight between the Committee

on Appropriations and the other 380 Members of the House.

Will you not, in a limited period, in effect, take all of this money away from the rest of us and have decided in committee where the money should be spent.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, let me respond to my friend. My mother did not raise an idiot. I would never pick a fight with 380 Members. Clearly those are untenable odds. I want to assure the gentleman that I would never take a nickle away from my colleagues.

What we are doing here, in response to the gentleman's inquiry, is simply saying you were given the money and direction 2 years ago on how to spend it. You refused to spend it that way. Now we are putting into law how you shall spend it. That is a legitimate function of the Committee on Appropriations, and incidentally, also of the Congress. That is our mandate constitutionally.

I know my colleague will want to respond on that.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me understand again because I know the gentleman would not want to take any money away from the rest of us. If we have some form of Gramm-Rudman, however loose, and if we are entering a period of finite budgets, and if the Corps of Engineers has a limited ceiling of money it can spend, is it not by definition true that if you start out in the Committee on Appropriations by telling it how to spend the first 30 percent, let us say, or the first 20 percent, that by definition, there is that much less available when the rest of us go over as mere suppliants and ask them to consider our projects?

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Chairman, what we are doing is prioritizing the projects. Many of us do not agree with the priorities of OMB. That is what we are doing. That is all these amendments do.

The money is there. They were directed how to spend it. They refused to spend it that way. Now we are telling them by law that they must spend it that way.

I urge the rejection of the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the comments of my colleagues who have spoken previously in opposition to this amendment. I say that, repeating some of their arguments, these projects in no way involve any new money. They are, with regard to the projects that I am particularly interested in, under the Flood Control Act of 1946 and involve serious erosion in the areas specified in the legislation.

These projects were referenced in the report language of the continuing resolution of last year.

No new money or authorization is involved in any event, and I think that it is interesting that the gentleman offering the amendment would suggest that this is where the administration would use a line-item veto if they were to have that authority. That will be of particular interest to constituents in my district, as I have opposed that authority, and we now see exactly how it would be used to frustrate efforts to provide relief to constituents under acts that are very meritorious and for which the Congress has already spoken in favor of in report language before it.

This is, indeed, a fight with OMB where the Congress has spoken that these projects are to be undertaken and where, in fact, the Congress is not acting arbitrarily, but rather in regard to these projects, the Corps of Engineers has already looked at them and has discussed the projects, indicating that they meet the requirements of the Emergency Erosion Protection Act.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to agree with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN]. I rise to oppose the amendment and to associate myself with the gentlemen from Florida, Michigan, and West Virginia.

The fallacy of this amendment is that it will not generate any savings and will not reduce the Federal deficit. The funds associated with the construction starts recommended by our committee are not contained in the bill before us today. Not a penny of appropriated funds would be touched by this amendment.

Funds available for these construction starts were appropriated in previous fiscal years. This amendment will not prevent the Corps of Engineers from spending funds already appropriated, whether for the specific activities recommended in this bill, or for some other Corps of Engineers project.

For this reason, I consider the amendment to be confusing and misdirected. I urge my colleagues to refrain from supporting this amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am as deeply concerned about cutting spending as anyone else here, but this amendment will not do that. As already has been said, the money has been appropriated under a previous Congress in two different sessions for these projects.

They are vital projects to those communities.

But the issue here is, Will it save money? It will not. As an example, the Port Austin Harbor, MI, was appropriated in 1986, not by line item, but spelled out in the report. It is a priority item as far as safe harbor is concerned. People have the risk of losing their lives in these areas. The Corps of Engineers has the responsibility, given to it by this Congress, to make sure that these harbors are safe. We provide safe harbors in case of storms.

The others, Wellsburg, WV, and Glen Dale, WV, are all bank stabilization. Again, the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers.

If we do not do it now, the corps does not do what Congress has directed, because it is a responsibility of the Corps of Engineers and the Federal Government, that money will have to be spent in the future, only it will cost a whole lot more.

So you can be penny-wise and pound-foolish by adopting this proposal. I know the gentleman has good intentions and he makes every effort to save money. I will certainly join him when he is right, but in this particular instance, it is a choice of whether the President—not really the President—I am sure he does not know where these projects are. I bet he does not even know that this bill is up this afternoon, but the Office of Management and Budget is looking for places—and I do not blame them for this—when they are right, I will join them, too, but they are looking for places to save money. I thank goodness they are. But they are wrong here.

Your subcommittee here has spent hours reviewing projects, hearing witnesses, as well as making personal visits. I do not think any of us have visited any of these projects, but some of the Members have and have come and testified before our committees. Shall you use the judgment of the Office of Management and Budget, none of whom know where these projects are, or are you going to accept the judgment of the subcommittee that you have given the responsibility for making these decisions?

The bottom line is, really, do you really believe in the line-item veto? I do not, because I think this is one of the reasons why you cannot support a line-item veto. You circumvent entirely the responsibility of Congress if you hand one person in OMB the right to pick and choose and not use the collective judgment of 535 Members of Congress.

Support your committee. Even though I am going to vote against the bill, this is one chapter that is doggone good. You ought not vote against these projects and this chapter. We

are under the President's budget. We just have a different choice. This is not the first time this has happened. I have been around here a few years. We have had disagreements with Democratic and Republican Presidents. It will not be the last time. Better vote with the committee on this instance.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a point because our friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], was very eloquent and I think very appropriately so.

I am confident that every project my amendment affects is a good project. I am confident that there are people in every community who would like their projects funded.

My only question was, If we are going to set up an executive branch and we are going to have them look at the whole country and we are going to hire professional engineers and we are going to have a Corps of Engineers, then if we have limited spending, the point I was trying to make earlier with the gentleman from Michigan, if we are going to have limited spending, is it really appropriate for the Congress, through this process, as we go through tightening the budget, for us to decide by the internal politics of the Congress whose constitutents get saved?

□ 1640

Or is it more appropriate for us to have the Corps of Engineers, the professional engineers, the professional staff, looking at and trying to rank professionally, out of the limited pot of money, who to help?

I would just suggest to my friends that it was for that reason of saying that as we get to a tighter budget, we need a more efficient Government, we need a government in which we have less pork barrel, and I think in that sense it is not a wise thing for us to get down to two $50,000 grants, three $50,000 grants, $100,000 grants, and $225,000 grants. That is just not the job for Congress, to get down to that level of micromanagement.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I had no intention to engage in this debate until I heard the most recent comments of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

I think it is very important to focus on what we think is our responsibility under the Constitution and that which resides in the executive branch. This is not a question of whether the Corps of Engineers or Congress is allowed to set priorities. That is clearly the way we have done it for many, many years, and I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] who said it is in the bipartisan interest of the legislative branch that we continue to exercise that authority and approach.

What Mr. GINGRICH simply has done with this amendment is to take recommendations that appear in the report that accompanied the bill and enumerate them in language in the same fiscal year. No new money is spent. We are simply saying to OMB, because they are the ones who have intervened here, that this is the will of the Congress, and we have to put it in law because they would not adhere to our priorities in the normal process where we use the committee reports to recommend our views to them.

This is an intervention by the OMB, a political arm of the executive branch, of the White House, into the area where the Corps of Engineers and subcommittees of jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee have traditionally worked together informally and in harmony.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I do not believe it is the Corps of Engineers who refused to carry out the wishes of Congress. I think the corps is perfectly willing, in my understanding. At least that is the information I have received, that they were willing to do that, as I was told by OMB.

Mr. FAZIO. That is exactly right.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. The question again is, Do you want the people who make the decisions to be someone the American people have elected, or do you want the decisions to be made by some faceless, nameless people who are removed from the realities of what is in this bill or what the requirements are?

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Indiana.

That is the very point. We are not intervening in the process of rationalizing the expenditures of funds, as the Corps of Engineers does. We are simply saying to OMB, "Don't intervene and contravene the experts."

We have relied on them traditionally, and should in the future.

In addition, this amendment would eliminate a provision which seeks to give the cities of Fairfield and Suisun credit for $4.2 million in cash they spent implementing portions of the Fairfield streams flood control project between 1977 and 1982. The credit would apply against a corps' requirement that a local sponsor contribute 5 percent of a project's total cost in cash during the time of construction, which in this case is $1 million.

Throughout the history of the project, the cities of Fairfield and Suisun, in good faith, put their own money into the project on the expectation that these payments would be credited to the cities' local share of the final project. These were not developer-contributed improvements. These were direct, out-of-pocket costs paid by the cities.

Further, the Corps of Engineers and the State board of reclamation each requested the opportunity to review and approve each portion of the project initiated by the cities. Most were constructed with permits issued from both the Corps of Engineers and the board of reclamation. And each portion of the project was included in the final project design memorandum signed in 1976.

The cities spent this $4.2 million in cash implementing portions of the project that could not wait for the new starts impasse to be broken in Congress.

The amount the cities contributed is four times as much as the corps is demanding in cash, payable now. The language in the supplemental would simply give the cities credit for having made this expenditure and eliminate the requirement that it come up with another million dollars on top of the more than $4 million it has already contributed toward meeting the corps responsibility.

The Fairfield streams project was authorized in 1970 and designed to provide the communities with a 200-year level of flood protection.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment. It is not only bad policy, it is bad politics, and it is terrible for Members of Congress who have allowed the executive one more time, if we do not defeat this, to have its will with us.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will take just a couple of minutes.

It is proposed by my friend and colleague from Georgia that this is to save money. It will not save one penny to pass his amendment.

The money was previously appropriated and is still going to be there for these projects. Congress has voted on two occasions already on there projects, on the authorization and on the appropriation. Nobody raised any questions about them. The only reason we have this provision in here is that the Secretary of the Army testified before our committee that if we put it in the body of the bill, the supplemental bill, that they would then go ahead and proceed with the projects, otherwise the money will be spent on only those projects OMB approves.

These are projects that are needed.

As far as the local participation is concerned, it will apply. We are not waiving Public Law 99-662 provisions.

The projects are in this bill, because, the testimony presented to my subcommittee made it necessary for us to do what the Assistant Secretary of the Army testified would have to be done to get these projects started.

This is the third time we are voting on this, and twice you have already, without objection from anybody, approved these projects, so I urge you to defeat this amendment.

It will accomplish nothing, and it will simply delay some projects here that are necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 100, noes 310, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

AYES—100

Archer
Armey
Badham
Baker
Ballenger
Barton
Bilirakis
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Chandler
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Coble
Combest
Coughlin
Dannemeyer
Davis (IL)
DeWine
Dickinson
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Fawell
Fields
Frenzel
Gallo
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Gregg
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Hiler
Holloway
Hopkins
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Konnyu
Kyl
Latta
Lewis (FL)
Lott
Lujan
Lukens, Donald
Lungren
Mack
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCollum
McEwen
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (WA)
Moorhead
Oxley
Petri
Porter
Rhodes
Ridge
Ritter
Roth
Saxton
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Solomon
Stangeland
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauke
Thomas (CA)
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Wortley
Wylie
Young (FL)

NOES—310

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Chappell
Clarke
Clay
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Craig
Crane
Crockett
Darden
Daub
Davis (MI)
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Frost
Gallegly
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grandy
Grant
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Harris
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Herger
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Luken, Thomas
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCurdy
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morella
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Pickett
Pickle
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Richardson
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Saiki
Savage
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schumer
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—23

Annunzio
Bartlett
Boulter
Collins
Courter
Daniel
Dorgan (ND)
Edwards (OK)
Ford (TN)
Hatcher
Jones (TN)
Kemp
Leach (IA)
Livingston
McDade
McKinney
Morrison (CT)
Pepper
Rostenkowski
Scheuer
Taylor
Torricelli
Wilson

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Boulter for, with Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota against.

Messrs. GEKAS, GALLEGLY, SCHUETTE, and QUILLEN changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CLINGER and Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Using funds previously provided in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Acts 1986 and 1987, (Public Laws 99-141, 99-500 and 99-591), the Secretary of the Army is directed to undertake the following projects in the amounts as specified hereafter:

Project	Amount
Port Austin Harbor, Michigan	$2,800,000
Sand Island Beach, Hawaii	$600,000
Wellsburg, West Virginia (Ohio River milepost 74.8 to 72.8)	
Cox Run Area	$50,000
Middle School Area	$50,000
Water Works Vicinity, Wellsburg Municipal Pool and Park Vicinity	$200,000
Main Street Areas	$100,000
Sistersville, West Virginia City Park Area	$50,000
Glen Dale, West Virginia	
Glen Dale Airport	$125,000
Sewer Outfalls	$125,000

In regard to the Wellsburg, Sistersville and Glen Dale projects, the Congress finds that an emergency exists in satisfaction of the requirements of Section 14—Emergency Streambank and Shoreline Protection.

Using funds previously provided in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1987 (Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591), the Secretary of the Army is directed to use $5,000,000 to initiate land acquisition activities as described in section 1114 of Public Law 99-662.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to the amounts appropriated under this head in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1987, as included in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, there are hereby appropriated such sums as become available in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: On page 20, line 15, strike all language through page 21, line 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. GLICKMAN) assumed the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

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

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1987

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, on the last amendment I guess what we did was establish the fact that the Appropriations Committee members have an inalienable right to put pork in supplemental appropriation bills. Now I guess what we need to figure is whether or not there is also an inalienable right to fiscal gimmickry in these bills, because in the case of the amendment that I am offering here, we are talking about $67 million of spending.

□ 1710

Mr. Chairman, why I say that we are engaged in fiscal gimmickry in this particular aspect of the bill is because when we passed the continuing appropriation last year, what we did was underfund this portion of the program. We did so with the belief that H.R. 6 was going to be passed, and so therefore the money would be made available through that particular route.

However, H.R. 6 did not get passed, and so therefore we are left short funded on this program. We are short funded because we short funded the program in the first place. What the President had proposed in his budget is that we use previously authorized user fees of $67 million and that they be appropriated to offset the operations and maintenance budget.

The committee has decided instead to appropriate these funds as an addition to the current funding level for O&M activities, thereby increasing the level of spending by $67 million.

I think if we are going to have that kind of gimmickry used out here, if we are going to underfund programs in the first place, and then come back later on and say, "Oh, but we need this money," it is high time that we call the process on that. I suggest that it is high time right now that if we are really going to begin saving money that we do it in ways that are real, and we stop this charade of suggesting in big appropriations bills that we have in fact fully funded programs only to find out later that we have to bust the budget in order to fund these programs that were underfunded in the first place.

So I would hope that the committee would approve this amendment. This is not money that the President asked for. Time and time again I have sat on this floor and listened to Members come to the floor and tell us that the President is asking for all of this money, and all the Appropriations Committee is trying to do is give the President those amounts that he is asking for.

Well, let me tell you, this is $67 million that the President has not asked for. This is $67 million that OMB and the President say that they do not want. It is $67 million that could be paid for by user fees. It is $67 million that we do not have to spend this way.

I would suggest that a vote against this money and for my amendment is the responsible vote if you want to do something about budget busting.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Public Law 99-662 provides for user fees. We are talking about 200 ports in this Nation, and we are talking about maintenance. We are not talking about building anything. We are not talking about starting anything. We are talking about maintaining and keeping in repair what we have.

Public Law 99-662 did not make this effective until April 1, the first of this month. So 6 months of the year is gone, and we have started collecting the fees. Nobody knows how much will be collected, so we cannot say specifically how much will be spent. This is to allow the corps to spend the funds collected to maintain our harbors as prescribed by Public Law 99-662.

The Corps of Engineers is in the process now of developing the procedures to carry out the law.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEVILL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, the ranking minority member of this panel.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, certainly the chairman has made a very able statement here. I think that the important thing that all of us should recognize is that this particular section of this chapter does not provide for an appropriation of income-tax dollars. Public Law 99-662 set up a fund for user fees. I am one in this Chamber who supports a user fee, but if we are never going to use it, if we are just going to build up a bank account someplace, I am not going to support user fees.

Now the user fees are paid by those who use these waterways for the purpose of maintaining them. This is the vehicle whereby we release those funds that will be paid into the fund—a penny cannot be spent unless it has already been put in there. This is a procedure where we take it out of that account and spend it on very badly needed maintenance.

Again, it does not save the first penny. It is going to have to be spent sometime. So if we build up that big account, continue to build more and more money, it will look good, but our maintenance will not get done.

That is what we are saying here: use that money as it accumulates as necessary to maintain the ports so that we can continue to be competitive with our products around the world, get them through the ports. We do not want to collect fees and just store it up someplace. That maybe once in awhile, but again, it would not be wise not to spend this money, because it will cost us much more in the future.

Mr. BEVILL. The gentleman is correct, and I urge Members to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I could ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for a moment, I may have misunderstood, as I understand his position, if we appropriate the additional $67 million, it is not in fact $67 million in additional spending, or it is not $67 million additionally toward the Gramm-Rudman limit? I am not sure that I fully understood what the gentleman just said, and I would like him to explain.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, what it really amounts to is the user fees that they started collecting about 3 weeks ago, will be used for maintenance and operation which this Congress supported overwhelmingly and we voted for. To neglect our maintenance would cost more money in the long run, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. GINGRICH. I am curious. Maybe I misunderstood the gentleman from Indiana, then, because as I understand it, the user fees are coming in this year.

Mr. BEVILL. They started collecting the fees 3 weeks ago.

Mr. GINGRICH. So would it not be possible to allocate or to direct Treasury to simply transfer the user fees as directed to meet the $67 million?

Mr. BEVILL. We would like to comply with Public Law 99-662, and I am sure that the gentleman does, and this provision will carry out the intent of Congress in Public Law 99-662. My amendment lets them use the money that is collected.

Mr. GINGRICH. But does it then have the user fee pay back that money, or does this come out of General Treasury?

Mr. BEVILL. This is the user-fee money that we are talking about.

Mr. GINGRICH. This $67 million here does not come from the General Treasury?

Mr. BEVILL. That is correct.

Mr. GINGRICH. The second point is, this is not an increase of the program level by $67 million?

Mr. BEVILL. It is no increase; that is right.

Mr. GINGRICH. I guess that we are going to have to ask the gentleman's folks and OMB to keep talking, because this is the second issue in a row where OMB comes in and the Office of Management and Budget says flatly that this is an increase in the program level by $67 million.

Mr. BEVILL. OMB proposed to strike out $67 million for operation and maintenance because they said they are going to receive this money, these user fees. We do not have that money. They have no idea how much they will collect. You see, they just started collecting it April 1.

Mr. GINGRICH. So if you do not have the money, I would say to my chairman, if he could explain this, if you do not have the money, in fact this $67 million will come from the General Treasury.

□ 1720

I mean that is what I am confused by.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana to explain that.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is to come out of the trust fund. The money is not there right now this very moment because they just started collecting it the first of April. But this is to be spent from that account as it goes in, and it does not authorize any expenditures to be released from any other fund.

But the issue is this: Shall that money be spent for operation and maintenance now or shall it just be accumulated in that account? The need is there, the necessity is there, and it will not be released and used for maintenance unless it is needed.

Earlier today we were concerned about the budget that was passed earlier this month that provides for tax increases. This will not require any income tax increase. This is only using trust accounts. This has already been set up, already provided for and has nothing to do with income tax dollars that you and all the other American people spend.

Mr. GINGRICH. If the gentleman is assuring, if I might walk through this for a moment, assuring us that is the case as currently written, because we are trying to sort this out that, in fact, OMB is misinforming us in saying that this would raise the amount spent by $67 million and it would count against the Gramm-Rudman limit.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. If the gentleman will continue to yield, OMB is correct, it is going to be spent if it is there, and I am presuming it is going to be there. It will have some impact as far as the total spending. But it is not going to effect the total dollars as far as income tax is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] has expired.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. It would have no impact on the national debt.

Mr. GINGRICH. Except, if I might, and I happen to favor strongly, as the gentleman knows, because I am on the Public Work Committee, the idea of capital budgeting. I favor taking all of these trust funds off budget. But is it not correct that under the unified budget this particular clause would add $67 million, in fact, under the unified budget toward the Gramm-Rudman limit?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. It would under Gramm-Rudman, the gentleman is exactly right. But what was the intent of Gramm-Rudman?

Mr. GINGRICH. I thought it was to get us down to a balanced budget by 1992.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. That is correct, and this will have no impact whatsoever on the balanced budget, except to the extent that the gentleman is exactly right. I voted for the consolidated budget back several years ago, but I would vote to reverse it now because I think I was wrong back then, because what happens today is those moneys are borrowed from the trust accounts, and it looks false because we are borrowing from that. We do not go out in the general public, and it looks like, it is making our budget look good, but it is phony because actually we are increasing the national debt and we do not show it.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me just say to my good friends that I would like very much to vote with the gentlemen to have a capital budget that is off budget as long as it is in the unified budget, and I took this position in voting to sustain the veto of the highway bill, which was not funds serving for public works. As long as it is a unified budget, then we ought to play by the unified rules, and this counts as $67 million in additional spending under the unified budget. I would urge support under those circumstances, and I would say to my friends in appropriations that I will do all I can to work with you this year to pass a capital budget account and to quit this phony gimmicking in which we collect the money from user fees but then frankly use it to buy U.S. bonds. So in these circumstances then, since it will raise $67 million in the deficit toward Gramm-Rudman, under the unified budget, I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Respectfully, I am afraid the gentleman is not carrying out what he says here. I quite agree with the gentleman as far as concern about a balanced budget. But then he goes on to say we are going to build up, we are going to collect money that is going to be borrowed, and it is going to be falsifying that budget even more in the future.

While we are trying to correct it, at least let us be honest about it, and let us say this money is here for that purpose. And let us go further and not further contribute to a false budget.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, this is our problem, and I think all of us share this dilemma. There is under the Unified Budget Act, which the gentleman helped pass a number of years ago, there is a scorecard.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. And I have regretted it ever since.

Mr. GINGRICH. That scorecard under revenues, under here counts user fees to reduce the deficit. We face this problem on aviation, we face it with highways, and the gentleman faces it in this case.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. When I voted for a consolidated budget, and maybe some of the rest of my colleagues did some years ago, it was never intended that it would be carried out with Gramm-Rudman. We knew nothing about Gramm-Rudman back then. The intent was that we would have everything out in front of us so that we would know what all of the Government was spending the money for, whether it be from trust funds or whatever. But now with Gramm-Rudman coming along, that has really contributed to falsifying, which was not the intent of the consolidated budget. It was to make it more honest. But Gramm-Rudman has contributed to making it more false, just the opposite of what the consolidated budget was meant to do.

Mr. GINGRICH. If the gentleman will yield for one last time, I will just ask my friend is it not correct that if we agree to this $67 million in additional spending, which is trust funded, that under the Gramm-Rudman rules if we are going to get the debt limit agreed to we will have to not spend $67 million somewhere else or we will have to raise $67 million in taxes? Under the rules, as we have set it up, to spend this $67 million and stay with Gramm-Rudman we either have to cut

91-059 O-89-32 (Pt. 7)

$67 million somewhere else or we have to raise $67 million in taxes? Not that I agree with the rules, but is that not a correct statement of the rules that we are now working under?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Actually, the gentleman is right, and I will go one step further. For people who want to cut even more, and I am one of those people, this is really saving the country money, because if we spend this $67 million here, it is collected and does not have to be borrowed. If we spend it somewhere else, we are going to have to borrow the money to pay for it. So you ought to be voting against this amendment instead of for it, because you are actually saving expenditures.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has it backward, because what you are going to force us to do is to find $67 million in savings somewhere else that, in fact, comes out of the hide of something that we do not have defined here. So what you have really done is transferred an obligation in such a way that it shows up as basically phony budgeting.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Oh, no, just quite the opposite. There is nothing phony about this. This money will be paid in from user fees. I will yield to the gentleman again in a moment, but listen to me. It is going to be paid into that account and we do not have to borrow that. If you take that $67 million that could be spent from some other program, we are going to have to borrow it. You do not have to borrow this $67 million; it is to be collected through user fees.

It is true, yes, we are going to take it from somewhere where it could be spent, but is the gentleman not concerned about the fact that there were $5.5 billion of rescissions that were not approved by the committee? The gentleman was not concerned about losing that $5.5 billion, so why is the gentleman worried about losing this $67 million from some other program?

Mr. WALKER. I am concerned about losing the $5.5 billion, and also I am concerned about anything raising the spending levels. The OMB tells us this raises the spending levels by $67 million.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. It does not. In this case the OMB is not telling the whole story. That money is going to be spent under Gramm-Rudman, $67 million. Which account does it come from, this account over here that we already have the money in, or is it going to come from this account over here that is already a red figure? That $67 million can be spent by Gramm-Rudman. You spend it where you already have it in the bank or you spend it over here where we have to borrow it. Which do you want to do? Do you want to spend it where we already have the money? Then you had better stick with the committee.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count for a quorum. The Chair counts 101 Members present, a quorum.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demanded a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 75, noes 332, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

AYES—75

Archer
Armey
Badham
Baker
Ballenger
Barton
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Chandler
Cheney
Coats
Coble
Crane
Dannemeyer
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Frenzel
Gallo
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Grandy
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Hiler
Holloway
Hopkins
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Jeffords
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Kolbe
Konnyu
Kyl
Latta
Lujan
Lukens, Donald
Mack
Madigan
Martin (IL)
McEwen
McMillan (NC)
Michel
Miller (WA)
Nielson
Oxley
Petri
Porter
Rhodes
Ritter
Roth
Rowland (CT)
Sensenbrenner
Shumway
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Stump
Swindall
Tauke
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Wortley

NOES—332

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Chappell
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Coyne
Craig
Crockett
Darden
Daub
Davis (MI)
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flake
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Frost
Gallegly
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grant
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Gregg
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Harris
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Herger
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Ireland
Jacobs
Jenkins
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Luken, Thomas
Lungren
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Pickett
Pickle
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roukema
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Saiki
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Sharp
Shaw
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whittaker
Whitten
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—26

Annunzio
Bartlett
Boulter
Collins
Courter
Daniel
Davis (IL)
Dorgan (ND)
Dymally
Ford (TN)
Hatcher
Jones (TN)
Kemp
Leach (IA)
Livingston
McDade
McKinney
Pepper
Rostenkowski
Scheuer
Solomon
Taylor
Torricelli
Waxman
Williams
Wilson

□ 1740

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Boulter for, with Mr. Ford of Tennessee against.

Messrs. SAXTON, PACKARD, and SWEENEY changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, general," $125,000 to be derived by transfer from "General Investigations" to perform a cumulative environmental analysis of Section 55 measures along the 46-mile reach of the Platte River between Hershey, Nebraska, and the Lincoln-Dawson County line.

REVOLVING FUND

The Corps of Engineers is directed to advertise and procure an automated system that adheres to specifications developed by the Corps of Engineers for civil program requirements without regard to the Army Information Architecture Tier 2 standards for operating systems.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Secretary of the Army shall file a report with the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate within ninety days after a written request is made pursuant to the provisions of subsection (m) of section 103 of Public Law 99-662 indicating the action taken on the request. In addition, the Secretary of the Army shall file a report with the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate within ninety days after enactment of this Act listing any project or study falling under the provisions of subsection (e)(1) of section 103 of Public Law 99-662.

The project for Denison Dam (Lake Texoma), Red River, Texas and Oklahoma, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, (52 Stat. 1219) is modified to provide that water allocations in Lake Texoma shall be as follows:

(1) the bottom of the conservation pool shall be designated to be at 610 feet elevation above sea level; and

(2) the bottom of the flood control pool shall be designated at 619 feet elevation above sea level.

Notwithstanding section 838(d) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, or any provision of law relating to water resource development, the United States shall not be obligated to pay compensation to any party by reason of the modification in subsection (a).

None of the funds in this Act or any other Act relating to water resource development may be used to construct or enter into an agreement to construct additional hydropower units at Denison Dam (Lake Texoma).

A project for flood control along the San Timoteo Creek in the vicinity of Loma Linda is authorized for construction as part of the Santa Ana Mainstem including the Santiago Creek project and in accordance with plans to be developed by the district engineer during preconstruction, engineering, and design studies for the Santa Ana Mainstem. In determining economic justification, the benefit and cost for the San Timoteo project will be included together with benefits and costs for the entire Santa Ana Mainstem, including Santiago Creek. The total cost for the Santa Ana Mainstem, including Santiago Creek, is to be raised accordingly.

Section 91 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1974 is amended by striking out "$28,725,000" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "$30,500,000".

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Construction program", for the cleanup of Kesterson Reservoir of the San Luis Unit, Central Valley Project, to remain available until expended, $5,600,000, to be derived by transfer of unobligated balances in "Loan program", Bureau of Reclamation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California: On page 23, line 17, before the period insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to obligate funds for the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program after August, 1, 1987, and through September 30, 1987, only after the Secretary has notified the Congress of his intention to comply with the California State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 87-3 (March 19, 1987): *Provided further*, That no funds may be obligated for the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program after October 1, 1987, unless the Congress has futher authorized such expenditures".

□ 1750

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California, [Mr. MILLER] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 15 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment to address the problems associated with contaminated irrigation drainage water in the Central Valley of California.

Unless quick action is taken, this contamination could threaten the future of irrigated agriculture in the Central Valley, and pose a threat to private property, wildlife, and public health.

Mr. Chairman, the efforts of the Interior Department, and particularly the Bureau of Reclamation, to solve this problem have been less than commendable.

The Bureau denied that a problem existed for several years. After they reluctantly agreed there was a problem, they scrambled to do something. Their solution was to embark on a $50 million, 5-year study program that looked more like a spending spree.

It soon became apparent that throwing money at this problem was no solution.

In 1985 and 1986, the Bureau spent $22 million studying drainage problems. Did this bring us any closer to a solution? The answer is "No."

During this period, the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program was poorly managed and disjointed. The Bureau's "program" consisted of highly technical and expensive studies which were leading nowhere. The study program was also operating under only vague congressional authority, and no steps were taken to recover the costs of these studies.

As a result, last year's continuing resolution authorized the Secretary of the Interior to "obligate no more than $8,800,000 by August 1, 1987, for the San Joaquin Valley Drainage Program." This amendment had the support of Mr. COELHO, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. PASHAYAN, and Mr. FAZIO. We wanted to force action by the administration to issue a legal opinion clarifying the program's authority, or submit necessary authorizing legislation.

The Interior Department Solicitor has now issued an opinion stating that there is sufficient authority under existing law to implement the program. In addition, management of the study program has improved, and it now appears to have a more clearly defined purpose.

As a result, there is a need to lift the August 1 deadline and allow funds appropriated in the continuing resolution to be obligated in August and September, 1987.

But the Secretary must recognize that our patience has worn thin. While the program has made some improvements, there is a long way to go.

There is still disagreement about the goals and objectives of the study program, and who should pay the costs. Unless we get answers to these questions, funding for the program should be eliminated.

As a result, my amendment provides that the Secretary must submit appropriate authorizing legislation for the program if funds are to be spent after October 1, 1987.

In addition, the amendment would also make lifting the August 1 deadline contingent on the Secretary complying with the California State Water Resource Control Board's order to clean up Kesterson Reservoir. The Secretary has already announced that he will "cooperate voluntarily" with at least part of that order.

The Secretary has expressed reservations about complying with that part of the order requiring him to im-

plement mitigation measures to replace valuable wetland wildlife habitat destroyed by the contamination at Kesterson.

Incredibly, lawyers in the Department actually believe that the Department may have no obligation to replace the lost habitat. This amendment will make it clear that they must comply with the State board order.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment on this side.

Mr. MILLER of California. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer support to the amendment offered by my friend and colleague, Mr. MILLER. The Interior Department has been dodging the Kesterson bullet for too long. The amendment offered by Mr. MILLER brings to an end the camouflage and smoke screen which has been the source of protection so inappropriately used by Interior for past several years. It places responsibility squarely where it belongs—on the Department of the Interior, and it places Congress in its rightful and effective role of overseeing the proper expenditure of funds and reviewing the progress of the solution to the problem.

We have listened with deepening skepticism about the need for more studies of a solution to this agricultural drainage problem. We have waited with "Job-like" patience for the results of reports on previous studies, and we have recently witnessed the carte blanche rejection of the recommendations contained in those studies by the State of California.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for the Interior Department to stop studying and start implementing. This amendment is designed to force that action. I support it, and I urge my colleagues to join with Mr. MILLER by giving their support.

The CHAIRMAN. Is any Member opposed to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Using funds previously provided in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1987 (Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591), the Secretary of the Interior is directed to undertake the following project in the amount specified hereafter:

Project	Amount
O'Neill Unit, Nebraska	$1,381,000

Using funds previously provided in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1987 (Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591), the Secretary of the Interior shall proceed with contracting for construction of the East-side and West-side roads and other features at the McGee Creek, Oklahoma, project in the amount specified hereafter:

Project	Amount
McGee Creek, Oklahoma	$7,755,000

LOAN PROGRAM

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Loan program" for the United Water Conservation District, to remain available until expended, $570,000, to be derived by transfer of unobligated balances in the "Construction program" from Teton Dam Failure, Payment of Claims funds provided under Public Law 94-355 and Public Law 94-438.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Notwithstanding provisions of title 5, U.S.C., except for section 5308, no funds approved for Southwestern Power Administration shall be used to pay the rates of basic pay and premium pay for power system dispatchers unless such rates are based on those prevailing for similar occupations in the electric power industry.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS: On page 24, after line 22, insert the following:

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Using funds previously appropriated in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1987, Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, the Secretary of Energy is directed to make available in fiscal year 1987 not less than $2,800,000 from the General Science and Research Activities appropriation to the Texas Accelerator Center, The Woodlands, Texas, to support ongoing research.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, let me explain the amendment.

The amendment would direct the Secretary of Energy to take out of the existing already appropriated funds not less than $2,800,000 from the general science and research and development activities appropriation to the Texas Accelerator Center, which has been established for some years by a consortium of universities. They are working on it, and we would like to continue that effort as an overall contribution to scientific achievement in this country.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

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

I am familiar with this amendment, the subcommittee is familiar with it, and we have no objection to it.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to just say that I want to thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, for offering this amendment. It is a very worthwhile amendment. The center that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] would provide funding for is doing very necessary work in high energy physics, and it is an asset to the entire Nation.

I thank my distinguished colleague for offering this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate chapter IV.

The text of chapter IV is as follows:

CHAPTER IV

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

For an additional amount for payment to the International Development Association by the Secretary of the Treasury, $207,476,749 for the United States contribution to the seventh replenishment, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

For an additional amount for payment to the African Development Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury, $36,639,000, for the United States contribution to the fourth replenishment of the African Development Fund, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For an additional amount for payment to the African Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the paid-in share portion of the United States share of the increase in capital stock, $6,492,127 to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the African Development Bank may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of such capital stock in an amount not to exceed $17,375,058.

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

ASSISTANCE FOR CENTRAL AMERICA

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

(a) Economic support fund: The President shall transfer to the "Economic support fund" for use pursuant to this heading $300,000,000, from funds made available by fiscal year 1987 or prior year Department of Defense Appropriations Acts.

(b) Funds transferred pursuant to paragraph (a) shall remain available until September 30, 1988: *Provided*, That the President shall make available the $300,000,000 transferred pursuant to paragraph (a) to

provide assistance under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to Economic support fund assistance) for the countries of Central America with democratically-elected governments as follows:

$64,000,000 shall be made available only for assistance for Guatemala,

$64,000,000 shall be made available only for assistance for Costa Rica,

$55,000,000 shall be made available only for assistance for Honduras,

$105,000,000 shall be made available only for assistance for El Salvador.

(c) Of the funds specified in paragraph (b), not less than 60 percent shall be used for assistance in accordance with the policy directions, purposes, and authorities of chapter 1 and chapter 9 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the remainder shall be used in a manner which will generate local currencies for use in accordance with those policy directions, purposes, and authorities.

(d) Preference shall be given, in El Salvador, to the import needs of the beneficiaries of agrarian reform.

(e) The local currencies generated from the funds specified in paragraph (b) for El Salvador shall be used for projects described in section 702(e)(2) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 (and of those local currencies, not less than 50 percent shall be used to support agrarian reform and not less than 10 percent shall be used for judicial reform).

(f) Of the funds transferred pursuant to paragraph (a), $2,000,000 shall be made available only for assistance for Belize.

(g) Of the funds transferred pursuant to paragraph (a), $10,000,000 shall be made available only for Child Survival Fund activities in the Central American democracies.

(h) Of the funds specified for El Salvador in paragraph (b), $50,000,000 shall be used only for earthquake relief and reconstruction which shall be used in accordance with the authorities contained in section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and shall be accounted for separately.

(i) The assistance provided under this heading shall be in addition to the amount previously allocated for fiscal year 1987 for these countries pursuant to section 653 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(j) Assistance pursuant to this heading shall be provided consistent with the policies contained in section 702 of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 (relating to El Salvador), section 703 of that Act (relating to Guatemala), and chapter 6 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to the Central America Democracy, Peace, and Development Initiative).

(k) Funds made available for assistance pursuant to this heading may be obligated only in accordance with the Congressional notification procedures applicable under section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and after submission of an official budget request for such funds and an official budget request identifying the Department of Defense transfers associated with these funds.

ASSISTANCE FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA

Of the funds appropriated for the "Economic support fund" in the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1987 (as contained in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591) or in previously enacted appropriations Acts, $50,000,000 shall be made available only as follows:

(a) $37,500,000 shall be made available to assist the member states of the Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference (SADCC) in carrying out the most urgent sector projects supported by SADCC in the following sectors: transportation and communications, energy (including the improved utilization of electrical power sources which already exist in the member states and offer the potential to swiftly reduce the dependence of those states on South Africa for electricity), agricultural research and training, and industrial development and trade (including private sector initiatives): *Provided*, That of this amount not less than 60 percent shall be used in the transportation sector.

(b) $12,500,000 shall be made available for humanitarian assistance for the member states of SADCC for such activities as: transport of emergency food and medical supplies; refugee assistance; and disaster relief and rehabilitation assistance which shall be provided pursuant to the authorities contained in section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

(c) Of the funds made available for the SADCC member countries for humanitarian assistance by paragraph (b), up to $5,000,000 may be made available for the United Nations Children's Fund's emergency appeals for affected countries in southern Africa.

(d) None of the funds made available under this heading may be derived from funds previously allocated for Africa in fiscal year 1987 pursuant to section 653 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including funds used to carry out section 802(a) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985). Funds made available under this heading may be used without regard to the limitations contained in section 620(q) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and section 518 of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1987.

(e) None of the funds made available under this heading shall be available for obligation pursuant to the provisions of this heading until they have been authorized.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $50,000,000 to be available only for the Philippines: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be available until they have been authorized.

EXPORT ASSISTANCE

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

LIMITATION ON PROGRAM ACTIVITY

Notwithstanding the "limitation on program activity" contained in Title IV of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1987 in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, during the fiscal year 1987 and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall be reduced from $900,000,000 to $800,000,000, and shall be provided under the terms and conditions in the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act of 1987 as they apply to the Export-Import Bank.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

GUARANTY RESERVE FUND

Section 24(c) of the Arms Export Control Act is amended subject to authorization, by striking the second paragraph and inserting the following:

"Funds provided for necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, and funds provided for necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II and of section 503 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay claims on the Guaranty Reserve Fund to the extent that funds in the Guaranty Reserve Fund are inadequate for that purpose.".

MORATORIUM ON FOREIGN MILITARY SALES DEBT RESTRUCTURING

Notwithstanding any other provision of law relating to foreign military sales or to special authorities of the President related to foreign policy, the executive branch shall not implement the proposal embodied in the determination of the President dated December 18, 1986 related to "FMS Debt Restructuring" and "prepayments" and "partial interest capitalization" of debt payments related to foreign military credit sales loans until the later of October 1, 1987 or until legislation providing for the appropriation, for the full fiscal year, of funding for Foreign Assistance and Related Programs, fiscal year 1988, passes Congress and is signed into law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: Beginning on page 25, strike chapter IV of title I.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that under the rule the time on this particular amendment is controlled, is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. And the time to be assigned on the two sides will be 15 minutes to each side; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 15 minutes in support of the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

We have not been advised on this side what the amendment is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the amendment is in order under the rule. It strikes chapter IV of title I.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, now that we are advised, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, what this particular amendment does is strikes the foreign

aid section of this bill. What we have in this particular section is a section that diverts money away from some of our best friends, and gives money to opponent's of our foreign policy.

In Central America the administration attempted to respond to real needs there. The committee has changed the priorities there, so that what we have is money going to people who basically oppose U.S. policies in the area.

More importantly, what we have done is, we have taken money also under this section; and we have sent $50 million over to Africa.

We have sent it to southern Africa, where the states of southern Africa are nations that totally oppose United States policy, and in many cases are outright Communist states.

I think that this is a mixed-up priority of terrible proportions, and ought not be voted on by this House.

Second, there is $250 million in this particular section for International Development Assistance.

IDA offers 50-year no-interest loans to help farm subsidies, to modernize industries, and support ailing oil producers. All of those things are being done in other countries.

Next week we are going to be out here voting on a trade bill, and a lot of Members will be down here complaining about unfair competition and foreign subsidies.

Who we are, what we are going to do with this bill is actually subsidize overseas competition.

It is things like hundred-million-dollar loans to rehabilitate a machine tool industry in China, rice exports in Burma, all kinds of things that we ought not to be helping to fund.

Mr. MACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. A moment ago you referred to the $300 million, I believe, for Central American countries.

Mr. WALKER. I did; that is correct.

Mr. MACK. I believe, my understanding is that that $300 million was part of the agreement that we made last year when we agreed to funding the Contras, the $100 million?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Instead of living up to that agreement, we have readjusted the priorities in this bill to take the money away from our friends, and give it to our adversaries.

Mr. MACK. When you say our friends, would you be more specific about who you are talking about?

Mr. WALKER. We take away the money from the Contras, the embryonic democracy in El Salvador has money taken away from it under this approach, and instead we end up with a bill that, as I say, sends this $50 million over to southern Africa where we are going to give money to places like Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Angola, all of which in the case of Mozambique, it is a Communist state.

In Zimbabwe, they bought Mig-29 airplanes from the Soviet Union, 12 of them.

We have got a situation here where we really are with this particular bill denying our friends money and giving it to our adversaries, and it makes absolutely no sense.

It is certainly a waste of the taxpayers money, and I would hope that we would vote for this amendment and end this 600 million dollars' worth of spending.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any Member who seeks time in opposition to this amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

□ 1800

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has managed to put into four sentences more misinformation than I have ever heard provided on the House floor in the 18 years I have been here.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read to the House a wire service story that appeared yesterday. The lead paragraph says as follows:

> Secretary of State George P. Shultz, pounding the podium for emphasis, denounced congressional reductions in the foreign affairs budget Wednesday, calling the cuts "brutal, wrong and stupid."

It then went on to say, he called the reductions "brutal," and said:

> They would force a massive reduction in American assistance to countries that promote strategic U.S. interests and would force the U.S. presence around the world to shrink.
>
> It is stupid to be hauling down the flag around the world as we are being forced to do.

A second point which I would like to bring to the attention of the House: OMB sent the Appropriations Committee a letter when this bill was before the full committee indicating that they would recommend, or might possibly recommend, a veto of this bill because this section of the bill did not give the President enough money. In other words in the eyes of OMB we did not spend enough money for foreign aid. Yet, the administration's little helper is now out here trying to really correct the problem.

I would like the Members to look at some facts. The administration asked us to provide $1.1 billion in supplemental funding for foreign assistance. We gave them $650 million. Every penny in this bill for foreign assistance is a penny which was requested by the administration. Not one penny which they did not request is in this bill. We cut the request by half.

Second, we provided $300 million to Central America. The assertion just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we took money away from Central America, away from countries like Honduras to give to African countries is absolute nonsense and baloney. I would say more if the rules provided me the opportunity.

By the fact is, the fact is we provided the full $300 million the administration asked for Central American funding. We provided the $50 million the administration asked for southern Africa in order to follow up on the antiapartheid program of this Congress last year.

We provided the $50 million in military aid to the Philippines, which the administration requested. We provided $250 million for the international financial institutions which the administration requested. In fact, we provided $42 million less for the banks than the administration asked for because we did not think we could afford it. We did all of that by providing for a zero increase in the deficit.

This chapter of the bill increases the deficit this year by not one penny because every dollar that we provide in the bill we pay for by taking that money from someplace else. We do not, however, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania suggested, take it from Central America. We do not take money away from El Salvador. We provide $55 million in additional funding for El Salvador. We provide every dollar that the administration asks for under expedited procedures for El Salvador. The only reduction from their request was on the earthquake relief which we cut in half because they have not been able to get that program off the ground and we have made quite clear we will provide the other $50 million in the regular appropriation bill.

For Honduras, we provided $55 million in new money. We did not take anything away from Honduras. We provided $55 million in new money. This committee recommendation is $36 million above the administration's original request for Honduras.

In Costa Rica, we provided $149 million, which is $1 million less than that originally requested by the administration in their fiscal 1987 budget. We provided $62 million for Guatemala.

I would like to simply make one point in closing. You can demagog if you want anytime that the Congress tries to meet administration requests for foreign assistance; that is up to you. I frankly am not enthusiastic about a single dime in this bill. I am

here providing it today because I am supposed to do my duty. We made a deal; we promised the President of the United States that he would have a $300 million request on the floor and we have provided that request. Every single country in Central America is getting additional funding. Not one dime is being taken away from Central America to fund Africa.

I remind you that the African request in this bill was requested by the administration, not by anybody else.

So if you want to vote against it, you go ahead and vote against it. It is irresponsible, it is gutless; it is, as Secretary of State George Shultz said, "stupid." That does not surprise me given where the amendment is coming from.

I would suggest Members do whatever you want to do on this. I am going to support the commitment that we made to the administration to try to get their request through. If people on this side of the aisle want to oppose their own administration, I think it is time the Secretary of State see where his real opposition is coming from.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

We do not have much time to debate this important amendment, but I just want to take a couple of minutes to point out its impact and its symbolism to those who view it as just another welcome opportunity to bash foreign aid.

To those on my side of the aisle, your vote for this amendment is a vote to cripple your President even further in the international arena. We heard a lot of very passionate arguments during the debate on the arms control amendments that the Congress should not tie the President's hands when it comes to international negotiations. Yet that is precisely what this amendment would do.

This amendment would remove a few more tools of the few that the President has left in several very important but unstable places in the world—namely Central America, Africa, and the Philippines. That is what this chapter is all about.

You would cut out completely the additional $300 million in economic aid to four Central American democracies. That aid was promised last year to these closest neighbors of Nicaragua as part of the Contra-aid compromise. What signal do you want to send now if you vote to renege on this promise? What do you think Daniel Ortega will say about that? What will the elected governments of these four nations tell their people about the United States?

Then you would cut out aid to South Africa's closest neighbors. What kind of a signal does that send? What position does that place your President in when he works with the international community to try to bring stability and economic progress to that flashpoint region?

And then, you would cut out very critical security assistance to the Philippines. We all stood on this floor last year and applauded the courage and the tenacity of President Aquino in her attempt to bring true democracy and economic justice to her people. The ceasefire has broken down in that country, and she needs our help. Will you abandon her now?

This is not just a bash foreign aid vote. It is a bash United States national interests vote. It is a tie your President's hands vote. It is a bad vote.

I urge you to vote against this cripple America amendment.

□ 1810

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, and I believe there is a proper role for a program of foreign assistance as a means of furthering the interests of the United States.

This appropriation does not do that.

This title provides for an appropriation of $600 million. At least half of that money is specifically earmarked to work against the interests of the United States.

Half of this money is to go to Central America—but in a way that sends a very clear signal to the democracies in Central America that they are better off if they do not support our own policies. Fifty million dollars less than the President asked for El Salvador. Ten million dollars less for Honduras—the poorest country in the region. And nearly $50 million more for the two countries that are the most critical of our policies.

The other half of this money goes primarily to work against our interests—against our national interests and against the specific interests of American manufacturers, American businessmen, and American farmers.

Fifty million dollars of this money goes to help the frontline Marxist countries of southern Africa. To Zimbabwe—presumably to help pay the Russians for the 12 new Mig-29's. To Mozambique, which calls itself a Marxist-Leninist country and voted against the United States last year in the United Naitons 94.1 percent of the time.

Two hundred and fifty million dollars of this money—a quarter of a billion dollars—goes to the World Bank's International Development Association to provide 50-year, interest-free loans to nations which consistently oppose U.S. policies. To help China, which is one of the wealthiest countries in the world—and which loans its money to other countries at regular interest rates. To help India, which has a first-class credit rating and can borrow money on the commercial market.

Are we going to vote to help India and China get 50-year loans, with no interest payments, when American farmers can't even get approval to stretch out a loan or negotiate a lower interest rate?

A quarter of a billion dollars for loans that help rehabilitate the machine tool industry—not in Pennsylvania, but in China; to help not Texas, but Indonesia, cope with falling oil prices; to help increase rice exports not from California, but from Burma.

There is nothing urgent in this foreign aid section. Those who insist on bypassing the procedures already in place for considering the $300 million for Central America have to be held responsible for what happens to it.

This is not just another year for foreign aid. We just can't throw money out and forget about how that money gets used or who gets it. We have to make sure our foreign aid program serves our Nation's interests by responding to our highest priorities and by delivering aid to countries that are our friends. This bill doesn't do that.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation works against Americans and it works against America, and I'm going to vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, is entitled to conclude debate, and has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin indicated that to vote against this was gutless and stupid. What is stupid about voting against $50 million going to the front-line states in southern Africa that vote consistently against us in the United Nations, who asked that the sanctions be imposed against South Africa, and then asked us to bail them out because we did what they asked?

In addition to that, it has been brought out very clearly by one of my colleagues that they are buying right now 12 Mig-29 fighter-bombers, and the only place that I know of that has these planes outside the Soviet Union is Zimbabwe, and possibly India.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. No, I will not yield; I only have 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, why is it wrong to vote against sending our taxpayers' dollars to Communist Mozambique, which has received over $1 billion from the Soviet Union, has over 1,000 Soviet, East German, Cuban, and North Korean advisers in that country, and continues to bad-mouth us every single chance they get? They vote against us, as the gentleman said, almost 95 percent of the time in the United Nations, and yet we are trying to wean them away from the Soviet Union by giving them our taxpayers' life's blood.

What is wrong with not giving aid to Zambia? Zambians, it has been reported, are routinely sodomizing their children in Zambia's prisons, and they are keeping in prisons that were built for 80 people more than 500 political prisoners.

What is wrong with cutting off aid to Zimbabwe? Why give aid to Zimbabwe? Mugabe has said time and again that he is a Marxist-Leninist for life.

I think the points that have been made here have been made very clearly, that it is not proper for the U.S. taxpayer to fund Communist governments who have put themselves in the trick bag that they are in. We should be supporting democracies around this world and using the taxpayers' money of this country to promote democracy under the Reagan doctrine, and not continue to support Communist repressionist governments like we are doing in this bill.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I am not here to talk about all the respective countries that are going to be receiving money; I want to talk a little bit about America.

Someone said earlier that they are going to be hauling down the American flag somewhere around the world. I am more concerned and more worried about the fact that someday frustrated Americans are going to start hauling the flag down in America. I represent a district which lost 55,000 jobs in the last 10 years. No one in this House, no President, no Senator, has said "Jim, what can we do to help?"

I think that it is time, before we ship more money overseas, we start taking a look at home folks.

Now let us talk about President Aquino and the sob stories that we heard. She came over here, a 1-day visit, and left with 200 million additional dollars last year. Now I am appealing to some sanity, not money going overseas and the merits of those respective countries. I am talking about the so-called budget-busting in America, and if we are going to have to bust it, why not help our own?

I am talking about let us come home today, let us vote for this amendment, let us see how we might put that money to more practical use in America, and let us look at my area, OK?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has 4 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has 3 minutes remaining.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the gentleman from Mississippi is going to use his entire 3 minutes to close? Is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. We will use it to close the debate.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

□ 1820

Mr. GINGRICH. We heard earlier from the very distinguished and very brilliant chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee and he posed several challenges and I want to answer them.

I voted for foreign aid and I helped, I think, carry my party in that direction. I will continue to vote for foreign aid when it is helpful to America. I think that the new House czar of foreign aid wants to have my vote for his version of foreign policy, and it is his policy that I will not vote for.

This bill punishes America's strongest allies in Central America. This bill give three southern African countries money which includes two Communist colonies and Zimbabwe. This bill, in effect, would subsidize Zimbabwe's purchase of Mig-29's from the Soviet Union.

Of these three southern African left-wing countries, one votes 5 percent for the United States in the United Nations, one votes 9 percent for the United States in the United Nations, and one votes 14 percent for the United States in the United Nations. So the gentleman's foreign policy would finance Soviet colonies at the expense of America's allies in Central America. The gentleman's foreign policy favors Soviet front-line states at the expense of American front-line allies.

But let me go a stage further. I stood here earlier, and obviously the gentleman was talking about me as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I talked about OMB. I am not an ally of most of the State Department bureaucracy. I am not an ally of a large part of what America does in foreign policy because, in my judgment, in terms of that bureaucracy it is not effective, it does not get the job done for America.

I think for us to spend more multilateral money where we have no real control and no real influence is foolish if we have limited resources. I think for us to punish Honduras is foolish when they have stood by us. I think for us to prop up Soviet colonies like Angola and Mozambique is virtually irrational and makes no sense in terms of the balance of world power.

So I am pleased to be here on the floor, and I say I am for Reagan's values; I am not for the State Department bureaucracy, not in favor of the kinds of policies that prop up Soviet states and Soviet colonies. I think that the proportions of the foreign aid bill written recently by the gentleman from Wisconsin deserve defeat to send the signal that this House will not waste the American taxpayers' money propping up Communist states and punishing American allies.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognzied for 1 minute.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I am sorry that the gentleman from Wisconsin in his remarks decided to turn some of these things personal. I do not think it is a personal kind of issue. I think it is an extremely important policy issue.

The gentleman called it irresponsible to vote for this amendment. Let me suggest that I do not think the American people are going to regard it as irresponsible to stop sending their money overseas in ways that do harm to our country. That is the issue here before us.

A vote for this amendment says not that we are against all foreign aid for all time, but we are against this kind of foreign aid, foreign aid that goes overseas in ways that end up harming America.

We deserve to have a foreign aid program that helps this country, not hurts this country, and that is exactly what we would do by spending this $650 million. We would spend money overseas, our tax money, in ways that harm America. That is wrong and I would urge support of the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

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

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

In speaking in support of this amendment my friend from Oklahoma made a number of points which I think deserve an answer. One point was that the $300 million that we are providing for the Central American

democracies is somehow being provided in a mix which does not conform to his priorities. I would simply note that the rule provided an opportunity for my friend from Oklahoma to offer an amendment to reverse or to adjust those priorities, but he chose not to offer the amendment, and I think it is, therefore, a little strange that he would not be complaining about that.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield, since he used my name?

Mr. McHUGH. I do not have the time to yield.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. If the gentleman will yield, I can explain to him why I did not offer the amendment.

Mr. McHUGH. I do not have the time to yield.

Second, the gentleman from Oklahoma suggests that a substantial amount of resources in the International Development Association goes to countries that are not friendly to the United States. That is simply not true. Of the funds that go to countries receiving funds from IDA, 54 percent that we give bilateral assistance to now, by definition, are friends of the United States; and second, 32 percent of the funds go to other friends of the United States, such as Argentina. You do not have to take my word for this. The Secretary of the Treasury, James Baker, has made this very point very strongly in hearings before our subcommittee. So 86 percent of the funds in IDA go to friends of the United States.

For that reason, it is important to defeat this amendment.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me just say that a few weeks ago on this floor we heard people saying that the budget was too low in foreign aid, and in terms of protecting our national interests. Now they want, those very same people, want to strike the foreign aid that is in this supplemental.

Then they want to say that what we are doing is aiding the enemies of our country. The aid in this bill for Mozambique is there because the Reagan administration wants it. The aid for Zimbabwe is in there because the Reagan administration wants it.

What is the Reagan doctrine? It was demonstrated several months ago when Ronald Reagan himself entertained the President at that time of Mozambique, Samora Machel, and welcomed him and asked him to join in an alliance to end the strife on the borders of southern Africa. Now we are being told that that runs counter to the Reagan administration.

Let me just simply say a vote for this amendment will be a vote that will weaken our foreign security as well as strengthen Africa's apartheid hand.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if I can just use the balance of my time I want to make three points.

Every dollar in this bill for foreign aid is here because Ronald Reagan asked for it.

Second, it has been suggested we are punishing Honduras. Some punishment when you give them $55 million more in American taxpayer dollars. Some punishment. I think a lot of people would like to be punished that way.

Third, a vote for this amendment most clearly is a vote for South Africa.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, noes 194, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

AYES—209

Applegate
Archer
Armey
Badham
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Bennett
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boner (TN)
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Coughlin
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
Davis (IL)
Davis (MI)
DeFazio
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Dyson
Eckart
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Fields
Flippo
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gibbons
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gradison
Grandy
Gregg
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hiler
Holloway
Hopkins
Houghton
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kolbe
Kolter
Konnyu
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Latta
Leath (TX)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Luken, Thomas
Lukens, Donald
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Nichols
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Penny
Perkins
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ravenel
Ray
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Russo
Saiki
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Spence
Stallings
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Traficant
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Watkins
Weber
Weldon
Whittaker
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—194

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Cardin
Carper
Clarke
Clay
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dowdy
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Edwards (CA)
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Florio
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grant
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Jeffords
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lowry (WA)
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Nelson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Panetta
Pease
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richardson
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Roukema
Roybal
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Schneider
Schumer
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Traxler
Udall
Vento
Visclosky
Walgren
Waxman
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolpe
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NOT VOTING—31

Annunzio
Bartlett
Bentley
Boulter
Brown (CA)
Collins
Courter
Daniel
Dorgan (ND)

Dymally	Martinez	Solomon
Foglietta	McDade	Stangeland
Ford (TN)	McKinney	Taylor
Hatcher	Murphy	Torricelli
Jones (TN)	Neal	Towns
Kemp	Pepper	Wilson
Leach (IA)	Rostenkowski	
Livingston	Scheuer	

□ 1840

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Boulter for, with Mr. Torricelli against.

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

Messrs. WOLF, TALLON, MILLER of Washington, HUTTO, COUGHLIN, BATES, and RAY changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER V

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $3,000,000: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount, $1,500,000 shall be available until expended and placed in a reserve for release at the discretion of the Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission after consultation with the Congress.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Of the funds provided to the Consumer Product Safety Commission for "Salaries and expenses" in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, an additional $20,000 shall be available for personnel compensation and benefits for the Commissioners of the Consumer Product Safety Commission appointed pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 2053.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $12,000,000, to be derived by transfer from "Construction grants".

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves deferral D87-54 relating to the Environmental Protection Agency, "Research and development", as set forth in the message of January 28, 1987, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this Act and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

ABATEMENT, CONTROL, AND COMPLIANCE

Of the funds appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency for "Abatement, control, and compliance" in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591 for the purposes of the Asbestos School Hazards Abatement Act of 1984, an additional $2,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses for section 206(d)(2) Public Law 99-519.

(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves deferral D87-55 relating to the Environmental Protection Agency, "Abatement, control, and compliance", as set forth in the message of January 28, 1987, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this Act and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Abatement, control, and compliance", $18,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988, and to be derived by transfer from "Construction grants".

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BOLAND: On Page 35, line 3 strike "$18,000,000" and insert in lieu the following: "Including $9,000,000 which shall be available for the project authorized by section 515 of the Water Quality Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-4), $27,000,000".

On Page 35, line 12 strike "$1,170,000,000" and insert in lieu the following: "$1,161,000,000".

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous request that they be in order notwithstanding the fact that they may involve paragraphs of the bill not yet read by the Clerk.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1850

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, these amendments are not controversial. They are needed to take care of a bonding problem related to a sewage treatment plant which turned out to be more pressing than we realized when the committee reported the bill.

This project is authorized, and my amendment would have no impact on either budget authority or outlays.

The CHAIMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

Of the funds appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency for "Construction grants" in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, the $1,200,000,000 which was not to become available until enactment of a subsequent appropriations Act authorizing the obligation of such funds is hereby made available: *Provided*, That the $1,170,000,000 remaining after the transfers to "Salaries and expenses" and "Abatement, control, and compliance" shall be allocated and used in accordance with the provisions of the Water Quality Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-4).

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE RESPONSE TRUST FUND

Of the funds provided to the Environmental Protection Agency for "Hazardous Substance Response Trust Fund" in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, no more than $16,000,000 shall be available to carry out the purposes of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-499).

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The regulation changes to 44 CFR parts 59 and 60 promulgated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and set forth at 51 Fed. Reg. 30306-30309 (August 25, 1986), which amended the definition, placement, and exclusion of mobile homes in an existing mobile home park or mobile home subdivision, as previously defined, shall not be effective from enactment of this Act through September 30, 1988.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time because the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has asked me to engage in a colloquy with him.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to engage my dear friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] in a brief colloquy relative to matters under the jurisdiction of his subcommittee, the HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee.

It is my understanding, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that the bill contains transitional funding out of Superfund moneys for a non-Superfund program, the Community Right-to-Know Program.

I have expressed my concern elsewhere about the precedent of funding non-Superfund programs with the limited moneys in the Superfund, which are needed to protect the public from exposure to toxic chemicals.

I would like to ask my good friend from Massachusetts if he would state for record why this one-time, transitional funding is necessary this year for Community Right-to-Know.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce is correct: this bill includes transitional funding for the Community Right-to-Know Program using Superfund moneys in 1987.

While I share the concerns the chairman has expressed and intend to oppose further use of Superfund moneys for non-Superfund activities, fiscal year 1987 presented the Congress with a special problem.

Some EPA Community Right-to-Know activities had been conducted under Superfund prior to its reauthorization last October. Due to the timing of final Superfund conference action, the expanded Right-to-Know activities were not anticipated or funded in

EPA's 1987 operating budget. Because of budget constraints and the risk that the Right-to-Know Program would fail if EPA does not complete its tasks promptly, it seemed prudent to provide transitional funding from Superfund for this single fiscal year.

The committee's rationale is explained in detail on pages 46 and 47 of the report. The chairman and I have also exchanged letters on this special situation, and pursuant to the general leave request, the letters would be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the letters to which I referred are as follows:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, March 11, 1987.

Hon. JOHN DINGELL,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you are well aware, the Environmental Protection Agency is having difficulty identifying 1987 funds to meet its responsibilities under the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986. I have discussed this issue at some length with Administrator Thomas at our appropriations hearings this week.

I am well aware that the Superfund conferees reached a clear and deliberate decision that Title III activities should *not* be funded from Superfund. Let me assure you that I support that policy and will continue my efforts to limit the use of Superfund monies to their intended purposes. We do, however, face a dilemma in 1987. Some of the Title III activities required of EPA were conducted under Superfund prior to its reauthorization. Because of the timing of final action on the Superfund conference last year, these activities and other Title III activities were not anticipated or funded in our regular appropriations for EPA's operating programs. We are now confronted with tight budget constraints and other supplemental requirements in EPA related to pay increases, the new retirement system, additional Clean Water standards and pesticide indemnification.

Administrator Thomas is appealing for limited use of previously appropriated Superfund monies, which would not be obligated in 1987, so that EPA can meet its immediate obligations under Title III. Given the circumstances, I feel that we could justify 1987 as a transitional year, until Title III can be integrated into EPA's operating program budget in 1988 and beyond. Without EPA guidance on Title III, I am concerned that the level of confusion and wasted effort, as states and localities undertake their emergency planning and right-to-know programs, would almost insure that the program would not function as intended.

If the authorizing committees would support this transitional funding plan—and we can get a clear understanding with EPA that future Title III funding come within the base program—the Appropriations Committee could use the upcoming 1987 supplemental bill to make up to $16 million available under Superfund to address this situation.

Let me assure you that I will join you in opposing future efforts to divert Superfund monies from their intended purpose.

Sincerely,

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on HUD-Independnet Agencies.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, March 12, 1987.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on HUD and Independent Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, H-143, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 11, 1987 outlining the problems you face in funding the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986.

As you know, I am opposed to funding new activities required by the Act out of the Superfund. During conference on the Superfund legislation, the House conferees fought hard to limit unwarranted raids on the monies in the Superfund for purposes not related to cleanup of abandoned hazardous substances. I am concerned, quite frankly, that what we are now seeing in the Administration's request for right-to-know funding out of Superfund monies is an attempt by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Office of Management and Budget to do exactly what the House conferees worked so hard to limit: using the Superfund as a pot of money for non-Superfund activities. The Superfund program is too important to the health and safety of the public to allow this to happen. As you and I have discussed, I am concerned that we would only encourage the Administration in its erroneous view of the Superfund if we set the precedent of funding non-Superfund activities.

Having stated why I believe we should not fund new right-to-know activities from the Superfund, I note that both you and our colleague Al Swift, the lead House conferee on Title III, have properly pointed out that some of the immediate activities required of EPA under the Act are activities which were funded under Superfund prior to its reauthorization. Failure to allow completion of those activities during the transitional period prior to FY 1988 would waste money and put the delegation of the right-to-know program to the states in jeopardy. In view of these unique circumstances, I will reluctantly agree to support the proposed one-time, transitional funding in FY 1987 out of Superfund monies. I respectfully request, however, that our correspondence on this issue be included in your Committee report and would also request an assurance from you that you will summarily reject future Administration requests to fund non-Superfund activities with Superfund monies.

I appreciate all the assistance and cooperation that you and your Subcommittee have extended to this Committee over the years in addressing the funding needs of the Environmental Protection Agency and look forward to continuing to work with you.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman will continue to yield, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] for his kindness and for the competent and efficient way in which he and his subcommittee have handled this difficult question.

I would like to observe that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] has also expressed concern on this matter, and at the appropriate time I will be inserting in the RECORD a letter from the gentleman from Illinois regarding this matter. The gentleman from Massachusetts always behaves as a complete gentleman and a very competent and valuable Member of this body. I thank him for his kindness and for the fine manner in which he has handled this matter.

The letter follows:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, April 21, 1987.

Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It has come to my attention that H.R. 1827, providing for certain supplemental appropriations, contains a provision relating to the Hazardous Substance Response Trust Fund ("Superfund") which is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. As Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, it is my responsibility to indicate my concern about this circumvention of appropriate committee jurisdiction.

The Supplemental Appropriations provision in question would allow Superfund moneys in the amount of $16 million to be spent for the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-know Act of 1986, which is an impermissible expenditure of funds from Superfund. The Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Superfund and the determination of general permissible expenditure purposes from the Superfund which are included in section 9507 of the Internal Revenue Code.

It is my understanding that there are special circumstances which have necessitated this unusual diversion of funds from Superfund and, therefore, I will not object to inclusion of the provision in the H.R. 1827. In the future, however, it is important that the Committee on Ways and Means be given the opportunity to consider all matters within the Committee's jurisdiction. I will appreciate your cooperation in ensuring that those matters within the Committee's jurisdiction which are considered by the Appropriations Committee are so referred in the future.

With warm regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DAN ROSTENKOWSKI,
Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", $80,200,000, to remain available until expended.

MEDICAL CARE

Of the funds provided under this head in the conference report on H.R. 5313, Department of Housing and Urban Development—Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1987, as enacted by Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, $44,178,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1988, to fund central procurement contracts for the acqui-

sition of automated data processing equipment and contracts for major systems support in amounts not less than $1,000,000 for the Decentralized Hospital Computer Program and the Integrated Hospital System.

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

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Labor-HHS Appropriations Subcommittee about funding for the Physician Payment Review Commission.

Payment for physician services under Medicare is one of the fastest growing domestic programs. By 1988, payments will total $24 billion a year, almost double the 1983 level.

The Physician Payment Review Commission was established last year to develop reform proposals for consideration by the Congress. We expect, the Commission to play a crucial role in the reform of the Medicare Program. The Commission is already beginning to fulfill that role, with its excellent first annual report.

Does the distinguished chairman concur with these expectations?

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. Yes. I believe that the Commission is off to a good start.

Mr. WAXMAN. I am concerned that the Commission does not have sufficient funds to meet the demands we are placing on it. Inadequate funding for the Commission should not be allowed to stand in the way of our moving ahead vigorously with Medicare reform. The Commission asked for a supplemental appropriation of $362,000 this year and for an fiscal year 1988 appropriation of $3.2 million. These amounts are reasonable, given the tasks we have assigned to it. Could the gentleman tell me his views on this level of funding?

Mr. NATCHER. As the gentleman is aware, the Appropriations Committee did not recommend additional funding for 1987 based on a review of the Commission's current and proposed spending for this year. The reasons for this are described on page 67 of the committee report. I want to assure the gentleman, however, that the committee understands the importance of the Commission and will give careful consideration to the needs of the Commission as we consider funding for 1988.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for that statement, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Of the funds provided under this head in the conference report on H.R. 5313, Department of Housing and Urban Development—Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1987, as enacted by Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, $17,925,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1988, to fund contracts in amounts not less than $1,000,000 for the acquisition of automated data processing equipment and services to support the modernization program of the Department of Veterans Benefits.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

Not more than $2,000,000 shall be available from the existing unobligated balance of the "Construction, major projects" appropriation for settlement of a contractor's claim involving the Veterans Administration Medical Center, Huntington, West Virginia.

VETERANS JOB TRAINING

For payments to defray the costs of training and provision of incentives to employers to hire and train certain veterans as authorized by the Veterans' Job Tranining Act, as amended (29 U.S.C. 1721), $30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1989.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The mission of the Veterans Administration Medical Center at Walla Walla, Washington, shall not be changed from that in existence on January 1, 1987.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", $450,000.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resource management", $2,800,000.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Operation of the national park system", $18,050,000.

LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Land acquisition and State assistance", $13,910,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 251k, the Secretary may acquire the 270-acre parcel known as Keystone Spit on Whidbey Island, Washington, and convey such parcel to the State of Washington in exchange for the approximately 1,000 acres of tidelands owned by such State within the boundary of Olympic National Park: *Provided further,* That if recreational uses of these tidelands must be regulated, the National Park Service shall consult with the State of Washington prior to the implementation of any such regulations: *Provided further,* That the exchange must include the mineral rights of the tidelands.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for "Surveys, investigations, and research", $2,597,000, of which $597,000 shall remain available until expended.

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

LEASING AND ROYALTY MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Leasing and royalty management", $800,000.

PAYMENTS TO STATES FROM RECEIPTS UNDER MINERAL LEASING ACT

In fiscal year 1987 the Department of the Interior shall deduct an amount equal to one half of the total annual cost of operation of the Federal onshore mineral leasing programs of the Minerals Management Service, Bureau of Land Management and the United States Forest Service from Federal onshore mineral leasing receipts prior to the division and distribution of such receipts between the states and the Treasury and shall credit these amounts to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS

The Bureau of Indian Affairs shall not contract with any third party for the management of tribal or individual Indian trust funds until: an accounting of the funds has been completed and provided to the appropriate tribes or individuals; and the appropriate Committees of the Congress and the tribes have been consulted with as to the terms of the proposed contract or agreement: *Provided,* That the Bureau may not implement or take steps leading to implementation of proposed initiatives, including but not limited to imposition of a flat fifteen per centum administrative fee for tribal contractors, and imposition of tuition fees at Bureau post-secondary schools, until Congress has reviewed all such initiatives and approved them as part of the fiscal year 1988 appropriations process.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

(BY TRANSFER)

For an additional amount for "State and private forestry", $1,500,000, to be derived by transfer from the permanent appropriation entitled "Timber purchaser roads constructed by Forest Service".

CONSTRUCTION

(BY TRANSFER)

For an additional amount for "Construction", $130,000, to be derived by transfer from the permanent appropriation entitled "Timber purchaser roads constructed by Forest Service".

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION: MOUNT ST. HELENS NATIONAL VOLCANIC MONUMENT

For payment of obligations incurred for construction of a road serving the Mount St. Helens National Volcanic Monument, $9,915,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than Mass Transit Account), to remain available until expended to liquidate the contract authority provided in title II of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1987, as included in section 101(h) of Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

SPECIAL ACTS

Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, section 101(h), Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1987, under this head, is amended by inserting ", Wasatch" after the word "Cache".

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Of the funds appropriated under this head in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, an additional $2,800,000 shall be available for continuing a research and development initiative with the National Laboratories for new technologies up to proof-of-concept testing to increase significantly the energy efficiency of processes that produce steel, and under the same conditions contained under this head in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

Personnel ceilings may not be imposed on the Indian Health Service nor may any action be taken to reduce the full-time equivalent level of the Indian Health Service by the elimination of temporary employees by reduction in force, hiring freeze or any other means without Congress having reviewed and approved such a proposal as part of the fiscal year 1988 appropriations process.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $500,000.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $80,000.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

Public Law 96-388, as amended (36 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.) is further amended as follows:

(1) 36 U.S.C. 1405(a) is amended by deleting the words "the President upon the recommendation of the Chairperson of the Council" and substituting "the Chairperson of the Council, subject to confirmation of the Council", and adding the following new sentence: "The Executive Director shall serve at the pleasure of the Council.";

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(2) 36 U.S.C. 1405(b) is amended by striking the "." in subsection (2) and adding "; and" after "law" and adding the following new subsection:

"(3) implement decisions of the Council, in the manner directed by the Council, and perform such other functions as may be assigned from time to time by the Council, the Executive Committee of the Council, or the Chairperson of the Council.".

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Training and employment services" for activities authorized by sections 236, 237, and 238 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, $20,000,000: *Provided,* That $50,000,000 appropriated under this heading in the conference version of H.R. 5233, and made available by the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1987, Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, for the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program shall be available for obligation upon enactment of this bill for the Summer Youth Employment and Training Program for program year 1986 only.

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS

For an additional amount for "Community service employment for older Americans", to carry out the activities for national grants or contracts with public agencies and public or private nonprofit organizations under paragraph (1)(A) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, $7,800,000.

For an additional amount for "Community service employment for older Americans", to carry out the activities for grants to States under paragraph (3) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, $2,200,000.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "State unemployment insurance and employment service operations", $130,000,000 from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund, of which $30,000,000 shall be used to carry out the targeted jobs tax credit program under section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and of which $55,000,000 shall be available only to the extent necessary to administer unemployment compensation laws to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the number of unemployment insurance claims filed and claims paid or increased salary costs resulting from changes in State salary compensation plans embracing employees of the State generally over those upon which the State's basic allocation was based, which cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments based on State obligations as of December 31, 1987.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Health resources and services", $37,500,000 for carrying out title V of the Social Security Act, as amended.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON AGING

For an additional amount for "National Institute on Aging," $1,800,000.

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH

For an additional amount for "Alcohol, drug abuse and mental health", $750,000.

FAMILY SUPPORT ADMINISTRATION

WORK INCENTIVES

For an additional amount for "Work incentives", $35,000,000.

OFFICE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

FAMILY SOCIAL SERVICES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Family social services", $165,227,000 for part E of title IV of the Social Security Act, of which $43,583,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances in "Social Services Block Grant": *Provided,* That of the total additional amount, $127,184,000 shall be available for foster care and $38,043,000 shall be available for adoption assistance.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Vocational and adult education", $1,000,000 for the support of curriculum coordination centers pursuant to part A of title IV of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act.

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Student financial assistance," $287,000,000, to be derived by transfer from "Guaranteed student loans."

HIGHER EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Higher education", $3,300,000, of which $1,000,000 shall be for activities authorized under part B of title III of the Higher Education Act, $1,000,000 shall be for activities authorized under part A of title VI of said Act, and $1,300,000 shall be for activities authorized under part C of title IX of said Act.

COLLEGE CONSTRUCTION LOAN INSURANCE

For carrying out part E of title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, $20,000,000 to be available until expended.

CHICAGO LITIGATION SETTLEMENT

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

To enable the United States of America to satisfy in full any and all obligations it may have to provide financial assistance for the Chicago Board's Desegregation Plan under section 15.1 of the Consent Decree entered in the case United States v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago, 80 C 5124, and to resolve all claims of the Chicago Board and all litigation concerning the United States' obligations to the Chicago Board under section 15.1, there is hereby appropriated $83,000,000 to be derived by transfer of remaining unobligated or contingently obligated balances of appropriations for fiscal years 1983 through 1986 for the Department of Education that would have been expended or lapsed but for the escrow provisions established as a result of the litigation between the Chicago Board and the United States: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Education shall make these funds available to the Board in a timely fashion, when needed, to be used only for desegregation activities in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Consent Decree: *Provided further,* That this $83,000,000 reappropriation constitutes full and final satisfaction of any and all past, present and future claims that the Chicago Board may have against the United States arising under or resulting from section 15.1 of the Consent Decree, and releases the United States from any further liability under section 15.1: *Provided further,* That the funds appropriated by this Act shall remain available until expended.

CHAPTER VIII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PAYMENTS TO WIDOWS AND HEIRS OF DECEASED MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

For payment to Elizabeth J. Grotberg, widow of John E. Grotberg, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, $75,100.

For payment to Joy Temes, daughter of Sala Burton, late a Representative from the State of California, $77,400.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

STANDING COMMITTEES, SPECIAL AND SELECT

For an additional amount for "Standing committees, special and select", $1,950,000.

ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Allowances and expenses", $9,508,000, including "Supplies, materials, administrative costs and Federal tort claims", $8,893,000, of which $6,845,000 shall remain available until expended for the purchase of a telephone switch for the House of Representatives; "Reemployed annuitants reimbursements", $368,000; and a special session or ceremony of the Congress in honor of the Bicentennial of the Constitution, $247,000, subject to adoption of an authorizing resolution.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For an additional amount for "Salaries, officers and employees", $371,000, including "Office of the Clerk", $280,000; "Office of the Sergeant at Arms", $72,000; and "Office of the Law Revision Counsel", $19,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Section 101(j) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1987 (Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591) is amended by inserting "'House leadership offices,'" after "'Allowances and expenses,'".

JOINT ITEMS

CAPITOL POLICE

GENERAL EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General expenses", $180,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

Title I of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1987 (Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591) is amended, in clause (4) of the paragraph relating to "Office of the Attending Physician" under the main heading "Joint Items", by striking out "eleven" and inserting in lieu thereof "twelve".

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $350,000.

CHAPTER IX

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

MATHER AIR FORCE BASE

The Department of Defense is directed to terminate all work in connection with the study for possible base closure of Mather Air Force Base, California.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

In addition to any other funds which may be available for such purpose, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to expend monies made available by the City of San Diego, California for the relocation or replacement of four family housing units in San Diego, California as a consequence of a final judgment in United States v. 35.934 Acres of Land, et al., Civil Action No. 800-0021-E in United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of California: Page 52, after line 2, insert the following:

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN

Section 17(g)(1) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is amended—

(1) by inserting "and" after "September 30, 1986;" and

(2) by striking "and September 30, 1988" and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1988, and September 30, 1989.".

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this is a noncontroversial, technical amendment that I am offering on behalf of Chairman HAWKINS of the Education and Labor Committee and Mr. JEFFORDS, the ranking minority member.

I have checked this amendment again, both with the chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member. What this does is to take care of a problem that exists between the current services allocation for the Women, Infants, and Children Program and the appropriated amount. It has no impact in either budget authority or outlays. It simply allows that ceiling to increase so that then, appropriations, if they should deem it necessary, can provide the additional moneys to allow current services or other increase to take place within the Women, Infants, and Children Program.

I would hope that the committee would approve this technical amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my good friend and colleague from California [Mr. MILLER]. Let me just say that the Special Supplemental Feeding Program for Women, Infants, and Children [WIC], is one of the most cost-effective and beneficial programs that we fund.

We have provided $1.663 billion for the WIC Program in 1987, and I'd like to work to increase that amount over the current services level for fiscal year 1988. The fiscal year 1988 authorization provides adequate authority for our committee to do so. But we would certainly exceed the fiscal year 1989 authorization cap in allowing for an increase this year.

By providing for a new fiscal year 1989 authorization at "such sums as necessary," our committee will be able to work to expand the number of low-income women, infants, and children at nutritional risk beyond the number presently served. Let me assure the gentleman that I will work to include the maximum possible level of funds with this authorization in place.

I might add that I would have been pleased to include this authorization during our committee markup. But, as the gentleman is aware, not many legislative committees are happy with our legislative initiatives.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection on this side to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

INVESTIGATIONS OF CHANGES NEEDED IN FARM PROGRAMS IN ORDER TO RESTORE THE AMERICAN FARM ECONOMY

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the following section.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve a point of order against the next three paragraphs?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Against the next three paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate whether producers of basic agricultural commodities, including soybeans, favor the imposition of mandatory limits on the production of basic agricultural commodities, including soybeans, that will result in prices for such commodities that provide a fair return to the farm producer at not less than the cost of production, $6,000,000.

□ 1910

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respectfully ask my colleague and dear friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if we might not engage in a colloquy at this point to try to clear up some areas about which we are not very certain in regards to the next three paragraphs to which I have reserved a point of order.

I would like to ask if my distinguished friend from Mississippi would allow me, is it the intention of the chairman that the Secretary of Agriculture endeavor to find out from farmers what their attitude or desires would be in regard to supply management or mandatory management of programs for basic commodities?

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield, may I say to my colleague and friend from Texas, have seen in the news media considerable news stories—and I will not use the names, of any individuals involved—regarding the handling of the present farm program. I have them here in my hand. I read the headlines before, "Farm Payment Abuses May Exceed $2 Billion—GAO Warns Congress of Rising Costs, Foreigners Get U.S. Farm Subsidies—GAO Says 598 Overseas Investors Collected $7.7 Million in 1985, One Commodity Received $728 Million in Subsidies—Lower Prices Required by 1985 Farm Legislation, Loophole Allows Extra Farm Subsidies—Payments Multiply Under Loose Definition of Eligible Person." This lead us to ask for an investigation by the Department.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. What I want to know is, what does my colleague want the Department to do? I am not talking rules now. What does my colleague want the Department to do?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will read the language in the bill: "To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate whether producers of basic agricultural commodities, including soybeans, favor the imposition of mandatory limits on the production of basic agricultural commodities, including soybeans, that will result in prices for such commodities that provide a fair return to the farm producer at not less than the cost of production * * *."

May I say that under existing law the Commodity Credit Corporaton has the power to raise the loan rate. That was the farm program which we used and which was used by the landowners to pay for the farms they own. Now the 1985 act provides for them selling below the cost of production and being dependent on a check from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So I do provide the money for the Department to check and see if they should not be given the chance to limit their production to that which is the foreseeable market, so as not to have the cost of producing too much extra and so as not to have that cost unloaded on the American Government.

The purpose is not spelled out here. The thing of it is that the gentleman and I need the information, and that is what we are trying to get.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. What I am trying to get at is, and the gentleman is not giving me much information, is something that would be understood in south Texas and Mississippi. Does the gentleman want a referendum or does he want an opinion ballot or does he want an election? How does he want the Department about getting the information?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, we carefully did not tell him how to get it, because we might have been in violation of the rule. We ask him to get the information. Then the gentleman's committee and my committee can use the information.

Because it did work before I suggested in the report that they ought to have a vote. That is my suggestion, because it worked before. But we do not say that in the bill because, it might have made it subject to a point of order. We leave it up to the Secretary's discretion as to how he gets the information, but once he gets it, we say that he should make it available to the gentleman and to me so that we can use it to clear this thing up. The present farm situation is critical, and we need all the information that we can get. We are trying to get it without committing ourselves to what use the gentleman will make of it and what use I will make of it.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Does the gentleman know that the 1985 Farm Act provided for a referendum that was held last year?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, the gentleman provided for it. We have followed along. We have provided for another one, because the story is sad over the last 12 months.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. So we are going to correct the farm problem by referendums.

Mr. WHITTEN. We have asked for further information.

(On request of Mr. WHITTEN and by unanimous consent, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Chairman, may I say that in the 1985 act it is provided that the definition of "person" shall be made by the Secretary of Agriculture. Checking with his lawyers, we have been unable to find that he ever made any such determination. So there are many, many things that we need to know about, but what we did, we limited ourselves to what the law lets us do. We asked for information, leaving it up to him as to how to get it.

I gave him some free advice in the report as to how that ought to be, but I did not put it in the bill.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. May I ask the gentleman now, since he says the Secretary of Agriculture says he does not have authority, basic authorizing authority, to hold a referendum or to write opinions——

Mr. WHITTEN. It worked in the past, and I suggested that he use that method in the report, which is not amendable, but the bill does not require that.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. So then what the gentleman does does nothing. If the Secretary does not want to do it, he does not have to. Is that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, we provide the money, but I will say this——

Mr. DE LA GARZA. He does not have to under the gentleman's language.

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me say this: He is not obeying the other laws that we passed, or the laws that the gentleman passed. We provided that several things should not be done at the expense of the existing soil conservation programs. He is ignoring that law, and he may ignore this law. But if we pass this, he definitely would be guilty of ignoring the intent of Congress.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Well, is it the intent of Congress should be from an authorizing committee that studied—How many days of hearings did the gentleman have on this issue?

Mr. WHITTEN. I have had 39 years, I believe, studying this.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. On this particular one.

Mr. WHITTEN. Something like that.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I cannot match the gentleman's 39 years. He has me at a disadvantage.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am giving the gentleman the benefit of my experience.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. The gentleman has me at a disadvantage there.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman knows that I am for him, but it is the appropriation where we are hit at because of the enormous cost of farm programs. We have $6 billion in here because the farmer is required to sell below the cost of production. While that is not involved here, the situation is so bad that we ask the Department to find out what the facts are and let the gentleman and me know.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I would like to cooperate and work with the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. We appreciate your cooperation, and the farmer needs it very badly.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. It is turning around. The issue is coming around. The cotton is working very well; the rice is working very well; the peanut program is working very well; the tobacco program is working fairly well; the sugar program is working fairly well.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to my chairman, you can leave my town and go 100 miles and you will find precious few farms that are in the hands of the owner. You study the record and you will find that Mr. Vance Clark, and I call names here, who heads the Farmers Home Administration, has come out with "cash flow" requirements which are not called for in the law. He has ignored the fact that he could save these folks' farms. He required you to show that you can pay all you owe, pay what you borrow this year, and pay it all this year. The only group in the world that that demand is made of is the U.S. farmer.

I am trying to get the information over to the gentleman—go down to my district and you will find that nine-tenths of the farms are now owned by some rich man who does not have to borrow money.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. How does this impact on Farmers Home?

Mr. WHITTEN. It tells the Secretary to get us information so that the legislative Committee and the Appropriations committee can help straighten it out.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. How much time do we allow him?

Mr. WHITTEN. We did not put a deadline on it. I am trying to get information only here, and I hope that the gentleman and I can get together and use it.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Well, I do hope so, because I think that all the information that we can get can be useful, and as always I appreciate——

Mr. WHITTEN. I want to work with the gentleman, as he well knows.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I do hope that we can do that, because we in the Agriculture Committee sometimes feel that we should be under the rules the responsible committee, and we always welcome from our distinguished friend's 39 years-plus of experience——

Mr. WHITTEN. That is quite a while, is it not? I do not believe it myself.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. We always will be happy to hear from him, but always we are cautious that maybe sometimes in a misguided effort to try and assist, we may cause more problems than we resolve. I hope that this is not the case, I pray that this is not the case, and we will work with the gentleman.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I would like for the day to come when I do not have to do this in an appropriations bill, either supplemental or continuing resolution, that somehow the gentleman would do his able mandated duty without us having to feel that he is infringing on the authorizing committee, because if he wants to infringe and he comes to our committee, we will be happy to welcome him as an ex officio member, and we can do it together. He does not have to do it to force us to come to the floor and have to engage in this type of colloquy.

□ 1920

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman does not wish it any more than I do. The gentleman has the authorization; we have the appropriation. We review everything in the Department each year. I look forward to working together, and I hope that this information we are calling on the Department to get will help us solve this problem, because the farmers are broke. We do not have a farm program. We have an investment program, we have a big man program, but we do not have a farm program. We are just trying to get information, and I will work with the gentleman in trying to solve the problems that have developed.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman. My concern is that I was just told by a very knowledgeable farmer, both older than my distinguished friend and myself together probably, and he said we do not want to study the issue any more. He does not want to study the issue any more, and that prompted me to wonder if this might not be——

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman would read this paper that I have in my hand he will see a number of organizations that do not want us to study this any more. If you look at the names, you have all of those that want to be able to buy below the cost of production. They do not want us to do it. They want low commodity prices. Let us get the information so that you and I can solve it.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I would hope in the future, Mr. Chairman, we might have the opportunity to open the doors of our committee. We welcome you as an ex officio Member. We will give you one of our caps that says, "Agriculture Committee," and we will not have to come and resolve it on the floor.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that I visited the gentleman's committee many times. My door is open and the gentleman has been there many times. Let us keep it up and get the information to act on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] has again expired.

Does the gentleman from Texas insist on his point of order?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, in view of the explanation by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], chairman of the committee, I do not pursue the point of order any further.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DE LA GARZA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I had a motion to strike this section written at a time when I was more upset at my distinguished friend and colleague than I am now, with all due respect. I think from this colloquy, knowing it would serve no useful purpose for me to move to strike, even if we were successful, I do not know if the Secretary will do it or will not do it. I do not know if it will survive conference. I do not know what could happen. I personally think we could better utilize the $10 million on another study.

But out of respect and admiration for my dear friend, and more out of respect for his 39 years, I will not make the point of order and I will not offer an amendment to strike. I will let the gentleman have his day and hopefully we do not have to meet again.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise Members the Clerk has read one of the three paragraphs in question and the Chair now directs the Clerk to continue reading.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc, and not withstanding the fact they relate to paragraphs in the bill not yet read by the Clerk.

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

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we do not have the amendments and I will reserve until we know what is involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendments, as the Chair understands it, would strike the three paragraphs.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. ARMEY: On page 52, strike lines 3 through 13.

On page 52, strike lines 14 through 18.

Strike from line 19 on page 52 through line 2 on page 53.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I can be very brief on this I listened to the dialog between the two gentlemen and it was informative. I think most of the Members have a clear understanding of what is in the bill.

My three amendments would simply reduce the expenditures by $10 million for the purposes of conducting these studies. In my estimation, conducting a study of this nature is tantamount to asking the American farmers if they would like to have guaranteed profits. I think we already know the answer to that. I think we know the outcome of the studies.

I think it is much more equitable use of the taxpayers' money to put that $100 million to any number of alternative uses.

With those comments, I would just ask the body to vote yes on my amendment to save $10 million for the taxpayers to be used for more important uses.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and I have had a colloquy on this matter already. But let me describe the situation again.

We have had 170,000 farmers go broke during the last 2 years and have to leave the land.

We set up the Commodity Credit Corporation as a Government corporation to do what other countries can do themselves. The Commodity Credit Corporation was set up because other governments can do things we, under our Constitution, cannot.

The 1985 Farm Act—I realize the problems our colleagues had in getting a bill. I was involved in a program with the former leader in the other body and he said "the President demanded a bill and we got him a bill," and that is the only thing he said about it. But we have had 2 years' experience with it now, and 170,000 farmers have gone broke. The head of the Farmer's Home Administration has required that a farmer, in order to be eligible for a loan, had to show that he could sell below the cost of production, pay off a new loan and all his outstanding debt.

Here are the headlines I read earlier. As I said, I am a former district attorney so I will not use the name of individuals. Farm Payment Abuses May Exceed $2 Billion—GAO Warns Con-

gress of Rising Costs, Foreigners Get U.S. Farm Subsidies—GAO Says 598 Overseas Investors Collected $7.7 Million in 1985, One Commodity Received $728 Million in Subsidies—Lower Prices Required by 1985 Farm Legislation, Loophole Allows Extra Farm Subsidies—Payments Multiply Under Loose Definition of Eligible "Person".

But the point of it is we need information to know what to do. We need to fix some way where the buyer from the farmer pays the price, rather than the Treasury.

This $6 billion for CCC should not be in this bill because if they had had the buyer to pay the price, we would not have to pay it out of the Treasury. I do not see how we can live with the budget unless we do let the buyer do it.

I have some telegrams and letters here from those who buy from the farmers, and they want to buy below cost. But they would hold up their hands in horror if you asked them to sell below cost and look for a check from the Government.

So what we have here, is that we have asked the Secretary of Agriculture, in view of the situation, in view of the headlines about how this has been handled, to come up with the information so that we would have information on which to act.

□ 1930

Frankly, my purpose would be to try to get them to get their price from the buyer as the law permits and as has worked for many years. Now the other thing is, the present head of the Farmers Home Administration not only refuses to make loans, but in addition the land that he is foreclosing on he will sell to anybody except the man who worked 40 years to pay for it. He will sell it to anybody else. I repeat again, the American farmer is the only man whose feet we have held to the fire on every dime that he owes. We have not done it on loans we made abroad, we have not done it in foreign aid, and we have not done it with the farm credit system. We have been bailing them out. But we have not done it for the farmer.

Let me repeat again. We have had experience now where we have had 258 banks to fail in the last 2 years. We have had 69 farm banks fail in 1986.

Again, let me say involved here is information, and may I say to my colleagues, if you refuse to let us get the information, you are condoning the facts that have been shown in the paper. So I plead again, do not cut out information that may help us to straighten this out.

Any change in the law will have to come from the legislative committee, but in the carrying out of existing law I hope it will come because we insist on it, not only us, but our friends on the legislative committee.

So I think everybody agrees that the farm situation is bad enough. We need all the information we can get and we need to work together to straighten this thing out.

So this is seeking information for the use of all appropriate committees, not just our committee. So I ask your support of the committee.

I am surprised that my colleague from Texas is offering this. But I hope you will vote against the amendment and give us a chance to get the information and the chance to work together to solve this problem.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I do not much care either way this goes, so I think we ought to support the chairman of the full committee.

I think we ought to make a couple of points. No. 1, I am chairman of the authorizing subcommittee that handles most of those commodities and we are looking at farm policy options right now very, very seriously. That is our particular job.

I am personally a little disturbed that the Committee on Appropriations will put the language in its bill which may not, according to our parliamentary procedure, be legislative, but reads like legislative language. I mean a study to produce a referendum is basically something which ought to be in the jurisdiction of the authorizing committee, not the Appropriations Committee.

So the way I look at the particular language of the amendment anyway, it does not mandate the Secretary to do anything. It authorizes him some money to enable him to conduct a study, but the full Committee on Agriculture will have the complete and final jurisdictional decision as to whether to go ahead with any program changes whatsoever, regardless of what they are. I think that record is clear. So I want to make it clear that the Committee on Agriculture is going to retain its jurisdiction in this matter, we are not ceding jurisdiction to anybody in this regard.

I think that the gentleman raises an excellent point, our farmers are in serious, serious trouble. We are looking for policy options right now. One of the policy options is a producer referendum, but there are many other policy options. I just want to make it clear that the Committee on Agriculture will and should be, under the rules of this body, the final arbiter as to what farm policy is.

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

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

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My understanding of the provisions of the chairman here is that it is basically enabling legislation, that the Secretary, if he wants to use the money, can conduct this kind of investigation. But this Secretary of Agriculture has always indicated an opposition to referenda. I think the gentleman would agree with me that it is not likely he would proceed, but in the very least this provides enabling legislation.

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think he should support a referendum because it worked before and who is in letter shape to know than the farmer. I do not know one way or the other what the Secretary would do, but I would agree with my colleague from Kansas that they have full jurisdiction to any change in the law. We also have the obligation to use all the law we have if it will help. I assure both of you I will be glad to cooperate in any way in the world. Right now I would not want to be charged with the jurisdiction of existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

The amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate whether producers of basic agricultural commodities, including soybeans, favor the imposition of mandatory limits on the production of basic agricultural commodities, including soybeans, that will result in prices for such commodities that provide a fair return to the farm producer at not less than the cost of production, $6,000,000.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the quantity of each basic agricultural commodity, including soybeans, needed by crop year to meet domestic consumption, to maintain an adequate reserve, and to regain and retain our fair share of world markets, $2,000,000.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the changes needed in existing rules and regulations of the Department of Agriculture to provide for implementation of mandatory limits on the production of basic agricultural commodities, including soybeans, and nonrecourse loans on basic agricultural commodities, including soybeans, that reflect a fair return to the farm producer at not less than the cost of production, $2,000,000.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Agricultural Research Service", $450,000.

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Cooperative State Research Service", $300,000: *Provided,* That of the amounts appropriated under the heading "Cooperative State Research Service" in the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1987, made applicable by sec-

tion 101(a) of the Continuing Appropriations Act, 1987 (Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591), for payments to agricultural experiment stations to carry out the purposes of the Hatch Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 361a-361i), any monies available for allotment to any recipient, but withheld by the Secretary of Agriculture for failure to meet the matching requirements of the Hatch Act, may be reapportioned to other agricultural experiment stations and used to carry out the purposes of the Hatch Act: *Provided further,* That no experiment station that received funds under the Hatch Act during fiscal year 1986 shall receive a total allotment in fiscal year 1987 that exceeds the total allotment it received in fiscal year 1986.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities and for grants to States and other eligible recipients for such purposes, as necessary to carry out the agricultural research, extension and teaching programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, $16,200,000, to remain available until expended.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service", $3,000,000.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Salaries and expenses", $24,000,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $24,000,000 of the above amount may be transferred to this account from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

GENERAL SALES MANAGER

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Not to exceed an additional $705,000 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation funds to the General Sales Manager to help implement export programs, including the adjustment of the offering price to remain competitive, as authorized by law, and programs mandated in the Food Security Act of 1985.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

To reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a-11, 713a-12), $6,653,189,000, such funds to be available, together with other resources available to the Corporation, to finance the Corporation's programs and activities during fiscal year 1987: *Provided,* That of the foregoing amount not to exceed the following amounts shall be available for the following programs: export guaranteed loan claims, $300,000,000; conservation reserve program, $400,000,000; additional payments to producers under section 633(B) of the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1987 (Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591), which shall be made to cover the difference between the partial payment and the amount of the full claim, $135,000,000; and interest payments to the United States Treasury, $400,000,000: *Provided further,* That five per centum of the funds available for the conservation reserve program in this Act shall be transferred to the conservation operations account of the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in carrying out the conservation programs of the Food Security Act of 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHUMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHUMER: Page 55, line 9, strike "$6,653,189,000" and insert "$6,221,189,000".

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple one. It would withhold $432 million from the $6.6 billion CCC appropriation.

Why $432 million? It is exactly the amount that the GAO has determined would go to farm corporations and individual farms who have taken advantage of lax enforcement and loopholes in USDA regulations. This money represents a violation of the 1970 law, requested by Mr. CONTE, that had put a $50,000 maxmum payment limitation on the amount any single farmer could receive in income supports.

Mr. Chairman, I come to this from the perspective of a Budget Committee member. I have sat on the Committee on the Budget and watched us cut many, many programs, some of which are very near and dear to me, year after year. And this year when we compiled the functions on the Budget Committee in terms of the increase that each of them had from 1981 to 1986, much to my surprise the highest increase was not defense, was not Medicare, but was agriculture which had gone up more than 100 percent. Yet at the same time I saw around me the very farmers whom these programs were intended to help, complaining that they were not getting the help they needed, complaining that the Government programs had not worked.

The GAO study only points the way in describing how these programs have not worked. But I think it is time to send a message to the U.S. Department of Agriculture that they had better start cleaning things up so that, the enormous amount of money we spend goes to some good. It is my guess, ladies and gentlemen, that the kind of thing that happended to the Defense Department budget with the exposé of $45 wrenches and $800 toilet seats, the same thing that happend to the Social Service programs with the exposé of welfare mothers driving Cadillacs or using food stamps to purchase alcoholic beverages, will indeed happen to agriculture if the kind of abuses pointed out in the GAO study are indeed allowed to continue.

USDA has allowed the $50,000 cap that the Committee on Agriculture placed in the law to become a total farce. For the past 3 years, large farmers have been reorganizing their farms on paper only and qualifying for multitudes of $50,000 payments. So in the middle of a terrible family farm crisis, the Federal Government has become the private subsidizer of large corporate farms.

While the U.S. census shows a decrease in the number of farmers, according to USDA the average number of farms has increased; fewer farmers, more farms. The number of new producers increased from 1,400 in 1984 to 5,700 in 1986 and that is only counting the producers who are very close to the $50,000 limit. The GAO estimates that reorganizations are costing $200 million more each year, will cost us $900 million by 1989, $2.3 billion for the 5-year period 1984 to 1989.

There are many areas of USDA failure. Their regulations are so vague under this $50,000 limit that they are meaningless. Let me read one. "Any change in farming operations that would otherwise serve to increase the number of persons for application of the payment limitation must be bona fide and substantive." Vagaries have led to outrageous abuses. In California 28 investors received $1.4 million collectively by leasing 6,600 acres of farm land from a parent company and then subleasing it to a management firm.

□ 1940

A rice farm in California was divided up 56 ways in 1984, with the farmers splitting $1.5 million in income subsidies. That abuse takes money away from a family farmer who is suffering, as well as my urban constituent.

There are plenty of abuses.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, the USDA is not enforcing the law. They did audits and found that the USDA has set an inconsistent standard in requiring local agricultural committees to show documentation when they approve these subdivisions. And much to my surprise, and I do not know that much about agricultural life, who are the local committees? Farmers. That is like putting a fox to watch the chicken coop. Should we set up a program where welfare mothers form a committee to decide how much money welfare mothers should get? Should we set up a committee of defense contractors to decide how much Government money defense contractors should get?

We do that here. Maybe in agriculture, we need local committees because we have many counties and they are spreadout, but if we do, and I wonder about it, then the USDA ought to be darn tough in demanding documentation. They are not.

This amendment is a shot across the bow to the USDA. It says, "Straighten up, straighten out these abuses, stop making a joke of farm programs or else the Congress, I believe, as well as the American people, will rise up and eliminate many of the subsidies that are needed, as well as the abuses in subsidies."

So I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, not only in the name of budget austerity, not only in the name of what is fair and equal, but also in the name of the poor family farmer who is suffering, not getting the help he needs, while the rich agribusiness farms get the millions of dollars that the GAO has documented.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if I might ask the author of this amendment, is this amendment the one for the lesser figure or the initial figure?

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment for $432 million, which is the amount that the GAO estimated was going to the breakup of farms. Some of that money, GAO estimated, was occurring illegally, either because in some cases, some farmers, some of these big agribusinesses did not report things accurately on their applications, and others, even though the farms did report it accurately, the local farm committees approved them even though they were in contravention of the very broad loophole-ridden USDA guidelines.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here as a defender of USDA, but I do hope that we would have some accuracy in the debate. I might remind my distinguished colleague that the figures that he used were attempted divisions of land that were disallowed by USDA audit. Therefore, those were not accepted by the USDA and they were not an accomplished fact.

But the gentleman is correct that we, if we utilize taxpayers' money, we have to be as careful as we can. We should do everything possible.

I have to defend the fact that in spite of what some term to be a large expenditure for agriculture, all the money spent in the agricultural programs amount to less than 3 percent of the total budget, less than 3 percent. If those who feed and clothe America and provide us with a large segment of our trade income are not deserving of at least that much, I do not know who is.

But we have to send the message, and with that, I concur with my distinguished colleague and join in saying that we will not tolerate fraud in the agriculture programs, as we will not in any other program. There is massive fraud in housing in the urban cities; there is massive fraud, as we have seen, in the Defense Department. They probably stumble over more money in 1 day at the Pentagon than we use in 1 year for agriculture. So we need to put it in perspective, the amount that we are dealing with.

But fraud is fraud and it needs to be stopped. This may be a way to send the message. I will not oppose the gentleman's amendment. I think that the shot across the bow may be an excessive amount because the amount that has been paid has already been paid. The ones that conceivably were fraudulent have been disallowed or are on appeal and would not be allowed.

We have asked for a GAO study. The subcommittee is working. If there is any impact, it would be too late for the press and they would not be until the 1988 budget, but a modest—I do not know that we could use "modest" when we use millions—but an amount at least indicative of our concern, I would not be opposed to.

I think if my friend, the gentleman from Kansas, the chairman of the subcommittee, will offer an amendment, then we can proceed and send the message and make the resolve that we will not tolerate any fraud or any attempt at fraud with the understanding that the human element is there and always there will be the availability for some person to get around the law.

We will do everything that we can, working with everyone of good will and good intention to see that the programs in agriculture go to those that are deserving and to those that it is intended.

Just very briefly, though, we are getting used to speaking about saving the family farm. The family farm in my area can be cabbage or lettuce or citrus fruit or a few cows. The family farm in another area can be apples or grapefruit, so I would ask that we think of this when we legislate.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GLICKMAN TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHUMER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GLICKMAN to the amendment offered by Mr. SCHUMER: Strike "$6,221,189,000" and insert in lieu of "$6,563,189,000".

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this on behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] and myself.

This amendment acknowledges the validity of the Schumer amendment, that there are people out there reconstituting their farms in order to get around the payment limit.

At the same time, we want to try to deal with a relatively appropriate figure, rather than just an aggregate figure in the GAO report, so today, my subcommittee had a hearing where we tried to determine what those right numbers were. We are told that that number is approximately about $90 million that would be fixed if we adopted corrective legislation to deal with this payment limitation reconstitution problem.

What I have done is I have taken the Schumer amendment and——

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, just to clarify, I believe if the committee took corrective measure, they would save the $432 million, but because three-quarters of that money was used legally to do it and a quarter was used—four-fifths was used legally and one-fifth was used illegally; that is the distinction here.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Let me just make a couple of points here. This issue was raised because the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], and I called for a GAO report last year so the Ag Committee is trying to get a handle on this problem of payments being abused by some of the anecdotal examples. It is a serious problem and we do need to rectify the situation.

Let me tell you a couple of things. The GAO report said that there were some reconstitutions occurring; that is, people breaking up their farms to get out under a $50,000-payment limit, but most farmers were not reconstituting. Roughly, maybe, 97 percent of the farmers in this country—maybe even more—were abiding fully and completely with the law.

□ 1950

There were some folks that were reconstituting their farms either legally or outside the spirit of the law, and we do not want that to take place. So the point of this amendment is to try to get the dollar amount down to the point where we will take substantive corrective action hopefully that will be in the reconciliation bill and that would deal with the problem of reconstitution.

Let me tell the Members one thing. Why is this recurring? Why do we have people busting the payment limitation? Let me tell the Members why.

It is occurring because the current farm bill in feed and seed grains to some extent, and also in cotton to some extent, relies on big Treasury payments from the Government. It is part of its stated motives. Bad or good, that is why it is occurring. So when we have more money coming from Uncle Sam and less money coming from the marketplace, we have more and more

people bumping up against the $50,000-payment limitation.

It used to be that farmers would get 100 percent of their money from the market. Now they are getting between 40 and 80 percent of their money from the Government because the farm bill pushed down the world price, and we have tried to make farmers whole in the process. So that is a real reason why more and more people are bumping up against the payment limit.

But in any event, the purpose of this GAO report was to examine why this was occurring and to make sure the Department of Agriculture got on the stick and did the job right.

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] who is the coauthor of the amendment.

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

It was the report from GAO that we requested, and I think that has produced the evidence that at least was the basis of the drive for this amendment. But the point that I think all Members have to be aware of is that while reorganizations have increased, the $430 million represents the total number of reorganizations that have taken place, but it is the percentage of those reorganizations that is questionable.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I have just a correction. The $432 million is not the legitimate reorganizations in bankruptcy. It is only a division of funds according to the GAO, as the gentleman knows, because he put the study together, that was cut in half, quartered, or whatever, to increase the $50,000 payment.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct, that it involved reorganizations under that cap, but they were nevertheless legal reorganizations according to the department.

The real question is, what percentage of these reorganizations were not legal. And that ranges anywhere from 4 to 21 percent, depending on whose numbers you look at. The gentleman's subcommittee and the full committee have been looking at the issue.

We intend to implement restrictions with regard to the limitation to tighten up on this issue because it relates not only to poor enforcement by USDA but it relates also to the problem of the clarity of the law, which is a legislative problem. So we are going to have to address both areas.

I think this amendment will give us the impetus, but let us target it at the area which is of concern, which is those reorganizations that indeed violate the law. For that reason we have offered this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] has expired.

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

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. First, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I think the body owes the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from California a great deal for asking for the study and for moving along the lines of reform.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] a couple of questions, if I might.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I would be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. SCHUMER. I would ask if this amendment might be acceptable, if we accept this amendment, is it the intention of the committee chairman that by the time the reconciliation bill reaches the Congress that the committee, the Congress, or the USDA, somewhere there would be in the law really tight legislation that would not allow individual farms to get more than $50,000?

Would it eliminate a cutting up of these farms simply to get around the $50,000 limit, except, of course, in very unusual circumstances?

Mr. GLICKMAN. I would be glad to yield to my chairman for an answer.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Of course, I would have to refer back to the chairman of the subcommittee who will be handling this in the timeframe, but I would tell my distinguished colleague that our intention would be to do exactly that. To what extent we can legislate to stop an activity entirely, let me say that the gentleman must understand that you can pass a law that says there shall be no murder committed in the United States. So to the extent that we can intelligently articulate the law to carry out our intention, we will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] has again expired.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, having studied this issue and not knowing as much as the gentleman, I believe that USDA has been entirely lax, and I am sure the committee could come up with some legislation that would be far more specific on how the $50,000 limitation should work. Is that the gentleman's intention?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that would be our intention. The USDA has come up with proposed regulations, but it is a volume 2 or 3 inches thick. The problem that we would have, if there would be a problem, would be time. But I assure the gentleman that we would diligently, with the cooperation of the chairman of the subcommittee, work to that end with the committee.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is the goal of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] and I, to get this language, which is what the gentleman is talking about, into the agricultural part of the reconciliation package.

Mr. SCHUMER. I think it is. Just so the gentleman understands, if this amendment is accepted, and I believe it will be, it would be the intention of the gentleman from New York and others, if it was not done by the time reconciliation came, to offer further amendments along the lines of the ones we had, perhaps even for greater amounts if they warranted it.

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I admire the initiative of the gentleman from New York in this. We ought to make clear that what we are trying to do here is to vindicate the Silvio Conte limitation. The gentleman from Massachusetts, my senior colleague, is the one who fought this, and we are working along with him to try to preserve it.

I would say that I think we are talking here both about illegality and about lousy public policy. The gentleman from Texas said that you can pass a law against murder but it will not stop murder. All we are asking to do is to stop paying a bounty to the murderer. We are talking here not about trying to protect them from breaking up their farms.

They are not hiding when they break up their farms. They do not break up their farms and not tell you. They do a phony breakup, and then they come in and say, "My son gets fifty grand, and my cousin gets fifty grand."

So this is a case where they come in and confess. We are not asking you to be Sherlock Holmes. Just stop giving them the 50,000 bucks when they do it. That is not hard. If it cannot be done as easily as some think it can be done, then maybe we should not pay $50,000 per.

People ask, "Why is this happening?" One reason it is happening—and the majority of farmers are on it—is that there is a minority in there, as in

any other profession, who are greedy, and we have laid down and been suckers for the greedy. We simply have to get a lot tougher, and if there is going to be these abuses, as in any other program where there are abuses, whether they are student loans or anything else, they threaten the level of the whole program.

The gentleman from New York deserves a lot of credit for doing this, and we are going to have to be a lot tougher, not just to do the illegal ones but the farm breakups that are motivated solely by wanting another fifty grand are an illegitimate plundering of the taxpayer, and they have got to stop.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that I believe 97, 98 percent of the farmers are not doing this kind of thing. The primary reason it is happening is because farm policy has deliberately reduced the prices farmers have received, and the Government has picked up the difference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] has again expired.

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

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

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] for offering this amendment.

I think it is very clear that at a time when we are stretching the budget and we are making every effort to help the farmers who are in legitimate trouble and they are making an effort to try to save the family farm and the farming interests of this country, that this practice cannot continue.

It is very clear in my mind that the farmers should be farming the land and not the Treasury of the United States, and I would hope that you would examine not just the illegalities but, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said, the basic public policy of allowing people to break up farms.

In California we have a situation not only of rearranging the farms for the purpose of gaining crop subsidies, we also have the same people rearranging farms in different patterns so they can get water subsidies. They are coming to the Treasury now at multiple times. I would hope that the gentlemen on the subcommittee would examine all these efforts so we can get these people to quit farming the Treasury and start farming the land.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the reason I am striking the last word is that I had a speech commending the gentleman from New York for his amendment. But now I understand that the gentleman from Kansas has offered an amendment to put back all of the money that the gentleman from New York took out.

The gentleman is shaking his head, but that is what I understand. His amendment cuts off $430 million. How much does the gentleman put back?

□ 2000

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

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GLICKMAN. I put back all but $90 million, so we reduce it by $90 million under the committee's budget as opposed to $432 million. That is because that is the Department of Agriculture's numbers they gave us today as to what percentage of these reconstitutions occurred because of probable, illegal reconstitutions.

Mr. CONTE. Let me say that I like the amendment of the gentleman from New York a lot better than I like yours, and I want to commend him for his work in trying to reform the farm programs that have grown out of control completely, as this gentleman well knows. This is an area that has been of great concern to the gentleman here in the well.

Last year, when the reports first started coming out on the loopholes in that 1985 farm bill—the Christmas trees, and the billions in unlimited subsidies flowing into the coffers of the Crown Princes and the corporate giants, I led the fight on the CR to cap payments and redefine program eligibility.

The GAO report that came out a few weeks ago confirmed our worst fears—farms are dividing and subdividing like amoebae. With a good lawyer and accountant, one family easily becomes 15 corporations.

One farm becomes many with limited partnerships, trusts, joint ventures, tenants-in-common, and so forth. In the next 2 years, an estimated 22,300 new persons will be created as a result of farm reorganizations. Unless we put a stop to them, CCC payments to these new persons will cost us at least another $900 million a year by 1989.

My concern with the gentleman's amendment is that we are not going far enough. Last month, USDA sent up a legislative proposal for reform that clearly highlighted the abuses found in farm subsidy programs.

I understand that our legislative committee is holding hearings with USDA witnesses this week. I commend my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee for their attention to this matter. We can't act quickly enough. I hope that we will soon see a bill reported out.

The supplemental before us contains over $6.65 billion in reimbursements to the CCC for losses incurred and anticipated during the remainder of fiscal year 1987. I have a detailed breakdown of the activities for which $5.15 billion is needed.

A total of $1.5 billion is included for CCC contingencies. That is, there are no identified needs for reimbursements at the present time, though there may be by September 30.

Our committee has already tapped into some of this reserve by transferring $135 million out of the CCC for Farmers Home disaster assistance payments, and another $20 million for additional staff at the Soil Conservation Service. If USDA's estimates of CCC needs are correct, these transfers will call for another urgent supplemental later in the year.

I regret that we have taken this action. I regret that the authorizing committee has not yet reported legislation raising the borrowing authority of the CCC to $40 billion. I regret that our committee has not provided the Corporation with the same type of indefinite borrowing authority to avoid these regular shortfalls.

But, since we have not, then we ought to carefully review the dollar-for-dollar needs of the CCC, and provide reimbursements for only those commitments we have made. I say a cut of $90 million or $430 million is not enough.

No sweetheart deal like we have here today. But cut a billion-and-a-half, a billion-and-a-half. That will shake them up down there and tighten up their grip.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] has expired.

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment to cut out the entire operating reserve of $1.5 billion. If additional funds should be required later in the year, let's review the justifications and consider waiving the Budget Act for another urgent supplemental at that time.

Perhaps with the added pressures of real funding restraints, USDA will double its efforts to crack down on abuse under current authority, and our legislative committees will be moved to quickly report a bill tightening up the statutes governing program eligibility.

This time, I am not going to offer the billion-and-a-half cut, I am not going to offer it. But next time, if this is not straightened out, we will offer a much greater cut.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's leadership is commended on this. I must confess that one of the reasons I introduced this amendment was to hear the gentleman speak so eloquently on one of his favorite subjects.

I must say, in all seriousness, that I would join the gentleman if, by the next appropriation, this mess is not on a real way to being straightened out, I would join the gentleman in asking for a much greater cut. But I have faith in the chairman of both the full committee and the subcommittee that they will straighten it out in time.

Mr. CONTE. I could not think of a better person to be associated with.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requiste number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say anything on this, but this record is such a mess. We need to get just a few facts into the RECORD.

To start with, 1984 figures were used here a while ago; 1984 figures are irrelevant to the present farm program. We passed a new one in 1985, it was a new program, and as the gentleman from Kansas said, that new program put the pressure on to try to find ways around limitation on payments.

Payments are not just welfare checks. Payments are made as a replacement for funds that were spent by producers for local taxes, for expenses on the farm, so farm products can be sold at lower prices in order to lower the price in the grocery store and in overseas sales. So, to the extent that the new policy of this Government is to lower the price of farm products so that we can sell them in the international market and keep the price low in the grocery store, to the extent we offset those costs, it is not a welfare check at all.

When the new program becomes law lowering prices and offsetting lower prices which some people tried to divide up their operations so they could stay in the farm program. If they do not stay in the farm program, they do not make a contribution, they do not idle any land, they do not make a contribution to soil conservation, and to the extent they do not contribute, family farmers must contribute more to make the program work.

So there was pressure to divide operations in the Spring of 1986 and the first of July, the Department came out, and it is not up to me to defend the Department, but it seems that no one else is, the first of July they came out with stringent, I am telling you they were stringent regulations. They are being implemented by the country committees today. The Members who have spoken did not just find a new Easter egg here. This is something that happened last year and the year before. It was exposed last year and it has already been taken care of largely.

Now, you can take $90 million out or you can take $400 million out; it does not make a bit of difference today. No matter which amendment passes, it will not make a bit of difference to the farm program. This money is for a replenishment for funds to the Commodity Credit Corporation. It would not affect entitlements. Passing one of these amendments would not have any really substantive affect. Members did not find something new; it has been known all along. We dealt with it last year in the resolution that the gentleman from Massachusetts talked about. We directed them to do something more on this and they are doing it. So, a lot of what you heard today is not just something new, and if you try to bring up a reconciliation package that reduces the amount of money for the Department of Agriculture by 1 billion or whatever it is, you just trying to hurt some family farmers who are in present-day farm programs and if we do that, the farm program won't work.

Shelter and housing and clothing are the important basics in this country. We spend Government money on all of them and the most successful one, the one that we get the most for is the farm program where we get cheap food and simultaneously support producers for less than 3 percent of our budget.

We get a lot less out of the housing programs and I voted for all of them. Twenty-six billion dollars is the total; it is the world's success story. In this country, for a mere $26 billion out of $1 trillion budget, we have the cheapest food in the world. It is a real success story.

We could cut that down to zero if you wanted to double the price of food. In Europe, they spend $900 per person, the Government does, on farm programs, and the cost of food is almost double what it is here.

□ 2010

We spend $600 per person in this country for farm programs, and we have the biggest food bargain in the world. So do not think that some of you just found a nest of Easter eggs here and a new way to save $1 billion. It does not make a bit of difference to the total budget or entitlements whether either one of those amendments pass.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from New York City, Mr. SCHUMER, for his concern about the abuses of farm programs. I also have a concern that the gentleman has not had much practical experience in the area of agricultural legislation, to say little about the experience in ag management that many producers have to face.

I only hope that the gentleman from New York City has the same concern for the foreign-aid budget, which at $12,500 million is only 12,500 times greater than the amount of money that the gentleman from Kansas wishes to cut out.

Yet $90 million cut in CCC funds at this time can have a very, very adverse effect on the agricultural economy out there. It is ludicrous to cut even that much money from the ag budget; $90 million is saying to the producer out there, "We're going to penalize all of you. We're going to penalize each and every one of you because a very few abused a regulation."

The 1985 farm bill was created to drive down the prices so we could be competitive on the world market, and that makes consumer prices in the United States of America cheaper or as cheap as anywhere in the world for wheat and corn and agricultural products, and yet these people are saying, "We're going to penalize all of you farmers who are providing this cheap food."

It saddens me that we are in this argument right now about a few who abuse and penalizing everybody across the board for those that do abuse.

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

Mr. MARLENEE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let the record show that I have talked with my good friend and colleague from New York. He has agreed to come to Dodge City, KS. We may make him an honorary marshal if he can get into town. I am not too sure if he will be able to leave it.

He is going to visit the local ASCS office and find out all about the frustration that farmers and ranchers have of waiting 8 or 9 hours in line, and the frustration on that level in terms of the personnel who have to put up with all these changes. We are just as upset about the fraud and abuse in agriculture on the farm level as the gentleman from New York is.

I have taken an opportunity to read his statement. I think that we have an obligation to really educate my colleague out there in Dodge, and so we are looking forward to it. And I will make the offer that I will come to the Big Apple just as well to look at his problems. Welcome to Dodge.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, let me assure the gentleman from New York City that we are very concerned about the fraud or abuse that is being carried on. Let me assure him that USDA is promulgating regulations faster than the local committees can read them, and there is a lot of confu-

sion out there, and farmers are spending more time trying to sign up for these programs—than they are on the tractors. Yet we are going to penalize all the farmers by cutting CCC funds because a few abuse.

I hope that we turn down both amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to some of the facts that have not been touched on here. We have two types of agricultural commodities. We have perishable commodities, where you buy up the surplus under the section 32 program and give it to the school lunch program. There is no better price support program than that. If you have the supply and the demand in balance, it takes care of itself.

That is different from what we are dealing with here. Here we are talking about basic commodities, really it is storable commodities. Cotton, for instance, will last 50 years and decrease only by $5 a bale. So here we we talking about basic or storable commodities. What we have here, as Mr. SMITH has said, is the restoration of losses to the Commodity Credit Corporation. We are going to owe it whether we appropriate it now or not. We passed the 1985 farm bill under which the commitments were made. But the law makes the mistake of changing the farm program we used to have where you supported the price and the farmer got his price from the buyer rather than from the Treasury. It may surprise you, but if you raise the price of cotton 10 percent, and that is all that is passed on to the consumer, it would raise the price of a $15.95 shirt a nickel. If you raised the price of wheat 10 percent, it would raise the price of a loaf of bread a half a cent, if that is all that they passed on to the consumer.

So this is a subsidy to the middleman, and he does not pass the savings on, he is not required to pass it on to the consumer.

In the testimony before our committee we have found that every country in the world sells what they have and do not need for what it will bring in world trade. They, in turn, talk us into holding our commodities off the world market so that they get rich by selling under our set price. Many American national and international companies are the ones taking advantage of it.

This again is restoring capital impairment to the Corporation. I think the debate has been wholesome because the Office of Management and Budget asked us to take all controls off CCC and let them just spend anything they want, just like it was a free flowing well, and this committee asked us to just take any limits off. Mr. SMITH is right, we are just restoring capital impairment. We are going to have to pay it whether you put the money in here or not. I think the debate has been wholesome.

But keep in mind that other countries say the world price is the price and they tax their people to offset cost.

They then talk us into not selling our commodities competitively in the world market.

During the 1970's three times our Government refused to let our farmers sell to Russia. Our Government declared several embargoes. Now that did not keep Russia from getting what they needed; they just brought it from Argentina or Canada or Australia.

Now if I was a U.S. company and bought some of that commodity and I could not export it because of the embargo, the Government paid me to cover my loss, but they did not pay the farmer to cover the loss he suffered becauses of the embargo.

Now here is the other thing, this fellow who heads the Farmers Home Administration came in about 2 years ago and said in order to borrow money from the lender of last resort you are going to have to have a "cash-flow." "You are going to have to show me that you can pay all you owe and pay all you are going to spend this year and live off of this year's crop." He just put the farmer off his farm. I have had it up and down with him. The law does not require cash-flow. Every year we have pointed out to him, "You've got authority to adjust and to defer principal and interest. You can lend him money to keep the farm in business." He will not use the authority he has in the law to do this.

The American farmer is the only group whose feet we hold to the fire and say, "You pay, or off your farm you go." One hundred and seventy thousand farmers have been put off their farms in just the last 2 years. They want to help the Farm Credit Administration who forecloses on the farmer; we are helping them, but not the farmer. One hundred and thirty-eight banks have gone broke during 1986 and we are trying to help the banks. So just keep it in mind, and I'm telling you like it is, the Commodity Credit Corporation was primarily set up for the purpose of supporting prices and exporting out surplus production. The Corporation was intended to support the domestic price to offset the high cost of production in America; and export our surplus production in world trade at competitive prices. And they talk us into not using it. So the money you are talking about goes to the middleman, not to the farmer.

I have here 12 big national organizations who want Members to be against my provision because they want to buy feed below the cost of production. If you asked them, "All right, Mr. National Broiler Council, you sell your chickens below cost, and we'll send you a government check," they would holler holy murder. Now that is a fact. I appreciate my friend from Texas and others, we all need to work together. But the buyer ought to be the one who pays this cost, rather than the Treasury. But we owe it now, because this money is needed to cover contracts already entered into, so one way or the other, we are going to have to come through with the money.

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something in behalf of the farmers out there in Nebraska. I like in the second most agricultural district in this Nation. I see those farmers getting old and trying to bring their son into their business, and trying to hold onto the land, and to have some young people on the farm, and I would like to invite Mr. SCHUMER to come to Nebraska when he goes to Kansas and go with me and visit some of those ASCS offices and see how they are staying there time-and-a-half.

□ 2020

They tell me the regulations come from Washington so fast they cannot absorb them and cannot understand them. And then they try to explain them to these poor farmers that are standing there waiting and trying to keep from losing their land.

I hope we will defeat both of these amendments.

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

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

First of all, I note that the gentlewoman comes from the second most agricultural district in the country. Maybe I should come out there because I come from the second least agricultural district in the country.

But one thing I can tell is that I do not know as much about the farm program as the gentlewoman from Nebraska or the gentleman from Dodge City. I told him I might come to Dodge City, and now I do not know if I will, unless they give me a few six-shooters. And certainly the good chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I think I could learn more from listening to him when he talks on agriculture. I understood every word you said, Mr. Chairman, and I will keep them in mind.

But I would like to say this person from an urban district knows fraud when he sees it, and I like those little farmers, and I have voted for agricultural programs even though I do not have a single farm in my district time and time again.

What I am trying to do here is help those small farmers, and certainly not hurt them, but eliminate that fraud. I hope the gentlewoman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE] will join with this gentleman from New York City in that effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The Secretary may adjust interest rates on existing nonsubsidized loans if he determines such interest rates are excessive in relation to prevailing commercial rates for comparable loans: *Provided*, That such rate adjustments shall constitute a change in the loan agreement and not a new loan.

The limitations on loan prepayments contained in section 634 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1987 shall remain in effect through September 30, 1987.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARMEY: On page 56, line 13, strike all language through line 17.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, when I first intended offering this amendment I had no idea we would be here so late into the evening. The hour is late and most of us are tired and would like to go home to our families. I will try to be brief.

I cannot help but remind Members that one reason we are late is we spent so much time today discussing legislative business that should not have been in this bill in the first place.

This provision in the bill provides $3 million for an industrial park in southeastern Oklahoma. I have not so much concern with the substance of the provision as I do with the strategy. I must say that this provision in this supplemental reflects some ingenious legislative work on somebody's part, because ordinally industrial parks of this nature would be built by the Farmers Home Administration which is not authorized to do electrical work. Yet, in this case we have an REA, a rural electrification cooperative, in a somewhat distressed area that would like to build an industrial park to assist in the development of the region and, in its own interest, to do something that we know as load building, which is necessary for the development of and the continuing operation of the cooperative, and to keep utility rates down for their current customers.

Given the fact that the funding could not come through the normal sources such as the Farmers Home Administration, this legislative effort, rather ingeniously, allows, through this $3 million, the REA in the local community to carry out the development. This is the kind of procedural effort that we see all too often. I find objectionable, irrespective of how ingenious it is on behalf of the parties concerned.

Having made those comments, I would like to turn my attention for just a moment to the bill at large, not addressing this particular provision in this last statement, but the bill as a whole. If I could take a moment at this late evening hour to characterize this bill, this is a bill built on pork, sold with baloney, that allows people to bring home the bacon and no matter how you slice it, a budget buster. So as we go through these amendments and finally reach final passage, again I would ask my colleagues to vote no on final passage.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to stand and oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. I have discussed this with him and elaborated on the fact that this area has an 18.6 percent unemployment rate that is chronic. This is a rural electric and it is an area where the income is such that people last year even removed their air-conditioning and everything else because the rates have gone up so high. We agreed to work it out.

This literally does not cost any money because the money was in the bill last year, but the Department has refused to go ahead and spend the money. Therefore, I had to come back and add it to this bill, put it in this language, in the law in order to try to get them to move.

So let me say I appreciate the gentleman's comments because I think he understands how this works, but I stand in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and ask my colleagues to oppose it also.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For a grant pursuant to section 310B(c) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1932), for the development of Choctaw Regional Rural Industrial Park, $3,000,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Soil Conservation Service, Watershed and flood prevention operations" for the watersheds authorized under the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701, 16 U.S.C. 1006a), as amended and supplemented, $300,000.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

CHANGE IN TUITION LIMITATION FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS

(a) SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS.—Section 12(d)(5) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(d)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) 'School' means (A) any public or nonprofit private school of high school grade or under, (B) any public or licensed nonprofit private residential child care institution (including, but not limited to, orphanages and homes for the mentally retarded, but excluding Job Corps Centers funded by the Department of Labor), and (C) with respect to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, nonprofit child care centers certified as such by the Governor of Puerto Rico. For purposes of clauses (A) and (B) of this paragraph, the term 'nonprofit', when applied to any such private school or institution, means any such school or institution which is exempt from tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.".

(b) SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAMS.—Section 15(c) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1784(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) 'School' means (A) any public or nonprofit private school of high school grade or under, including kindergarten and preschool programs operated by such school, (B) any public or licensed nonprofit private residential child care institution (including, but not limited to, orphanages and homes for the mentally retarded, but excluding Job Corps Centers funded by the Department of Labor), and (C) with respect to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, nonprofit child care centers certified as such by the Governor of Puerto Rico. For purposes of clauses (A) and (B) of this paragraph, the term 'nonprofit', when applied to any such private school or institution, means any such school or institution which is exempt from tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.".

EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on July 1, 1987.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Food and Nutrition Service, Special milk program", $3,426,000.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Foreign Agricultural Service" to offset increases in overseas costs, $1,000,000.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Funds available to the Department of Agriculture during fiscal year 1987 shall be available to assist an international organization in meeting the costs, including salaries, fringe benefits and other associated costs, related to the employment by the organization of Federal personnel that may transfer to the organization under the provisions of

5 U.S.C. 3581-3584, or of other well-qualified United States citizens, for the performance of activities that contribute to increased understanding of international agricultural issues. Such funds may be transferred for such purpose from one appropriation to another or to a single account: *Provided*, That not to exceed a total of $500,000 may be expended for such purpose and such amount shall remain available until expended.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Food and Drug Administration, Salaries and expenses", $1,500,000 for evaluation and analysis of the drugs, vaccines, and tests for treatment of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome.

CHAPTER XI

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Operations", $55,200,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DYSON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DYSON: Page 59, line 21, strike "55,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "46,600,000".

□ 2030

Mr. DYSON. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, what my amendment would do is remove $8.6 million from the supplemental appropriations bill, which was earmarked for closing 55 FAA flight service stations during the last quarter of this current fiscal year. The FAA has embarked on a consolidation program which would eventually close 345 stations and combine them into 61 automated stations. I have had serious reservations about this and over the last 2 years have talked to the chairman of the subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, in addition to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention after we have had a colloquy with the chairmen to ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment. I do have a number of colleagues here on both sides of the aisle who wish to speak to this issue. I have serious reservations about this program of the FAA. I have reservations about it because I think what they are doing or what they will be doing will be placing in jeopardy those general aviation pilots who use airports in mostly rural communities and need the services of the individuals at the flight service stations.

I think to close some of these prematurely, I would even say haphazardly, without having the fully automated systems in place is a great mistake. I think I, like a majority of the Members of Congress, have great reservations about the ability of the FAA to protect us in the skies.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have an opportunity here to provide a better service to pilots. We can ill afford to be reducing services to pilots at a time when airway safety is creating more and more anxiety.

A flight service station provides a tremendous service to general aviation aircraft pilots who usually fly their own planes. Flight service stations are primarily located at rural airports and airstrips throughout America. The flight service station in my district—Salisbury—serves pilots who fly through the Eastern Shore and southern portions of Maryland. Farmers, small business people, military pilots, and the Maryland State Police Medevac unit are just some of the groups who depend on the information provided by this flight service station. This air corridor is one of the busiest in the country and it is important that the FAA provide pilots in this region with the most current and accurate information.

I have known of cases when the flight service specialists have radioed to a pilot to inform him that he was getting ready to land without having first lowered his landing wheels. There are numerous instances where personnel at flight service stations have assisted lost pilots and steered them out of restricted military areas and back to safety. One of the concerns I have with the FAA's present consolidation program is that this type of service would be lost temporarily, or, perhaps permanently, if some action is not taken by this Congress.

I do not oppose the concept of flight service station consolidation to an automated system. I do oppose the method in which the FAA has been closing these stations however. Recent hearings in Congress have pointed out the serious lags in service to pilots caused by the consolidation process. Twice before, Congress has taken action to slow the automation process because the FAA was not providing equal or better service. It is apparent that some communities will never have the service they have come to trust. I realize that there are always going to be bugs which need to be worked out of a new system, however, the FAA has compounded these problems by closing stations too hastily.

The rural communities are the ones who are most affected by lags in service. These are the pilots who most depend on the flight service station. When services to these pilots are reduced, we are compromising air safety. I do not believe we should be reducing an important element of safety by limiting information to pilots. Make no mistake, the hastly closing of these stations will have an impact on businesses, farmers, and medical services to rural communities.

We have an opportunity to once again prevent the FAA from proceeding with the consolidation effort without sufficient attention to the needs of those communities which most depend on the services provided by the FAA personnel. Repeatedly, the FAA has been asked if there was any method in the selecting which sites will close last. Until this morning, the FAA said no. Now, FAA Administrator Donald Engen testified that he would give consideration to flight service stations where unusual weather was a factor. Well, this new commitment is helpful, but, it does not go far enough. Of the 55 flight service stations scheduled to close this year, there are many where rapid weather changes affect air safety. This will not help them if they are closed. The FAA will not reopen them.

This amendment is still needed to prevent unnecessary closings and disruption in service. Admiral Engen's commitment to keep open certain stations until 1991 is too late. The FAA needs to pause briefly to establish a logical order of "last to close" stations and pay more importance to the impact on safety and economic development in rural areas.

Ladies and gentlemen, better service is not just around the corner. This amendment will not gut this program. This amendment will send a clear message to the FAA to take action and slow efforts to automate this program. This action is not being taken to derail this effort. Quite the contrary. I want to see the best possible service provided to the thousands of pilots who fly everyday. The well-informed pilot is a safer pilot.

If automation is the best service, then I support it, but, at this time, it is proving to be disruptive to air safety at a time when we can least afford it. I would agree that we cannot easily walk away from a program which Congress gave its blessings to and supports. I realize that significant investments have been made toward automation, however, we must be assured it is implemented properly. When the FAA recognizes the importance of this service to rural communities and proceeds without disrupting it, then I will support a consolidation effort.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have to rise in opposition to the amendment even though it is being withdrawn. But I do want to reassure my friend from Maryland that I understand his predicament. None of us like to see Federal facilities moved from our districts. We had a hearing with the Federal Aviation Administration today. The Federal Aviation Administrator, Admiral Engen, testified that he was going to look at certain of these flight service stations with regard to using them

as an adjunct or a satellite facility. He said some of the criteria would be the problem of geography, the problem of special weather conditions and the way these facilities were located.

But I want to reassure my friend from Maryland that when the Federal Aviation Administrator comes before our subcommittee again on Monday that we are going to again request him to take a look at the remaining service stations and especially the ones that the gentleman is mentioning in Maryland to see if it is possible that they could use this as one of their satellite units. I hope that though I cannot make a commitment for FAA because it is FAA's decision, you may be reassured that the Administrator will know that I am concerned about the gentleman's particular situation.

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that our unique weather situation and our geographic situation on the Eastern Shore of Maryland at Salisbury, a town between an ocean, a river and the Chesapeake Bay, would fit into that very scenario that the gentleman presents to us.

I am pleased to hear the gentleman is going back to Admiral Engen and talk to him about our situation and the numerous others around this country.

There are 55, as you know, that are slated for closure in the final quarter of this fiscal year.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Not only will they have another look at the one that the gentleman is speaking of in Maryland, but we will certainly reconsider those others. We will ask Admiral Engen, the Administrator, to reconsider those others which have been called to our attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DYSON] has expired.

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

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

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join our fine colleague from Florida in terms of the assurances to the gentleman from Maryland about looking at this situation.

Mr. Chairman, as the person who chairs the Subcommittee on Aviation, we have been very concerned about the whole issue of the proper equipment and facilities being there to service the pilot community. And I think to the extent that we have that proper equipment there and the ability to handle the traffic as well as the adverse weather conditions in these areas is an important consideration. Recently I asked the General Accounting Office to look at whether or not the pilot community was getting the services that they needed from this new equipment. It is my hope that we will be getting that final report from the General Accounting Office some time this spring. And I think that their findings will indicate that the new equipment is performing adequately and that the equipment is doing the job that is expected of them.

I think what the gentleman brings out and some of the other instances of places where weather changes rapidly, the question about whether or not the equipment is able to respond to the pilot needs in those communities is something that has to be evaluated and I believe that that is what the gentleman from Florida would like to go back to the Federal Aviation Administration to make sure that this equipment is in fact equal to or better than the service that is being provided right now because that is the commitment under the previous continuing resolution, or the continuing resolution which we are under at the present time.

In terms of long-term savings, I feel that this consolidation has to go forward. We have already spent I believe some $325 million, $350 million in terms of the money that has gone into the research and development of this new equipment and it is my hope that model 1, and the follow-on system, model 2, will be able to provide the information and assure the pilot community that the information is timely and is equal to or better than what is being provided right now.

So again I will join with my colleague from Florida in making sure that the FAA is responsive to the issues and concerns that are being raised by our colleagues.

I thank my colleague from Maryland.

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

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dyson amendment striking the $8.6 million in the supplemental needed by the FAA to proceed with the flight service station closures.

I was somewhat concerned with the gentleman from Florida putting the issue in the context of closing facilities that Members in their individual districts may not want closed. I assure the gentleman that I have never addressed this issue in a pork barrel context, only in the interest of air safety. So I am relieved by the assurances given to us by the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] that air safety is indeed the priority on which we will keep our attention focused.

I commend the gentleman from California because he has always been very diligent in addressing the concerns of those of us who represent these districts that do, indeed, have unique weather problems; he has always been very kind in listening to our concerns. With the assurances that the gentleman has given us that he will keep the heat on the FAA to address our air safety concerns, I feel somewhat relieved in my concern about the gentleman withdrawing his amendment; but, I am wondering if the heat will stay on quite as much without the pressure the gentleman's amendment. I hope it will.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation has over 260,000 pilots who fly general aviation aircraft for business and personal use. These individual pilots rely heavily on the services provided by the FAA flight service stations. To allow some of these stations to be closed without a thorough evaluation of the safety implications is shortsighted and potentially life-threatening.

We are all concerned that air travel in this country is not as safe as it should be. We are publicly committed to addressing those safety concerns. Denying general aviation pilots the services of the flight service station at this time is not consistent with our commitment to provide the air traveler with the safest system possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland has 1 minute remaining.

(On request of Mr. EMERSON and by unanimous consent, Mr. DYSON was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] will withhold, I did promise the gentleman from Ohio first.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to take a minute and I guess everybody is concerned about the closing in their respective areas. My case is a little different. The city of Youngstown had taken the FAA to court. There is a specific court case which stated that that airport, for strategic reasons, due to inclement weather which develops hurriedly, where last year we had one of the worst tornadoes in American history. It struck down and stayed on the ground for 26 miles in two States. That court case said that it has to be specifically mentioned that that Youngstown airport would be closed with congressional action.

Now the FAA has interpreted this to be any omnibus language that is in the bill. I think it is time that this business stops down here.

Now I am bringing in an amendment later and I am going to take it if I have to for a vote. But if Congress is going to disregard the rulings of that court, I think it is a sad day in this House. It will be a sad day in northeastern Ohio. I know everybody wants to get home, but I am sorry, I think we are going to have to bring it up for a

rollcall. I thank you for the time, but I want to apprise the respective committee people there is nothing personal, I respect everybody very much, but I am very concerned that we are going to have dangerous situations in American skies by this action.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2040

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, have a rather parochial interest. A flight station involved in my district just happens to be my home town of Dodge City, but we have lost five of these flight stations so far in our rural areas and the superstation that is supposed to pick up the slack with the high-technology capability that is so well publicized by the FAA has not come on board.

In conversation with the various members of the subcommittee, I thought we were going to have assurance that at least they would ask the FAA to take a hard look at this with the proposition that if we do have holes in the coverage, we could reinstitute a regional center, if you will, to at least come on line and continue this service until the regional facility does come on board.

Am I wrong in this understanding or does the gentleman want to comment on that?

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Chairman, that was my understanding. I do not know whether the chairman would want to enhance that any. I know the statement has been made by the gentleman from Missouri about the porkbarrel aspect of this. In my statement, I emphasize that safety is our No. 1 concern. That is regardless of whether the airport is in Missouri, Kansas, Nevada or Maryland. That is the No. 1 concern, and yes, my understanding is that that would be one of the area in which the committee would focus.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I have a 58-county district. It is larger than most States. Forty percent of our accidents in regard to aviation come as a result of adverse weather that changes very abruptly. It seems to me that as we close these manual stations to go to the high-technology regional center, that might be fine, but it is not working that way. It has not worked that way.

We did this once back in 1983 to take a look at it. I am all for the regional setup if it will provide the service, but I do not think it will. In lieu of that, we need some kind of guarantee that we have some kind of safety guarantee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment and with deep concern for the safety of thousands of private and commercial pilots and their passengers dependent on local flight service stations.

In 1981 the Federal Aviation Administration drew up a plan to update the flight service station system that pilots use to receive vital weather and navigation information and file flight plans. It was a two-part plan to close down the more than 270 existing flight service stations while at the same time replacing those offices with 61 new, high-technology, fully automated "super-stations."

Six years ago this plan was sold to Congress with guaranties from the FAA that the new automated stations would: First, provide better and faster service to pilots; second, provide a more efficient system by reducing work-load and manpower; and third, provide a substantial cost-savings to taxpayers by closing existing manually operated stations.

Mr. Chairman, the FAA has failed in each of these guaranties. While moving ahead with the first part of their plan to close down existing stations, they have failed to meet the Federal law that mandates them to provide equal or better service in place of the stations that are abandoned. To date more than 45 flight service stations have been closed or consolidated, but they have not been replaced with the promised new automation system.

The FAA is more than 5 years behind schedule in developing the automated weather, navigation and communications technology needed to equip the proposed superstations. Automation system develop has lagged so far behind that in 1983 the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee rightfully denied further funding for the automation program and in 1984 work on the system stopped altogether.

Safety is my primary concern, Mr. Chairman, as is it should be with the FAA. The private and commercial pilots across the Nation depend on accurate, up-to-date weather information that existing on-duty flight service stations now prepare.

Changing weather conditions are responsible for 30 to 40 percent of all aviation accidents. When pilots and their passengers fly over my 58-county Big First District of Kansas, where weather conditions and high winds change abruptly, they depend on accurate up-to-date weather information that the Dodge City, Garden City, Goodland, Hill City, Russell, and Salina flight service stations now provide. If this amendment is not successful, $8.6 million will be made available to the FAA to close three flight service stations in Kansas and more than 50 more nationwide in 1987.

The proposed automated flight service station system to date has been a comedy of errors, littered with broken promises, delayed schedules, poor management and inadequate performance.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to deny further funding of flight service station closings. The safety of private and commercial pilots, their passengers and the general public should not be jeopardized.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DYSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I did not realize that the amendment was going to be withdrawn, but I would like to encourage the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DYSON], as well as the gentleman from California to really guarantee to us that this will happen and that we will look at this safety issue.

When I look at my State, one little town, which is probably 6,000 feet high, surrounded by 10,000-feet mountains, and there is usually snow—you cannot even find the town—these little flight service stations are very, very important to our State and an automated weather station in Reno, 300 miles away, there is no way that they can deal with this problem.

I hope that there will be serious consideration by the FAA on these adjunct satellite flight service stations, if that is going to happen.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take my 5 minutes, but let me just associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman from Florida and the distinguished chairman from California and point out that the admiral did assure us today, speaking before our subcommittee, that the quality of service and the safety of the system would remain intact.

I think it is important to point out that the funds that we are talking about are not really to close flight service stations; they are to open the facilities, the successor facilities, to the current flight service stations and provide the automated service that will be the substitute for those flight service stations.

To eliminate these funds would produce exactly the wrong effect in terms of not providing for the substitution for the services of these flight service stations and would have a detrimental effect on the safety of the system.

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For an additional amount for liquidation of obligations incurred for airport planning and development under section 14 of Public Law 91-258, as amended, and under other laws authorizing such obligations, and obligations for noise compatibility planning and programs, $160,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the first proviso under the heading "Grants-in-Aid for Airports (Liquidation of Contract Authorization) (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)", as contained in the Department of Transportation and Related

Agencies Appropriations Act, 1987, 99th Congress, H.R. 5205, to the extent and in the manner provided for in the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference thereon, 99th Congress, House Report 99-976, as filed in the House of Representatives on October 7, 1986, as if enacted into law, pursuant to section 101(l) of Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, approved October 30, 1986, is amended as follows:

"*Provided,* That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the commitments for which are in excess of $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1987 for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development and noise compatibility planning and programs, notwithstanding section 506(e)(4) of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended: *Provided further,* That an additional $25,000,000 of such commitments may be made in fiscal year 1987 using unobligated amounts in the supplementary discretionary fund provided by sections 505(a) and 507(a)(3)(B) of such Act, without affecting the amount authorized to be appropriated from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund under section 506(c), the amount of apportionments required to be made under section 507, or the satisfaction of general limitations under section 508(d) of such Act.".

AIRCRAFT PURCHASE LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

For the settlement of promissory notes issued to the Secretary of the Treasury, $2,602,000, to remain available until expended, together with such sums as may be necessary for the payment of interest due under the terms and conditions of such notes.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of section 402 of Public Law 97-424, $35,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended.

BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PARKWAY

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Baltimore-Washington Parkway", $2,000,000, to be derived by transfer from "Motor Carrier Safety Grants" and to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. KYL

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

Mr. Chairman, there are four amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc and not withstanding the fact that they relate to paragraphs of the bill not yet read by the Clerk.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. KYL: On page 61, line 21, strike all language through page 62, line 26.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment cuts a total of $11 million from the funding of these four special-interest highway projects. The administration does not believe any supplemental appropriation for these specific projects is necessary.

There is no reason why these projects cannot be funded from the State's formula allocation. As a matter of fact, by not spending these funds, there would probably be more money available for highway construction in my State and in other States because, like the vast majority of my colleagues here, we do not have any special projects for funding in this bill.

These are demonstration projects, but I would ask just what it is that they demonstrate. I understand that these specific projects are actually to be used to construct or reconstruct roads, bridges, or crossings. I have a couple of bridges in Arizona that need special attention, Mr. Chairman, and we could use some additional help. But we have been playing by the rules.

I am sure these particular projects can use the money; we all can. But that is the point. Why are some more equal than others?

Arizona highways are no different from highways elsewhere, so we are not talking about truly distinct projects here.

The point is that we should not be funding these special projects through this process.

There is another reason. The 100-percent Federal funding for these projects is not subject to the spending control of the annual obligation limitation.

Moreover, I am advised that none of these projects have been authorized by the appropriate committee.

Here is a chance to say no to specific spending that will cause us to violate the Congressional Budget Act and the Gramm-Rudman deficit reduction level.

When constituents ask you where specifically would you cut, you can say, "I will give you some examples."

These are good examples. Mr. Chairman, presumably these are all worthy projects, but projects that ought to have a lower priority in this day of $160 billion deficits.

Let us exercise our own line-item veto. Some will argue that this is just a transfer of funds, which is true, but they are part of the motor carrier safety grant authorization. If those funds are no longer needed there, then the money should be reallocated to the general formula fund for allocation to all of the States, not just for a few special-interest projects.

I say to my colleagues that if you voted for the highway bill and you got a little criticism for engaging in pork-barrel politics, vote yes on this amendment. It is a relatively small savings, but it makes a statement that you do not favor special-interest highway projects.

I certainly do not enjoy raising these amendments, but these projects can do just fine, I suspect, in competing for State formula dollars. Let us save some money today.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

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

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

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL]. I am not arguing the merits of the specific projects in question because perhaps they are, in fact, necessary.

What I object to is the process. As a matter of fact, I personally use the Baltimore-Washington Freeway on a regular basis as I commute to and from my home district in Pennsylvania.

□ 2050

That highway happens to parallel I-95, a very adequate Federal highway in the Federal system. What I object to is the process that is being abused here. When I was brought down here as a freshman, I was under the impression that we had an authorization and appropriation process, and that we would adhere to that process, and what I see happening here is that four items are put in this particular bill that have not gone through the appropriate authorization process, that have not been scrutinized by that committee, and, therefore, they do not deserve to be considered here.

Each of us could go back to our districts and come down here with projects that we think deserve special mention and special consideration. That would be unwise and unfair to the taxpayers and would not demonstrate fiscal responsibility.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of the amendment.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to hear my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, uses the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. He, therefore, I am sure, knows the condition of that parkway.

I have a Federal study here that I am going to talk about fairly soon with reference to the condition of that particular roadway.

Is the gentleman aware that there is a particular authorization for this parkway separate and apart from the highway user funds to which he referred in his debate?

Mr. KYL. I am not aware of that fact. In fact, I was informed it is not authorized.

Mr. HOYER. It is authorized. I understand that all the other projects are also authorized.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, before I yield any further, let me say, just so there will be no confusion here, my comment went to authorization from the Public Works Committee. My understanding is they are not authorized by the Public Works Committee. Obviously I did not have reference to appropriations.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, obviously, the Washington-Baltimore Parkway has been authorized since 1971 or 1972.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First, I want to reassure my colleague from Pennsylvania, and my colleague from Arizona, that the four projects they wish to strike from this bill are authorized, and have been authorized.

The people who represent the areas where these projects are can probably speak better than I can about these projects. But I want to reassure my colleagues that these projects are worthy projects. They provide additional safety on the highways. They provide better economic opportunity for these areas, and they provide the possibility for jobs in areas that need jobs.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman who offered the amendment did say something about these projects contributing to the deficit. Is it not true that these funds come out of the highway trust fund, and do not contribute 1 cent to the budget deficit of the country?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. My friend from New Jersey is correct. These projects are not going to add 1 penny to either budget authority or outlays, because we are using previously appropriated funds from other programs.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Can the gentleman tell me under what acts these highways were authorized? Were they authorized under appropriations bills, or were they authorized under the highway bill?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I can tell you one by one. The Baltimore-Washington Parkway is authorized under the Federal Aid to Highways Act of 1970. If you want them one by one, I can give them to you.

Mr. WALKER. That one was authorized by kind of a permanent appropriation that is in place for that road, and it goes back to 1970, as I understand it.

What about the other projects? Were they included as part of the authorization of the highway bill we passed the other day?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. The other ones are authorized under Public Law 99-591.

Mr. WALKER. Were those appropriations bills?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. No, those are authorized by the continuing resolution, but they do provide authorization.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield, but that is exactly what we are complaining about, is the fact that what we have got is an end run around the process.

The gentleman from New Jersey tells us that this money all comes out of the trust funds, so it really does not matter.

We also have people then who are not going through the regular authorization process. They escape the State formula process.

This ends up being pork barrel for the Members of Congress.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I wish to reclaim my time.

Mr. HOWARD. If the gentleman from Florida will yield, the gentleman from New Jersey did not say that it does not matter at all.

I did state that it does not contribute to the deficit, because it is trust fund.

There were five projects in this bill, I believe, and four of the five, the four of the five that the amendment would eliminate have been authorized.

The only one that had not been authorized is the one that they did not include in their amendment to eliminate, the one that is in the district of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

We certainly agree with that project being in the bill, but I think that it is very awkward for people to talk about the fact that projects are not authorized when they all were but one.

There was an agreement on all five of these, and they all come out of the trust fund, and none contribute to the deficit.

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I would like to yield to some of the Members whose districts these projects are in.

I therefore yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR].

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman. These are important and needed projects.

They have been given the scrutiny of the authorizing committee. I know on each of these occasions where an extraordinary authorization was had in the continuing resolution, it was done with the consultation and the approval of the leadership of the authorizing committee.

I would also like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Public Works and Transportation Committee, in saying that my friend from Pennsylvania, and my friend from Arizona, have been a bit disingenous here in trying to scope out those projects which are in fact duly authorized, but have alone the one single unauthorized project in this bill, because it happens to be in the district of a person whom we all have high regard for, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

It seems to me that it is a little bit transparent what my friend from Pennsylvania, and my friend from Arizona, are all about here.

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

This is a very interesting debate, Mr. Chairman, because on the one hand, what we have is the chairman of the authorizing committee arguing that these bills have been authorized, even though they were not authorized by his committee, that the proper authorization was the one that came through on the continuing resolution, and that is quite all right, despite the fact that just a few days ago, he was telling us about this all-important highway bill where we were finally going to take care of all of this problem with authorizations.

Then a few days later, we come back here with an appropriations bill that further violates the highway bill.

It is absolutely incredible what goes on out here in the name of spending money. Let us refer to the one that Mr. CONTE has in the bill.

It is my understanding that Mr. CONTE was in the hospital during the time that the highway bill was considered, and so, therefore, it was agreed that perhaps, because of the fact that he was not available during that time, during the time that we considered the highway bill, that this particular project ought to be included in this bill, because of the special circumstances surrounding that.

If you want to get on the floor, and you want to argue that those special circumstances no longer apply, fine, go ahead and do that, offer the amendment.

I think the gentleman from Arizona would be very glad to accept an

amendment to his amendment to throw out that one, too, but we thought maybe in the interest of the agreement that was made, that we ought not to deal with that particular amendment.

On the other hand, it is just absolutely wrong that every one of these highway projects just happens to be somebody on the Appropriations Committee who is doing something a little bit special for his district.

The problem with the gentleman from New Jersey's contention that this is highway trust fund money is the fact that every time you transfer one of these bits of money to a project, you take it out of the formula money.

Somewhere along the line, it comes out of someone's hide. Sure it does.

You cannot say no. Somewhere along the line, it comes out of money that would otherwise be going to formula moneys, because it is all under Gramm-Rudman.

It is all impacted. There is a ceiling under Gramm-Rudman, and so, therefore, it does not get into formula money.

Every one of these pork barrel projects comes out of someone's hide, and the problem is for many of us who do not happen to have a place to get our little piece of the pork in the Appropriations Committee, it comes out of the hide of the formula money that goes toward building roads in our State.

□ 2100

I think that there are roads in Pennsylvania that are just as deserving as some of the roads that we are now appropriating special money for out here. There are roads in Arizona, there are roads in Georgia, there are roads all over the place; we would like to have everybody play by the same rules.

We are not playing by the same rules out here tonight, and we do not play by the same rules at all. There is always a special, little bit of pork for those folks that can find the ways to get it onto the House floor.

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

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

Mr. HUNTER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Would the gentleman describe which of these particular projects, which ones were authorized and which ones were not?

Mr. WALKER. What we are hearing on the floor is they claim that all of these were authorized. The fact is, they were not authorized by any authorizing committee, they were authorized under continuing resolutions, so it is the Appropriations Committee members who got them authorized in the first place who are now coming back and finding the funding within what? An appropriations bill for the bills that they authorized previously under an appropriations bill. It is a nice, little in-house system; the problem is that it freezes out everybody else.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield, I understand at least one of the authorizations or one of the appropriations projects was authorized by the appropriate authorizing committee. Is that right?

Mr. WALKER. Evidently back in 1970 there is some kind of a permanent thing that went in place for the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. I happen to drive that parkway too, and I will tell you that there are an awful lot of roads in Pennsylvania that are in far worse shape than the Baltimore-Washington Parkway is, and so $2 million of money that might otherwise find its way to Pennsylvania is going to go to the Baltimore-Washington Parkway which I drive every week, and which I can say may have some problems with it, but certainly is in no worse shape than any road that I know of in my district.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make it clear once again, concerning the project that was not included in this amendment, the project of the gentleman from Massachusetts. We are in favor of that project; that project is in the bill. Nobody intended that it ought to be out of the bill.

Had we been able to work it in in time, it would have been in H.R. 2, the highway bill that was passed over the President's veto. So I want to make it very, very clear, we were only talking about whether, in response to the other side as to whether projects have been authorized or not authorized.

As to this taking money out of the formula from the others, I would state once again, there is in the highway trust fund at this present time over and above the legislation that we have passed, money that has been paid by the people who buy gasoline all over this country. Every time they buy a gallon of gasoline, 9 cents is paid for highway projects, and there is $9.7 billion in that fund at this time. Money that they have already paid that may not be used because of the smoke and mirrors of the Budget Act that we have in this Congress.

We are not taking money from other formulas in this provision and we are only using money that has been paid in the trust fund by law may not be used for any other purpose.

So I believe that the wise thing to do would be to defeat this amendment and get on with this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say to my very distinguished chairman who I enjoy very much working with, that I joined you, I believe it was a little over a year ago, in an effort here on the House floor to once again correctly take the trust fund out of the budget process. That we had what is technically the right position. As you know, I belong strongly to the group on the aviation trust fund and on the highway trust fund that thinks that we need to build infrastructure, we need to have a capital budget, we need to take it off budget.

Sadly, I remind my distinguished chairman, that tonight we are on the House floor under rules we do not like. That sadly that is still part of a unified budget because some of our colleagues voted wrong and last year defeated your gallant effort.

So under the rules of the game as defined in the House today, sadly, this extra money counts against the Gramm-Rudman limit. the question before all of our colleagues is simple: At a time when we have to pick and choose carefully, at a time when we have to have very limited use of limited resources, do we want to crowd the Gramm-Rudman limit by allowing the Appropriation Committee to pick and choose for those projects the Appropriations Committee likes, to decide which highways it wants to authorize in a continuing resolution, which is technically not an authorizing vehicle; to come back then and appropriate for something it authorized and should that relatively small subgroup of the Congress end up making decisions which happen, to a peculiar degree, to fit the more limited experience of the members of the committee. As opposed to whether it is our committee or other committees having the full authorizing committee look at all of the options in the country about how to spend limited resources.

So, only in this narrow sense, would I say to my chairman, that as the rules were set by our colleagues who defeated us last year, there is tragically a ceiling in what we can spend out of the trust fund under the unified budget and it does apply to Gramm-Rudman.

Mr. HOWARD. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman made a great statement. If we are going to be cutting down on some projects to meet the Gramm-Rudman levels, many people would think that those who speak out most forcefully for it ought to be the ones who would be willing to take the projects from their district and make the cuts there.

Mr. GINGRICH. I think it is very clear, I would say to the chairman, that those of us who are willing to stand up and examine openly how power exists in the House obviously run the risk that that power would

make it a little harder to get the next bridge or a little more difficult to get the next item.

I rely on the statesmanlike attitude of all of our committee members and know that they would never hold a grudge because of a clear policy difference brought out clearly in the open.

Mr. HOWARD. If the gentleman will yield, I just wanted to assure the gentleman that the gentleman from New Jersey has no amendments in hand.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the full 5 minutes. I think, however, this amendment was offered obviously somewhat symbolically. The projects are not of a major consequence, and in point of fact, as has been made very clear here, there were some $23 million worth of projects included in this particular section and some $11 million is to be cut by this particular amendment.

I think, very frankly, there was some misinformation. First of all, the distinguished sponsor of the amendment indicated the projects were not authorized. Obviously, all of them are, and indeed, the project in my particular district, but which as the gentleman from Pennsylvania so aptly pointed out, is used by probably most of the Members of Congress from time to time; the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, is in very bad shape.

I hold in my hand an engineering study indicating why this project is critically needed, notwithstanding the fact that this is only a small portion of that project.

It was authorized in 1970, as the gentleman has now found out, some 17 years ago. There is a special authorization for this particular parkway which is not a State parkway, but belongs to the Park Service, and indeed, I have a letter from the Department of the Interior, and I would think that the gentleman would want to know this information as he considers his amendment.

In any event, whether he wants to know it or not, I am going to give him the information. These are two bridges and all of us have seen pictures recently of bridges collapsing and people dying. They are not going to be interested next year if these bridges collapse over the Patuxent and Little Patuxent Rivers. They are not going to be interested in whether or not some esoteric, Gramm-Rudman ceiling did not prevent the collapse of these bridges.

This is from the Department of the Interior; this is not from the State of Maryland; this is not from STENY HOYER's office. This is from the Department of the Interior, headed by, of course, a distinguished appointee of the administration, assigned by the Regional Director of the National Capital Region who owns this road; not the State of Maryland.

□ 2110

This is a Federal road. The decks are seriously deteriorating, and are estimated to have a 3- to 7-year life span. This was a judgment made 2 years ago, as identified in the supplemental bridge safety inspection reports compiled by the Federal Highway Administration, $2 million could be obligated right now in fiscal 1988 based on fiscal 1987-88 design. In other words, they could get to these bridges.

I am not going to read all this report, but the problem they say is these bridges are badly deteriorating and may collapse.

I understand the gentleman's objection that there may be other areas in the country that are that way. Having said that, there may have been even a $19.4 million project in Georgia that I know that gentleman was very concerned about that was located in a demonstration project in the highway bill, not in the general allocation, a special interest pleading for the State of Georgia. I know that the gentleman supported that bill. I also know that the gentleman supported the President's veto. That was his judgment. But he supported that special demonstration project.

I would urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, symbolic in nature, but perhaps very consequential in terms of the safety of the American public.

Yes, there are other needs. We cannot fund indeed all the needs that there are out there. But because we cannot fund all the needs that are there, that does not mean that we ought not to respond as we identify particular safety questions to those identified safety aspects.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my first question is, Does the money in this bill in effect for the purposes of citizens of Maryland increase the amount of money Maryland gets over and above the highway bill authorization?

Is this additional money, or is this taken out of Maryland's apportionment?

Mr. HOYER. No, it is not taken out. This is a Federal road. This is a park road, not a Federal highway in that sense. It comes out of the Park Service allocation. To that extent there is a competition nationally, as the gentleman knows, and to the extent, however, that we have a particular authorization for this highway, it does not either diminish Maryland's funds or national funds.

Mr. GINGRICH. If I might ask one other question along the same line, just part of educating the Congress, I guess.

If the problems are as severe as the gentleman suggests, and I do not in any way dispute that, why is it not part of the normal request of the Federal Highway Program or the normal request of the Park Service?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has expired.

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

Mr. HOYER. The response to that question is that we are going to be seeking—this is a $65 million rehabilitation program. It so happens that this particular project is perceived as a safety-sensitive aspect of that project. The rest is rehabilitation—not the rest, there are some other safety-sensitive aspects of the project—but most of it is obviously rehabilitative and rebuilding, bringing up to standard.

But the answer to the gentleman's question is, this is a particular safety aspect, and what the Park Service has said, "If you can get the money, we can move ahead on this now in a badly deteriorating situation which ought to be moved on quickly." We have that opportunity. It is in the bill. We would hope that the House would reject this amendment to delete this very needed project.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me ask one other question if I might of my colleague. Normally and in normal circumstances would this bill—would the authorization for this particular expenditure have come up through the Interior as part of the Park Service, or have come up through Public Works as part of the highway, as a technical question?

Mr. HOYER. Well, the technical response is I think somewhat complicated. I am not sure that I understand it, because I have had it explained to me a number of ways. The gentleman from Georgia knows, because he sits on the committee, this project was authorized in 1970. There is nothing further for Public Works to do; $65 million is in that authorization, some of which has been spent.

The Appropriations Committee simply needs to allocate those sums. Now the chairman may want to correct me if I am wrong on that, but the point is that this has already been authorized. This is not being authorized by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me ask, if I might, it would be my inclination, because frankly when we did our research we did not candidly go back 17 years, and I appreciate both the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the Member from Maryland

educating us—I would be inclined to ask unanimous consent that that particular portion of the amendment which would affect Maryland be dropped from the amendment if we could have unanimous consent to do that.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion. I am sure that there are three people who would object to that.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to remove that part of the amendment which relates to the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. It is the first portion of the amendment, page 61, line 21, through page 62, line 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report that part of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 61, line 21, through page 62, line 2.

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

Mr. CARR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that you have to be on your feet to object, and that the gentleman who objected was not on his feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had objected earlier when he was on his feet.

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

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

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that there was an objection to my request to exempt the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. The gentleman from Maryland made the point earlier that perhaps this amendment was presented as a symbolic amendment, and in some respects that is of course true. It is certainly not my intention to try to pick out specific projects from a very large bill and try to have those projects defeated, particularly when, as I said in my remarks, these are undoubtedly good projects.

The point that I am trying to make by this amendment is that it is very difficult for me to return to Arizona and explain to my constituents why it is that the Congress does business this way, and why I do not stand up and make an objection when I have the opportunity to do that. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the purpose of this amendment is in fact symbolic, and it presents all of us with a good opportunity here. That opportunity is to vote to save some money; to vote to stick with Gramm-Rudman; to vote not to violate the Budget Act; to vote in effect to do business as we ought to do business, by having our highways, the priority for those highways determined on a State level with the money to be shared through the allocation formula through the States rather than for specific committees of the Congress to identify specific projects for their members for special treatment in a supplemental appropriation of this kind.

It is a very difficult thing for me to explain to my constituents when they see these special projects and there is no apparent way for us to try to remove these projects and to have them put back into the formula in the usual way.

There would be more money available for projects in my State and other States if this money was not made available through this special procedure, and that is why, Mr. Chairman, I asked for the withdrawal of these $11 million in these four specific projects. Whatever else has been said here this evening, there is one fact that remains: These are four special projects. Nobody else is treated this way, just these four special projects. That is what we are objecting to, the process.

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

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Maryland, there seems to be some confusion, our staff is doing some research, and it was their impression that the original authorization was inadequate, that there was a clause put in a highway bill I believe the Congress before last which did not get passed, and that it was then put in an appropriations bill since then relating directly to the Baltimore highway. Is that correct?

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman from Louisiana will yield, I am not sure, the provision that was—that they may be referring to was a provision that we passed 2 years ago which deleted the requirement that the highway be transferred to the State. The Federal Government and the State could never agree on that. The Federal Government decided to keep it, and that was included as a deletion 2 years ago.

Mr. GINGRICH. And was that provision in an authorizing bill or in an appropriations bill?

Mr. HOYER. That was in an authorizing bill.

Mr. GINGRICH. I think that our staff was under the impression that in fact the authorizing bill was never passed and it ended up being put into an appropriations bill.

Mr. HOYER. That may have been the case; the gentleman may be correct. But all that deals with, that is not authorizing the project, that was taking out a condition in this 1970 authorization bill. There was a condition preceding, the gentleman is correct on that, but the project was authorized in 1970.

□ 2120

Mr. GINGRICH. Could the gentleman inform us, was the gentleman's precedent then in the 1970 bill that the highway was ultimately to be turned over to the State?

Mr. HOYER. That was the condition precedent in 1970 which the Federal Government abandoned.

Mr. GINGRICH. So we are relying on a 1970 authorization which would have turned the highway over to the State, but which has been amended since and the State will not take it, but had the highway been turned over to the State, based on the authorization that we are relying on, this would then clearly be an addition to Maryland's funds?

Mr. HOYER. If that were the case, of course. And If I had $2 million in my pocket, I would not have to be up here talking about it. What does the "if" have to do with it?

Mr. GINGRICH. Had the gentleman's colleague not objected, I would still have preferred to have taken it out to add a minimum clutter, and I appreciate the gentleman's efforts to educate the House.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 254, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

AYES—133

Archer	Combest	Grandy
Armey	Craig	Gregg
Badham	Dannemeyer	Gunderson
Baker	Daub	Hall (TX)
Ballenger	Davis (IL)	Hamilton
Barton	DeWine	Hansen
Bates	Dickinson	Hastert
Bereuter	DioGuardi	Hefley
Bilirakis	Dornan (CA)	Henry
Bonker	Dreier	Herger
Buechner	Edwards (OK)	Hiler
Bunning	Fawell	Holloway
Burton	Fields	Hopkins
Callahan	Frenzel	Houghton
Chandler	Gallegly	Hunter
Cheney	Gekas	Hyde
Coats	Gingrich	Inhofe
Coble	Goodling	Ireland
Coleman (MO)	Gradison	Jacobs

Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Kasich
Konnyu
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Leath (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCollum
McEwen
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Pashayan
Patterson
Petri
Porter
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rowland (CT)
Saiki
Saxton
Schneider
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Spence
Stallings
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauke
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Whittaker
Williams
Wortley
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—254

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Chappell
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Coyne
Crockett
Darden
Davis (MI)
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLay
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Flippo
Florio
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Frost
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grant
Gray (IL)
Green
Guarini
Hammerschmidt
Harris
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hughes
Jeffords
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Lancaster
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Luken, Thomas
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCurdy
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Panetta
Parris
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Pickett
Pickle
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Rinaldo
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schumer
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stangeland
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

NOT VOTING—46

Annunzio
Aspin
Bartlett
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Collins
Courter
Crane
Daniel
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Dymally
Early
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Garcia
Gray (PA)
Hall (OH)
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hubbard
Hutto
Jones (TN)
Kemp
LaFalce
Latta
Leach (IA)
Livingston
Lukens, Donald
Madigan
Martinez
McDade
McKinney
Miller (OH)
Murphy
Oakar
Pepper
Richardson
Rostenkowski
Scheuer
Solomon
Taylor
Torricelli
Towns
Vander Jagt
Wilson

□ 2130

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Boulter for, with Mr. Ford of Tennessee against.

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri and Mr. ROBERTS changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HIGHWAY SAFETY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Highway Safety and Economic Development Demonstration Projects", $5,000,000, to be derived by transfer from "Motor Carrier Safety Grants" and to remain available until expended.

HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Highway Safety Improvement Demonstration Project", $2,000,000, to be derived by transfer from "Motor Carrier Safety Grants" and to remain available until expended.

HIGHWAY-RAILROAD GRADE CROSSING SAFETY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Highway-Railroad Grade Crossing Safety Demonstration Project", $2,000,000, to be derived by transfer from "Motor Carrier Safety Grants" and to remain available until expended.

VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the purpose of carrying out a demonstration of methods of improving vehicular and pedestrian safety on roads on the Federal-aid urban and Federal-aid secondary systems, involving Route 66 in Northampton and Huntington, Massachusetts, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $12,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended, of which $5,000,000 is hereby appropriated to be derived by transfer from "Motor Carrier Safety Grants" and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That all funds appropriated under this head shall be exempt from any limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Operations and Research", $1,000,000, to be derived from unobligated balances of funds made available by section 311 of Public Law 96-131 for replacement of facilities associated with Interstate Route 170 and to be merged with this account, notwithstanding any limitation on obligations on Federal-aid highways, and to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

RAIL SERVICE ASSISTANCE

(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves deferral D87-42 relating to the Federal Railroad Administration, "Rail Service Assistance", as set forth in the message of January 28, 1987, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this Act and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves deferral D87-45 relating to the Federal Railroad Administration, "Northeast Corridor Improvement Program", as set forth in the message of January 28, 1987, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this Act and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT FINANCING FUNDS

For payment to the Secretary of the Treasury for debt reduction, $12,500,000, to remain available until expended, together with such sums as may be necessary for the payment of interest due to the Secretary of the Treasury under the terms and conditions of such debt.

SETTLEMENTS OF RAILROAD LITIGATION

For the settlement of promissory notes pursuant to section 210(f) of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-236), as amended, $56,928,495, to remain available until expended, together with such sums as may be necessary for the payment of interest due to the Secretary of the

Treasury under the terms and conditions of such notes.

CONRAIL COMMUTER TRANSITION ASSISTANCE

(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves deferral D87-46 relating to the Federal Railroad Administration, "Conrail Commuter Transition Assistance", as set forth in the message of January 28, 1987, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this Act and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH, TRAINING, AND HUMAN RESOURCES

(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves $4,036,000 of the proposed deferral D87-47 relating to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, "Research, Training, and Human Resources", as set forth in the message of January 28, 1987, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this Act and the amount of the deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

INTERSTATE TRANSFER GRANTS-TRANSIT

(DISAPPROVAL OF DEFERRAL)

The Congress disapproves deferral D87-48 relating to the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, "Interstate Transfer Grants-Transit", as set forth in the message of January 28, 1987, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President. The disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this Act and the amount of the proposed deferral disapproved herein shall be made available for obligation.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses for operation and maintenance of those portions of the Saint Lawrence Seaway operated and maintained by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, $4,000,000, or so much thereof as may be available in and derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99-662.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

REBATE OF SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY TOLLS

(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

For rebate of the United States' portion of tolls paid for use of the Saint Lawrence Seaway, pursuant to Public Law 99-662, $6,250,000, or so much thereof as may be available in and derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $250,000 shall be available for expenses of administering the rebates.

PANAMA CANAL COMMISSION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating Expenses", $8,013,000, to be derived from the Panama Canal Commission Fund, of which $6,000,000 shall be available to cover the cost of removing a landslide at the Panama Canal, and $2,013,000 shall be available for payment to the Republic of Panama, pursuant to article XIII, paragraph 4(c) of the Panama Canal Treaty of 1977.

GENERAL PROVISION

AMTRAK ADVISORY COMMISSION

None of the funds provided for the Department of Transportation in this or any other Act shall be used to implement any charter establishing an advisory commission on the privatization of Amtrak.

□ 2140

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ARMEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARMEY: On page 67, line 22, strike all language through line 26.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, the provisions of the bill that I seek to strike are those provisions that prohibit Department of Transportation funds from being used to fund an established Commission to implement a study of the privatization of Amtrak.

This is an amendment, concerning which I feel very strongly, and I think it is only fair to advise the body that I will call for a recorded vote on this amendment.

The concept of privatization has a great deal of value to us. For many of us, privatization does not represent something new, but it represents a restoration of the traditional structure of a private enterprise Democratic political economic system.

We are very much concerned about the intrusion of the Federal Government into the affairs of Commerce, and in many cases, the overburdening of Government by the acquisition of functions and activities that legitimately and more efficiently can be carried out in the private sector, thus not only handicapping the productivity of those sectors of the economy and diminishing the overall well-being of the community, but also, in addition to that, overburdening the Government so that, in fact, we are unable to perform our necessary and legitimate tasks.

Amtrak represents a case in point where, for many of us, the Federal Government involved in a business for which it is not equipped and, we believe, it has no legitimate authority.

We believe that we can improve the efficiency of rail transportation, decrease the Federal budget, providing a safety valve to the Gramm-Rudman budget pressure that not only allows us to reduce costs, but allows the consumers of transportation services to get better services at less cost with greater efficiency through the private sector.

The Secretary of Transportation has quite rightly established a commission to examine these propositions, to study the issue. This is a study, a study that will test the proposition with data and analysis. If the analysis supports our contention, we should have a proven validity to save the taxpayers about $700 million a year.

If we are correct, we should also be able to provide passengers with greater transportation opportunities at greater efficiency and with greater equity, and we should provide the Nation's taxpayers a reprieve from the tax burden that they must carry in order to subsidize the transportation needs of a few.

Amtrak, I believe, is an ideal opportunity to prove the concept of privatization, restore a proper balance between the public and the private sector, and to provide the American consumers with greater opportunities, greater efficiency and greater prosperity.

It would seem to me a very serious loss indeed if this body would deprive the American people of the opportunity to gain more knowledge and more understanding by striking the ability of the Department of Transportation to fund this study and to further advance this proposition.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman for his amendment. It seems to me rather odd that a little while ago, we approved in this body spending $10 million to study socialized agriculture, but when it comes to the idea of maybe looking at whether or not we could privatize the railroad system, now we are going to keep that from being even considered or even looked at.

□ 2150

On one hand, leftwing Democrats would have us say that what we can do is study socializing the entire agricultural system, but we cannot look at spinning off private enterprise in the railroad system. It just strikes me as being a totally ludicrous kind of dichotomy in this bill.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is rather interesting that after most of the evening when Members have been proposing cuts to our supplemental appropriation bill, now my friend, the gentleman from Texas, wants to add money to our bill. This is a new switch.

The real issue is the makeup of the Commission that he is concerned about. Our subcommittee opposed funding for this Commission at this time, and it is best explained in a few lines from the committee report language. I will read what it says:

The Committee is concerned that the Advisory Commission on the Privatization of Amtrak, proposed by the Secretary on March 6, 1987, reflects an unbalanced bias

favoring the elimination of Amtrak rail passenger service. The announced membership of the Commission, together with the objectives set forth in its charter, raise serious questions as to the objectivity and intentions of the Commission. Termination of Amtrak service repeatedly has been rejected by the Congress. While the Committee would value recommendations for reducing Amtrak's dependence on federal support and for increasing its efficiency, it is unclear that the Commission as presently constituted and chartered can provide any proposals toward this end.

Our subcommittee has given compromise language to the Secretary's office that they are studying at the present time. Should that compromise language be accepted by the Secretary's office and by the authorizing committee, our subcommittee would have no more problem with this study group, and we would remove our objection to the funding as proposed by the Secretary.

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

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would allow me, I would touch quickly on two points.

First, I do not believe it is accurate for the gentleman to characterize my amendment as one that would spend more money. The money the Department has to be used for this purpose is already authorized and appropriated and would be transferred from some other department function.

The other point the gentleman made—and the gentleman and I did discuss this—is that I appreciate he may be concerned with the composition of the study commission and would like to use this leverage to make a change.

I, on the other hand, have found myself in this body many times having to accept study commission memberships that I found inconvenient to my point of view, and on that basis I would still insist or hope that the Members would vote for my amendment. I appreciate the gentleman's point of view also that in conference he hopes to achieve desired results, but I have to say in all candor that I have come to be not too optimistic about what I could rely on in conference even though I know the gentleman would fight hard for the points that have been made.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's position.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say to our colleagues that the process of privatization is a very important experiment on how we run this Government and how we achieve certain things.

This study commission does not achieve anything legally without Congress approving it. What it does is allow the Reagan administration to move forward with the process of studying and reporting on privatization. I would ask my friends in the Democratic Party, why be afraid of it? At least let us look at it. Let us get it out in the open.

If it can deliver rail service, if it can serve the passenger better, if it is better for the country, let us at least give it a chance.

I would hope that no one would vote for ignorance, that no one would vote to cut off the study, that we would instead allow the study to go forward and allow the Commission to report, and then this Congress in its appropriate committees and subcommittees can take up their report.

So I would strongly urge a vote in favor of allowing this Commission to look at the issue of privatizing Amtrak and to recognize that all it is doing is raising the question of whether or not this is a useful process. I think it is legitimate for the Secretary of Transportation to appoint a committee that fits the interests and the values of the administration, knowing that when that Commission comes to the Congress, we will have a chance to work our will.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 144, noes 239, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

AYES—144

Archer
Armey
Badham
Baker
Ballenger
Barton
Bateman
Bennett
Bentley
Bilirakis
Bliley
Broomfield
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Chandler
Cheney
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Coughlin
Craig
Dannemeyer
Davis (IL)
de la Garza
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Fields
Fish
Frenzel
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Grandy
Gregg
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hiler
Holloway
Hopkins
Houghton
Huckaby
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Johnson (SD)
Kasich
Kolbe
Konnyu
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Leath (TX)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Martin (IL)
McCandless
McCollum
McCurdy
McEwen
McMillan (NC)
Michel
Miller (WA)
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Neal
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price (NC)
Pursell
Quillen
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Ritter
Robinson
Roemer
Rogers
Roukema
Saiki
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Skeen
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Spence
Stangeland
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Thomas (CA)
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—239

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Bates
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Bilbray
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Chappell
Clarke
Clay
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Darden
Daub
Davis (MI)
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Flake
Flippo
Florio
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Frost
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grant
Gray (IL)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lowry (WA)
Luken, Thomas
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McGrath
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Nelson
Nichols
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Panetta
Pashayan
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Pickett
Price (IL)
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Ridge
Rinaldo
Roberts
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Roth
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schneider
Schumer
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Traficant

Traxler	Watkins	Williams
Udall	Waxman	Wise
Valentine	Weiss	Wolpe
Vento	Weldon	Wyden
Visclosky	Wheat	Yates
Volkmer	Whittaker	Yatron
Walgren	Whitten	

NOT VOTING—50

Annunzio	Ford (TN)	Miller (OH)
Aspin	Garcia	Murphy
Bartlett	Gray (PA)	Myers
Bosco	Hatcher	Oakar
Boulter	Hawkins	Pepper
Brown (CO)	Hutto	Richardson
Collins	Jones (TN)	Rostenkowski
Courter	Kemp	Scheuer
Crane	LaFalce	Solarz
Crockett	Latta	Solomon
Daniel	Leach (IA)	Swift
Dorgan (ND)	Livingston	Taylor
Dowdy	Lukens, Donald	Torricelli
Downey	Madigan	Towns
Dymally	Martinez	Vander Jagt
Early	McDade	Wilson
Foglietta	McKinney	

□ 2210

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Boulter for, with Mr. Dymally against.

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

Ms. SNOWE changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER XII

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $5,500,000, of which $500,000 is for the Office of Depreciation Analysis, and of which $5,000,000 is to remain available until expended for repairs and improvements to the Treasury Annex.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $1,900,000, which shall remain available through September 30, 1988, for headquarters relocation.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $10,000,000.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR INTERDICTION PROGRAM

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, $2,500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1988, for the purpose stated in the conference report to accompany H.J. Res. 738 (House Report 99-1005).

DISAPPROVAL OF DELAY IN AVAILABILITY

The Congress disapproves the proposal to delay availability of obligation of $32,099,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Air Interdiction Program, until after October 1, 1987, contained in House Document 100-31, of February 9, 1987. This disapproval shall be effective upon enactment into law of this Act and the funds shall be made available for obligation.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

PROCESSING TAX RETURNS

For an additional amount for "Processing tax returns", $55,200,000.

EXAMINATION AND APPEALS

For an additional amount for "Examination and appeals", $8,110,000.

INVESTIGATION, COLLECTION AND TAXPAYER SERVICE

For an additional amount for "Investigation, collection, and taxpayer service", $16,690,000.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $5,722,000.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

PAYMENT TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND

For an additional amount for "Payment to the Postal Service Fund", $79,177,000.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF REVENUE

In addition to the aggregate amount heretofore made available for real property management and related activities in fiscal year 1987, $61,900,000 shall be made available for rental of space: *Provided*, That any revenues, collections and any other sums accruing to this fund during fiscal year 1987 in excess of $2,447,756,000, excluding reimbursements under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)), shall remain in the fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating expenses", $475,000.

TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1987

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1987, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"House leadership offices", $39,000;

"Members' clerk hire", $2,584,000;

"Committee employees", $720,000;

"Special and select committees", $446,000;

"Allowances and expenses", $408,000;

"Salaries, officers and employees", $618,000;

JOINT ITEMS

"Joint Economic Committee", $75,000;

"Joint Committee on Printing", $10,000;

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

"Salaries and expenses", $209,000;

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses", $80,000;

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Office of the Architect of the Capitol: "Salaries", $50,000;

"Capitol buildings", $70,000;

"Capitol grounds", $40,000;

"House office buildings", $300,000;

"Capitol power plant", $40,000;

Library buildings and grounds: "Structural and mechanical care", $50,000;

BOTANIC GARDEN

"Salaries and expenses", $25,000;

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

"Salaries and expenses", $605,000;

Copyright Office: "Salaries and expenses", $173,000, of which not more than $17,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 1987 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(3) and 116(c)(1);

Congressional Research Service: "Salaries and expenses", $215,000;

COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL

"Salaries and expenses", $5,000, of which $4,000 shall be derived by collections from the appropriation "Payments to Copyright Owners" for the reasonable costs incurred in proceedings involving distribution of royalty fees as provided by 17 U.S.C. 807;

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Office of Superintendent of Documents: "Salaries and expenses", $46,000;

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses", $2,500,000;

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

"Salaries and expenses"; $504,000;

"Care of the building and grounds", $24,000;

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

"Salaries and expenses", $97,000;

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

"Salaries and expenses", $69,000;

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

"Salaries and expenses," $15,032,000;

"Defender services", $593,000;

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

"Salaries and expenses", $504,000;

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

"Salaries and expenses", $116,000;

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses", $172,000;

EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

"Operating expenses", $43,000;

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE PRESIDENT

"Salaries and expenses," $10,000;

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

"Salaries and expenses", $16,000;

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

"Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality", $3,000;

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

"Salaries and expenses", $23,000;

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

"Salaries and expenses", $28,000;

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $57,000;

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

"Salaries and expenses", $290,000;

OFFICE OF FEDERAL PROCUREMENT POLICY

"Salaries and expenses", $12,000;

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

"Office of Science and Technology Policy", $3,000;

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

"Salaries and expenses", $77,000;

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

"Operating expenses, Agency for International Development", $2,175,000;

"Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development, Office of the Inspector General", $103,000;

PEACE CORPS

"Peace Corps, operating expenses", $324,000;

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

"African Development Foundation", $15,000;

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Office of the Secretary", $31,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration", $7,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental and Public Affairs", $7,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics", $7,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education", $7,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Service", $7,000;

"Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs", $8,000;

"Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development", $8,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment", $7,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services", $7,000;

"Departmental Administration", for budget and program analysis $79,000; for personnel, finance and management, operations, information resources management, equal opportunity, small and disadvantaged business utilization, and administrative law judges and judicial officers, $232,000; making a total of $311,000;

"Building operations and maintenance", $35,000;

"Office of Governmental and Public Affairs", for public affairs $53,000; for congressional relations, $5,000; and for intergovernmental affairs $4,000;

"Office of the Inspector General", $400,000;

"Office of the General Counsel", $300,000;

"Agricultural Research Service", $3,935,000;

"National Agricultural Library", $65,000;

"Economic Research Service", $415,000;

"National Agricultural Statistics Service", $490,000;

"World Agricultural Outlook Board", $15,000;

"Foreign Agricultural Service", $567,000;

"General Sales Manager", an additional $114,000, to be derived by transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation fund;

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", an additional $8,967,000, to be derived by transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation funds;

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $3,000,000;

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

"Conservation operations", $7,297,000;

"River basin surveys and investigations", $102,000;

"Watershed planning", $74,000;

"Watershed and flood prevention operations", $943,000;

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $2,000,000;

FEDERAL GRAIN INSPECTION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $53,000;

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

"Limitation on administrative expenses", (increase of $501,000 in limitation);

"Funds for strengthening markets, income and supply (section 32)", (increase of $112,000 in the limitation, "marketing agreements and orders");

"Packers and Stockyards Administration", $78,000;

"Agricultural Cooperative Service", $32,000;

"Office of Transportation", $23,000;

"Food Safety Inspection Service", $7,000,000;

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

"Food program administration", $713,000;

HUMAN NUTRITION INFORMATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $34,000;

FOREST SERVICE

"Forest research", $1,844,000, to be derived by transfer from the permanent appropriation entitled "Timber purchaser roads constructed by Forest Service";

"State and private forestry", $413,000, to be derived by transfer from the permanent appropriation entitled "Timber purchaser roads constructed by Forest Service";

"National forest system", $17,574,000, to be derived by transfer from the permanent appropriation entitled "Timber purchaser roads constructed by Forest Service";

"Construction", $2,859,000, to be derived by transfer from the permanent appropriation entitled "Timber purchaser roads constructed by Forest Service";

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

(TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $450,000, to be derived by transfer of unobligated balances from "Regional development programs";

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $397,000, to be derived by transfer from "Economic Development Revolving Fund";

ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

"Salaries and expenses", $332,000, to be derived by transfer of unobligated balances from "Regional development programs";

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

"Operations, Research, and Facilities", $7,505,000, to be derived by transfer from "Coastal Energy Impact Fund";

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $243,000, to be derived by transfer from "National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Operations, Research, and Facilities";

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

"Operation and Maintenance, Army", $2,679,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Navy", $3,350,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", $183,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", $1,925,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies", $2,307,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve", $109,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve", $29,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve", $3,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve", $281,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard", $285,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard", $618,000;

"Court of Military Appeals, Defense", $1,000;

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

"Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army", $336,000;

"Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy", $33,000;

"Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force", $306,000;

"Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense Agencies", $115,000;

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

"General expenses", $1,832,000, to be derived by transfer from "Construction, General";

SOLDIERS' AND AIRMEN'S HOME

"Operation and maintenance", $554,000, to be derived by transfer from "Capital outlay";

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Energy Information Administration", $469,000, to be derived by transfer of unobligated balances in "Fossil energy research and development";

"Emergency preparedness", $89,000; to be derived by transfer of unobligated balances in "Fossil energy research and development";

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $5,892,000;

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Indian health services", $7,686,000;

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

"Office of the Director", $150,000;

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

"Federal Subsidy for Saint Elizabeths Hospital", $2,487,000;

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on administrative expenses", $18,000,000, to be derived from amounts available in this account for automatic data processing and telecommunications activities";

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

"Human Development Services", $500,000;

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

"General departmental management", $1,500,000;

"Office of Consumer Affairs", $10,000;

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Salaries and expenses", $9,714,000, to be derived by transfer from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration;

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

"Management of lands and resources", $5,622,000;

"Oregon and California grant lands", $815,000;

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

"Resource management", $3,046,000;

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

"Operation of the National park system", $9,960,000;

"National recreation and preservation", $200,000;

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

"Surveys, investigations, and research", $6,072,000;

BUREAU OF MINES

"Mines and minerals", $900,000;

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

"Operation of Indian programs", $9,765,000;

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

"Office of the Secretary", $350,000: *Provided*, That the limitation on expenses for the immediate Office of the Secretary in fiscal year 1987 under this head in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1987, as included in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, shall be increased only to the extent necessary for pay adjustments pursuant to Executive Order 12578 of December 31, 1986;

"Office of the Solicitor", $200,000;

"Office of the Inspector General", $120,000;

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $575,000;

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $84,000;

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

"Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", $1,646,000;

"Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division", $315,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988;

"Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys", $2,818,000;

"Salaries and expenses, Oversight of Bankruptcy Cases", $93,000;

"Salaries and expenses, United States Marshals Service", $2,234,000;

"Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service", $64,000;

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

"Salaries and expenses", $9,309,000 of which $5,686,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1988;

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $2,593,000;

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $5,588,000;

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

"Salaries and expenses", $3,932,000;

"National Institute of Corrections", $20,000;

"Buildings and facilities", $30,000;

"Limitation on administrative and vocational training expenses, Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated" (increase of $27,000 in the limitation on Administrative expenses, and $106,000 on Vocational Training expenses);

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

"Salaries and expenses", $172,000;

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $1,583,000, to be derived from the unobligated balances of Employment Standards Administration, "Salaries and expenses";

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

"Black Lung Disability Trust Fund", $708,000, of which $296,000 shall be available for transfer to Employment Standards Administration, "Salaries and expenses" and of which $412,000 shall be available for transfer to Departmental Management, "Salaries and expenses";

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

"Salaries and expenses", $1,476,000, to be derived from the unobligated balances of Employment Standards Administration, "Salaries and expenses";

"Office of the Inspector General", $460,000, to be derived from the unobligated balances of Employment Standards Administration, "Salaries and expenses";

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

"Salaries and expenses", $6,900,000;

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", $750,000, to be derived by transfer from the unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers";

COAST GUARD

"Operating expenses", $20,100,000, of which $3,945,000 shall be derived from the unobligated balances of "Deepwater Port Liability Fund", $5,000,000 from the unobligated balances of "Research, development, test, and evaluation", and $1,155,000, to be derived by transfer from "United States Railway Association, Administrative expenses";

"Reserve training", $1,200,000 to be derived by transfer from the unobligated balances of the "Deepwater Port Liability Fund";

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

"Headquarters administration", $500,000, to be derived by transfer from "Operation and maintenance, Metropolitan Washington airports";

"Operations", $44,000,000, of which $8,500,000 shall be derived by transfer from the unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers";

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on general operating expenses" (increase of $1,200,000 in the limitation on general operating expenses);

"Motor carrier safety", $140,000, to be derived from unobligated balances of funds made available by section 311 of Public Law 96-131 for replacement of facilities associated with Interstate Route 170 and to be merged with this account, notwithstanding any limitation on obligations on Federal-aid highways;

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

"Operations and research", $600,000;

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

"Office of the administrator", $200,000, to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Conrail labor protection";

"Railroad safety", $400,000, to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Conrail labor protection";

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

"Limitation on administrative expenses, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation" (increase of $30,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

"Research and special programs", $150,000, to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers";

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

"Salaries and expenses", $400,000, to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers";

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", $1,353,000;

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

"Salaries and expenses", $118,000;

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $1,430,000;

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS

"Salaries and expenses", $1,359,000;

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $12,577,000;

UNITED STATES MINT

"Salaries and expenses", $571,000;

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

"Salaries and expenses", $721,000;

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $1,000,000;

"Processing Tax Returns", $7,003,000;

"Examination and Appeals", $13,700,000;

"Investigation, Collection, and Taxpayer Service", $11,400,000;

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $2,045,000;

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Salaries and expenses", $9,000,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Buildings and facilities" appropriation for construction of a laboratory at the Environmental Research Center at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas;

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

"Operating expenses", $1,233,000: *Provided*, That in addition to this appropriation, the annual limitation for expenses of transportation audit contracts and contract administration payable from overcharges collected is increased by $4,000 to $10,504,000;

INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SERVICE

"Operating expenses", $297,000;

FEDERAL PROPERTY RESOURCES SERVICE

"Operating expenses", $177,500;

GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $912,000;

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

"Office of Inspector General", $198,000;

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE STAFF FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

"Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents", $3,000;

FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND

"Limitations on availability of revenue", in addition to the aggregate amount heretofore made available for real property management and related activities in fiscal year 1987, $3,071,700 shall be available for such purposes and the limitation on the amount available for real property operations is increased to $755,959,000 and the limitation on the amount available for program direction and centralized services is increased to $57,219,000 and the limitation on the amount available for design and construction services is increased to $63,537,700: *Provided,* That any revenues and collections and any other sums accruing to this fund during fiscal year 1987, excluding reimbursements under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)), in excess of $2,450,827,700 shall remain in the fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts;

CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER

"Consumer Information Center", $8,000 (and an increase of $8,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Research and program management", $25,000,000, of which $12,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Space flight, control and data communications";

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Salaries and expenses," $2,400,000, to be derived by transfer from the "Business Loan and Investment Fund", to remain available until September 30, 1988;

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

"Medical care", $149,391,000;

"Medical and prosthetic research", $1,859,000;

"Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses", $400,000;

"General operating expenses", $5,500,000;

"Construction, minor projects" (increase of $350,000 in the limitation on the expenses of the Office of Facilities);

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

"Salaries and expenses", $34,000;

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

"Salaries and expenses", $8,000;

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL PAY

"Salaries and expenses", $1,000;

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $140,000;

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

"Arms control and disarmament activities", $124,000;

COMMITTEE FOR PURCHASE FROM THE BLIND AND OTHER SEVERELY HANDICAPPED

"Salaries and expenses", $4,000;

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $250,000;

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $2,640,000;

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

"Limitation on administrative expenses" (increase of $157,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $755,000;

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

"Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board" (increase of $200,000);

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

"Salaries and expenses", $136,000;

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $200,000;

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $181,000;

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", $170,000;

"Office of the Special Counsel", $42,000;

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $592,000;

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

"Salaries and expenses", $6,000;

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

"Grants and administration", $200,000;

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

"Grants and administration", $200,000;

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", $628,000;

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", $60,000;

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

"Research and related activities" (increase of $1,300,000 in the limitation on program development and management);

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Salaries and expenses", $731,000 together with an additional amount of $435,000 for current fiscal year administration expenses for the retirement and insurance program to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Management in amounts to be determined by the Office of Personnel Management without regard to other statutes;

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $1,837,000;

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

"Salaries and expenses", $2,654,000;

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

"Salaries and expenses", $490,000

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

"Salaries and expenses", $21,000;

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

"Holocaust memorial council", $19,000;

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

"Salaries and expenses", $2,691,000;

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

"Salaries and expenses", $150,000.

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I know of no further amendments to this title, and I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title II?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—INCREASED COSTS FOR RETIREMENT CONTRIBUTIONS (PUBLIC LAW 99-335)

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1987, for Federal Employees' Retirement System costs authorized by or pursuant to law as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"Allowances and expenses", $35,880,000;

JOINT ITEMS

"Joint Economic Committee", $155,000;

"Joint Committee on Printing", $34,000;

Capitol Guide Service: "Salaries and expenses", $32,000;

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

"Salaries and expenses", $545,000;

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses", $452,000;

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Office of the Architect of the Capitol: "Salaries", $166,000;

"Capitol buildings", $187,000;

"Capitol grounds", $68,000;

"House office buildings", $611,000;

"Capitol power plant", $109,000;

Library buildings and grounds: "Structural and mechanical care", $130,000;

BOTANIC GARDEN

"Salaries and expenses", $48,000;

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

"Salaries and expenses", $1,906,000;

Copyright Office: "Salaries and expenses", $287,000, of which not more than $12,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 1987 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(3) and 116(c)(1);

Congressional Research Service: "Salaries and expenses", $617,000;

Books for the blind and physically handicapped: "Salaries and expenses", $103,000;

COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL

"Salaries and expenses", $7,000, of which $6,000 shall be derived by collections from the appropriation "Payments to Copyright Owners" for the reasonable costs incurred in proceedings involving distribution of royalty fees as provided by 17 U.S.C. 807;

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Office of the Superintendent of Documents: "Salaries and expenses", $83,000;

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses", $3,563,000;

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

"Salaries and expenses", $409,000;

"Care of the building and grounds", $33,000;

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

"Salaries and expenses", $23,000;

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

"Salaries and expenses", $49,000;

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

"Salaries and expenses", $9,688,000;

"Defender services", $887,000;

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

"Salaries and expenses", $80,000;

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER

"Salaries and expenses", $108,000;

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses", $374,000;

EXECUTIVE RESIDENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE

"Operating expenses", $53,000;

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE PRESIDENT

"Salaries and expenses", $107,000;

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

"Salaries and expenses", $95,000;

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

"Salaries and expenses", $89,000;

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

"Salaries and expenses", $62,000;

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $214,000;

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

"Salaries and expenses", $413,000;

OFFICE OF FEDERAL PROCUREMENT POLICY

"Salaries and expenses", $20,000;

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

"Office of Science and Technology Policy", $20,000;

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

"Salaries and expenses", $168,000;

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

"Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development", $5,488,000;

"Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development, Office of the Inspector General", $218,000;

PEACE CORPS

"Peace Corps, operating expenses", $436,000;

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

"African Development Foundation", $99,000;

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Office of the Secretary", $29,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration", $8,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental and Public Affairs", $6,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics", $6,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education", $6,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Service", $6,000;

"Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs", $8,000;

"Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development", $8,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment", $6,000;

"Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services", $6,000;

"Departmental Administration", for budget and program analysis, $73,000; for personnel, finance and management, operations, information resources management, equal opportunity, small and disadvantaged business utilization, and administrative law judges and judicial officer, $385,000; making a total of $458,000;

"Building operations and maintenance", $165,000;

"Office of Governmental and Public Affairs", for public affairs, $111,000; for congressional relations, $6,000; and for intergovernmental affairs, $9,000;

"Office of the Inspector General", $622,000;

"Office of the General Counsel", $239,000;

"Agricultural Research Service", $4,747,000;

"Extension Service", $6,500,000;

"National Agricultural Library", $97,000;

"Economic Research Service", $580,000;

"National Agricultural Statistics Service", $612,000;

"World Agricultural Outlook Board", $21,000;

"Foreign Agricultural Service", $607,000;

"General Sales Manager", an additional $107,000 to be derived by transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation fund;

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", an additional $9,920,000 to be derived by transfer from the Commodity Credit Corporation fund;

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

"Salaries and expenses", $114,000;

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

"Conservation operations", $5,331,000;

"River basin surveys and investigations", $130,000;

"Watershed planning", $97,000;

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $4,678,000;

FEDERAL GRAIN INSPECTION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $76,000;

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

"Marketing Services", $490,000;

"Limitation on administrative expenses", (increase of $213,000 in limitation);

"Funds for strengthening markets, income and supply" (section 32), (increase of $84,000 in the limitation "marketing agreements and orders");

"Packers and Stockyards Administration", $58,000;

"Agricultural Cooperative Service", $46,000;

"Office of Transportation", $34,000;

"Food Safety Inspection Service", $4,573,000;

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

"Food program administration", $1,503,000;

"Human Nutrition Information Service", $75,000;

FOREST SERVICE

"Forest research", $1,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the permanent appropriation entitled "Timber purchaser roads constructed by Forest Service";

"State and private forestry", $190,000, to be derived by transfer from the permanent appropriation entitled "Timber purchaser roads constructed by Forest Service";

"National forest system", $9,300,000, to be derived by transfer from the permanent appropriation entitled "Timber purchaser roads constructed by Forest Service";

"Construction", $1,600,000, to be derived by transfer from the permanent appropriation entitled "Timber purchaser roads constructed by Forest Service";

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $464,000;

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

"Salaries and expenses", $1,433,000;

"Periodic censuses and programs", $2,806,000, to remain available until expended;

ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

"Salaries and expenses", $408,000;

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $400,000, to be derived by transfer from "Economic Development Revolving Fund";

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

"Operations and Administration", $2,237,000, to remain available until expended;

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

"Minority business development", $180,000;

UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $49,000;

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

"Operations, research, and facilities", $5,972,000, to remain available until expended;

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

"Scientific and technical research and services", $1,368,000, to remain available until expended;

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $213,000;

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

"Operation and Maintenance, Army", $119,047,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Navy", $148,880,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps", $8,117,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Air Force", $85,564,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Defense Agencies", $102,453,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve", $4,858,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve", $1,306,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve", $135,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve", $12,471,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard", $12,666,000;

"Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard", $27,479,000;

"National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army", $7,000;

"Court of Military Appeals, Defense", $36,000;

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

"Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army", $14,955,000;

"Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy", $1,477,000;

"Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force", $13,609,000;

"Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense Agencies", $5,165,000;

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

"Military Construction, Army", $4,136,000;
"Military Construction, Navy", $1,736,000;
"Military Construction, Army Reserve", $53,000;

FAMILY HOUSING

"Family Housing, Army", $435,000;

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES—ARMY

"Salaries and expenses", $40,000;

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

"General expenses," $1,400,000, to be derived by transfer from "Construction, General";

SOLDIERS' AND AIRMEN'S HOME

"Operation and maintenance", $578,000, to be derived by transfer from "Capital outlay";

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $4,108,000;

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Indian health services", $4,000,000;

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

"Disease control, research, and training", $1,237,000;

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

"Office of the Director", $350,000;

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

"Federal Subsidy for Saint Elizabeths Hospital", $1,941,000;

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

"Office of the Inspector General", $500,000, to be derived by transfer from "Grants to States for Medicaid" in the Health Care Financing Administration;
"Office of Consumer Affairs", $8,000;

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Salaries and expenses", $9,755,000, to be derived by transfer from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration;

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

"Management of lands and resources", $454,000;
"Oregon and California grant lands", $479,000;

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

"Resource management", $2,800,000;

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

"Operation of the national park system", $4,000,000;
"National recreation and preservation", $100,000;

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

"Surveys, investigations, and research", $4,206,000;

BUREAU OF MINES

"Mines and minerals", $1,350,000;

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

"Operation of Indian programs", $4,500,000;

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

"Office of the Secretary", $400,000: *Provided* That the limitation on expenses for the immediate Office of the Secretary in fiscal year 1987 under this head in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1987, as included in Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, shall be increased only to the extent necessary for agency contributions for retirement costs prescribed by the Civil Service Retirement System (5 U.S.C. ch. 83) and the Federal Employees Retirement System Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-335);
"Office of the Solicitor", $200,000;
"Office of Inspector General", $180,000;

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $778,000;

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $155,000;

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

"Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", $2,213,000;
"Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division", $430,000, to remain available until September 30, 1988;
"Salaries and expenses, United States Attorneys", $3,510,000;
"Salaries and expenses, Oversight of Bankruptcy Cases", $150,000;
"Salaries and expenses, United States Marshals Service", $3,211,000;
"Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service", $85,000;

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

"Salaries and expenses", $23,005,000;

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $7,324,000;

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $10,186,000;

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

"Salaries and expenses", $17,053,000;
"National Institute of Corrections", $129,000;
"Buildings and Facilities", $208,000;
"Limitation on administrative and vocational training expenses, Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated" (increase of $25,000 in the limitation on Administrative expenses, and of $30,000 in Vocational Training expenses);

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

"Salaries and expenses", $210,000;

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

"Program administration", $808,000 to be derived from the unobligated balances of Employment Standards Administration, "Salaries and expenses";

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

"Black Lung Disability Trust Fund", $494,000, of which $224,000 shall be available for transfer to Employment Standards Administration, "Salaries and expenses" and of which $270,000 shall be available for transfer to Departmental Management, "Salaries and expenses";

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $1,533,000 to be derived from the unobligated balances of Employment Standards Administration, "Salaries and expenses";

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $1,941,000 to be derived from the unobligated balances of Employment Standards Administration, "Salaries and expenses";

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

"Salaries and expenses", $1,302,000 of which $199,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances of the Employment Standards Administration, "Salaries and expenses", and $1,103,000 shall be derived by transfer from Employment Standards Administration, "Salaries and expenses";
"Office of the Inspector General", $556,000 to be derived by transfer from Employment Standards Administration, "Salaries and expenses";

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

"Salaries and expenses," $16,734,000;

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", $450,000, to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers";

COAST GUARD

"Operating expenses", $2,000,000, to be derived from the unobligated balances of the "Offshore Oil Pollution Compensation Fund";

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

"Headquarters administration", $350,000, to be derived by transfer from "Operation and maintenance, Metropolitan Washington airports";
"Operations", $46,000,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Operation and maintenance, Metropolitan Washington airports";

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on general operating expenses" (increase of $1,600,000 in the limitation on general operating expenses);
"Motor carrier safety", $660,000, to be derived from unobligated balances of funds made available by section 311 of Public Law 96-131 for replacement of facilities associated with Interstate Route 170 and to be merged with this account notwithstanding any limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways;

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

"Operations and research", $400,000;

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

"Office of the Administrator", $100,000;
"Railroad safety", $250,000";

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

"Administrative expenses", $300,000, to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Research, training, and human resources";

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

"Limitation on administrative expenses, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation" (increase of $30,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS ADMINISTRATION

"Research and special programs", $100,000, to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers";

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

"Salaries and expenses", $400,000, to be derived from the unobligated balances of "Payments to air carriers";

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", $863,000;

FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER

"Salaries and expenses", $167,000;

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $1,164,000;

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO AND FIREARMS

"Salaries and expenses", $3,428,000;

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $10,066,000;

UNITED STATES MINT

"Salaries and expenses", $422,000;

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

"Salaries and expenses", $1,058,000;

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $3,110,000;

"Processing Tax Returns", $81,854,000;

"Examination and Appeals", $23,325,000;

"Investigation, Collection, and Taxpayer Service", $11,711,000;

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $5,387,000;

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

"Salaries and expenses", $5,000,000;

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

"Operating expenses", $1,611,000: *Provided,* That in addition to this appropriation, the annual limitation for expenses of transportation audit contracts and contract administration payable from overcharges collected is increased by $6,000 to $10,510,000;

INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT SERVICE

"Operating expenses", $328,000;

FEDERAL PROPERTY RESOURCES SERVICE

"Operating expenses", $290,000;

GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", $1,214,000;

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

"Office of Inspector General", $373,000;

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE STAFF FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

"Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents", $5,000;

FEDERAL BUILDING FUND

"Limitations on availability of revenue", in addition to the aggregate amount heretofore made available for real property management and related activities in fiscal year 1987, $5,762,000 shall be available for such purposes and the limitation on the amount available for real property operations is increased to $761,024,000 and the limitation on the amount available for program direction and centralized services is increased to $57,444,000 and the limitation on the amount available for design and construction services is increased to $64,009,700: *Provided,* That any revenues and collections and any other sums accruing to this fund during fiscal year 1987, excluding reimbursements under section 210(f)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 490(f)(6)), in excess of $2,456,589,700 shall remain in the fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts;

"Consumer Information Center", $6,000 (and an increase of $6,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Research and program management", $10,500,000, of which $7,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Research and development" and $3,500,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Space flight, control and data communications";

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"Salaries and expenses", $2,400,000, to be derived by transfer from the "Business Loan and Investment Fund";

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

"Medical care", $131,600,000;

"Medical and prosthetic research", $1,024,000;

"Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses", $175,000;

"General operating expenses", $5,000,000;

"Construction, minor projects" (an increase of $275,000 in the limitation on the expenses of the Office of Facilities);

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

"Salaries and expenses", $14,000;

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL PAY

"Salaries and expenses", $2,000;

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

"Arms control and disarmament activities", $176,000;

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

"Salaries and expenses", $19,000;

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $250,000;

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $1,889,000;

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

"Limitation on administrative expenses" (increase of $227,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $1,199,000;

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $83,000;

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

"Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board", (increase of $200,000);

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY

"Salaries and expenses", $220,000;

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $147,000;

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", $188,000;

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY STAFF

"Intelligence Community Staff", $155,000;

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $10,000;

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", $272,000;

"Office of Special Counsel", $79,000;

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

"Operating expenses", $863,000;

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

"Salaries and expenses", $17,000;

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HANDICAPPED

"Salaries and expenses", $10,000;

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

"Grants and administration", $200,000;

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", $1,659,000;

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", $44,000;

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

"Salaries and expenses"; $1,129,000 together with an additional amount of $682,000 for current fiscal year administration expenses for the retirement and insurance program to be transferred from the appropriate trust funds of the Office of Personnel Management in amounts to be determined by the Office of Personnel Management without regard to other statutes;

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

"Limitation on administration" increase of $764,000 in the limitation on administration in fiscal year 1987, which shall be available only after maximum absorption within the existing limitation and only to the extent necessary for agency contributions prescribed by the Federal Employees Retirement System Act of 1986, to be derived from the railroad retirement accounts;

"Limitation on railroad unemployment insurance administration fund" increase of $214,000 in the limitation on railroad unemployment insurance administration fund in fiscal year 1987, which shall be available only after maximum absorption within the existing limitation and only to the extent necessary for agency contributions prescribed by the Federal Employees Retirement System Act of 1986, to be derived as authorized by section 11(a)(iv) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

"Limitation on review activity" increase of $22,000 in the limitation on review activity in fiscal year 1987, which shall be available only after maximum absorption within the existing limitation and only to the extent necessary for agency contributions prescribed by the Federal Employees Retirement System Act of 1986, to be derived from the railroad retirement accounts and the railroad unemployment insurance account;

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", $2,163,000;

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

"Salaries and expenses", $1,700,000;

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

"Salaries and expenses", $330,000;

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

"Salaries and expenses", $19,000;

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

"Holocaust memorial council", $16,000;

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

"Salaries and expenses", $5,443,000;

"Radio Broadcasting to Cuba", $516,000;

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

"Salaries and expenses", $75,000.

Mr. WHITTEN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I know of no further amendments to the title, and I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title III be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title III?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV

URGENT RELIEF FOR THE HOMELESS

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1987

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

GRANTS FOR FACILITIES TO ASSIST THE HOMELESS

For grants to private voluntary organizations, units of local government, and States for facilities to assist the homeless as authorized by title III of the Urgent Relief for the Homeless Act as passed the House of Representatives on March 5, 1987, or similar legislation if enacted into law, $75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

EMERGENCY SHELTER GRANTS PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program carried out by the Department of Housing and Urban Development pursuant to section 101(g) of Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That in addition to the allocations required for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program pursuant to the provisions made applicable by section 101(g) of Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall (for amounts appropriated beginning with the enactment of this Act) allocate assistance under the program to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States, in accordance with an allocation formula established by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may waive the 15 percent limitation on the use of assistance for essential services established for the Emergency Shelter Grants Program pursuant to section 523(2)(B) of the provisions made applicable by section 101(g) of Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, if the unit of general local government receiving the assistance demonstrates that the other eligible activities under the program are already being carried out in the unit of general local government with other resources.

TRANSITIONAL HOUSING DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the Transitional Housing Demonstration Program carried out by the Department of Housing and Urban Development pursuant to section 101(g) of Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, $30,000,000, to remain available until expended.

PERMANENT HOUSING FOR HANDICAPPED HOMELESS PERSONS

For grants for the acquisition and rehabilitation of property to serve as permanent housing for handicapped homeless persons as authorized by title IV of the Urgent Relief for the Homeless Act as passed the House of Representatives on March 5, 1987, or similar legislation if enacted into law, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

For an additional amount for the "Emergency food and shelter program", $50,000,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any provision of this or any other Act, the earmarking of funds solely for the provision of emergency rent and utility assistance shall not apply to the funds provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MONTGOMERY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONTGOMERY: Page 123, after line 17, insert the following:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

VETERANS' DOMICILIARY PROGRAM

Of the amounts appropriated in this title and available for obligation without regard to a requirement for release in subsequent appropriations Acts, $20,000,000 shall be made available to the Veterans' Administration (to be derived by a pro rata reduction of such amounts), to be available only for expansion of the capacity of the Veterans' Administration domiciliary program, to remain available through September 30, 1988.

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 2220

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would earmark $20 million of the funds appropriated by title IV of the bill (H.R. 1827) to take care of homeless veterans in the VA's domiciliary program. It would do this by reducing accounts in title IV of the bill by a proportionate amount. With $20 million, the Veterans' Administration can take unused space on the grounds of several VA medical centers and turn it into 600 to 700 domiciliary beds. According to the VA, these beds would be established in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Little Rock, Denver, Palo Alto, CA, and Tacoma, WA.

We also think that some other medical centers, such as those in Chicago and Miami, could convert space for this purpose.

Domiciliary care in VA facilities provides necessary medical and other professional care for eligible ambulatory veterans who are disabled by age, disease, or injury and are in need of care but do not require hospitalization or the skilled services of a nursing home. Veterans who can be cared for in VA domiciliaries are veterans who are down and out and need help. Many have no place to go. The VA Domiciliary Program is ideal for the care and treatment of homeless veterans.

We are told that in some areas of the country, about one-third of the homeless population are veterans. They fall into three categories. There are those who are mentally ill. Some are veterans who may need treatment for drug or alcohol abuse, and there are those who lost their job and have been unemployed for a long period of time. What we can do in the VA Domiciliary Program is give the veteran a place to live while he or she is being treated and rehabilitated so that the veteran can go back into the community and live on his own. All of these veterans are without adequate financial means to get back on their feet without some help.

This program is already authorized and ongoing. We know that the program works because we have over 10,000 veterans in our domiciliaries every day. With this $20 million, the VA can establish 600 to 700 more beds and hopefully take care of several thousand homeless veterans within the next 12 months.

Mr. Chairman, I would especially like to thank Mr. BOLAND of Massachusetts, chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Agencies and HUD and Mr. GREEN of New York, the ranking minority member for accepting this amendment. These two leaders did not have to accept the amendment but they did to help homeless veterans.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for yielding. The gentleman states it correctly. This amendment provides $20 million for an expanded domiciliary program for homeless veterans. This amount is derived by transferring funds on a pro rata basis for the various homeless programs provided for in title IV of this bill. There is no objection on this side from the subcommittee that I chair.

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

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for yielding to me.

As the distinguished gentleman knows, he and I have had numerous discussions about the problem of homeless veterans. In my hometown, it is estimated that roughly 30 percent of all of the single adult homeless are veterans. I have seen similar numbers for other major cities, and obviously there is a problem to be addressed there.

As the gentleman and I have discussed this, we did agree that the domiciliary program looked like a very good vehicle for dealing with this population of veterans who need a little bit of a structured environment to

assist them, to provide shelter for them, and I therefore want to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN] and would like to thank also the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] as well as other members of the Appropriations Committee for giving me this opportunity.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Health resources and services", for carrying out the activities authorized by section 101(a) of H.R. 558, the Urgent Relief for the Homeless Act, as passed the House on March 5, 1987, $75,000,000 to remain available through September 30, 1988.

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH

For an additional amount for "Alcohol, drug abuse and mental health", for carrying out the activities authorized by section 101(b) of H.R. 558, the Urgent Relief for the Homeless Act, as passed the House on March 5, 1987, $25,000,000 to remain available through September 30, 1988.

FAMILY SUPPORT ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

For an additional amount for "Community services block grant", for carrying out the activities authorized by section 101(h) of H.R. 558, the Urgent Relief for the Homeless Act, as passed the House on March 5, 1987, $45,000,000 to remain available through September 30, 1988.

AUTHORIZATION

The provisions of the bill H.R. 558 (100th Congress, 1st Session), the "Urgent Relief for the Homeless Act", as passed the House of Representatives on March 5, 1987, are hereby enacted.

SHORT TITLE

This title may be cited as the "Urgent Relief for the Homeless Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1987".

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or other funds, available during fiscal year 1987, limiting the amount which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, enforce, or otherwise carry out any provision of Executive Order No. 12564 (dated September 15, 1986).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BARTON OF TEXAS

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTON of Texas: On page 125, line 19, strike out "SEC. 503" and all that follows through line 22 and renumber the remaining sections accordingly.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, some Members of this body may wonder what section 503 is. Let me read it very quickly. It says:

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, enforce or otherwise carry out any provision of Executive Order 12564.

Mr. Chairman, Executive Order 12564 is the Executive order that President Reagan signed on September 15 of 1986 that allows for mandatory drug testing in the Federal work force in certain sensitive areas of employment. It is estimated that there are about 1.1 million Federal workers in sensitive areas that could be required to be tested for drugs.

What are some of these areas? Customs agents, FAA air traffic controllers, Amtrak train engineers are just a few examples.

Mr. Chairman, If my colleagues will recall, in the last Congress we passed a very, very much ballyhooed law, a drug bill that we said we were going to try to make America drug free. President Reagan, in order to do this, decided to set an example in the Federal work force.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a second?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I am happy to yield the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think he has an excellent amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman, he is talking about Federal employees who would be impacted and involved in this drug test. Regarding the Conrail engineer who was partaking of marijuana and had a wreck, would his successor be barred from testing or not be tested because of this particular provision?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. It is my understanding that the gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the answer to the question is no, and the reason the answer is no is the program for testing was in being prior to September 15, and this language does not affect any program that was in being.

I would suggest further to the gentleman that the Customs program of which the gentleman spoke would also not be affected because it was in being as well prior to the Executive order.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield further for clarification, let me ask a question. Who would be affected in the Federal force by this provision?

Mr. HOYER. The Federal employees who would be affected by this are those Federal employees that do not fall under any program now, so none of the services are affected, Customs is not affected, and in the particular program and situation the gentleman spoke of, Conrail is not affected. It would be those employees who would be impacted by a new program adopted between now and September 30 of this year.

Mr. HUNTER. My question then, I guess, to the gentleman is, if the gentleman will continue to yield, is if there are some programs that are presumed to be beneficial for employee groups that are ongoing right now, why do we have this limiting provision in the appropriation supplemental?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If I may, I would like to reclaim my time. I am sure the Chair will recognize the gentleman on his own time.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I would like to point out, as the gentleman from Maryland pointed out, there are several drug testing programs in the Federal work force today that have been very successful. The armed services have been allowed to test their new recruits for drugs since 1981, and because of this they have cut drug use in our Armed Services from in the 40 to 50 percent range to in the neighborhood of 4 percent. The Customs Service has a drug testing program that they have wanted to implement. An appeals court in New Orleans this week just ruled that that drug testing program was constitutional and could be implemented.

Mr. Chairman, if we are serious about a war on drugs we have to start somewhere, and I think an excellent place to start is by allowing the President's drug testing program in the executive branch of the Federal work force to go forward.

I would point out that his drug testing program does not require that somebody that has tested positive be fired. They have the option to go into a rehabilitation program, and if they successfully complete that program

they can continue in the Federal employment.

□ 2030

We have got to start somewhere. This is a great place to start. I think this particular amendment would be one that is very worthy of passage and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an excellent amendment and I think there is still some confusion in the House as to whether or not we are talking about eliminating some substantive programs that could make this Nation safer, that would be beneficial in fact for Federal employees and their families.

It appears to relate to Executive Order 12564 dated September 22, 1985, I believe. My question again is going to the Conrail accident that had such tremendous publicity. Was the gentleman from Maryland stating that the individual who was involved in that program or in that accident was under a testing program or who had been tested under a drug program prior to the accident?

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

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that is the case. The reason I say that is because the only program that has been implemented at this point in time, the only one pursuant to the President's Executive order is the OPM, the agency itself that has a drug plan.

However, they have not yet identified the sensitive employees. All they have done is give the 60-day notice consistent with the President's Executive order. So that in light of the fact that that is the only program that is effective, DOT has not implemented its own program, that testing was done obviously under a prior drug testing program in effect prior to the Executive order.

Mr. HUNTER. So the gentleman is saying that the conductors of the Conrail trains are being tested right now.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I presume that is the case, yes. But what I am saying is the DOT program anteceded the Executive order and would not be affected therefore by this language.

Mr. HUNTER. But the gentleman is not sure if there is an ongoing drug testing program right now for people who operate the Conrail trains.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield further, the honest answer is I am nor sure because I have not checked into it. I presume it is because I know Secretary Dole is for such a program and therefore it would not have terminated and therefore such a program is in existence and would not be adversely affected by this amendment.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is my understanding there is a proposed testing program, but it has not been implemented. Is that the understanding of the gentleman?

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will yield further, the answer to the gentleman's question is Secretary Dole—and I think here is the confusion—has talked about another program. However, that program has not been implemented. My answer to the question of the gentleman with reference to Conrail was that there was a test effective there and obviously there was an existing program under which that test was affected which was not the new program that the Secretary is now talking about. That was any point.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the easiest way to simplify this debate is to state it is follows: if you are for drugs in the Federal work force, vote against this amendment; if you are against drugs in the Federal work force, vote for this amendment.

Mr. HOYER. That is certainly a simplistic way to put it; incorrect, but simplistic.

Mr. HUNTER. Reclaiming my time, let me just say to my colleagues that in the next 12 months approximately 300,000 pounds of cocaine is going to be smuggled and sent into this country by the cocaine-producing nations of the world. Some of that cocaine is going to destroy Federal families, families of people work in the Federal work force.

Looking at the problem and analyzing it from the standpoint or point of view of a member of the Select Committee on Narcotics, I think it is as much a benefit to the families of Federal employees to have this Executive Order 12564 implemented as it is to the rest of the general community. I think the gentleman has an excellent amendment. I would commend him for it.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote for it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment does in fact strike the language in the bill which would prohibit the use of funds in this act to implement the Executive order relating to drug testing of Federal employees; there is no doubt about that. The proposal to test employees, however, raises profound contitutional questions with reference to the rights of Federal workers. That is what I am concerned about.

Now, these issues are also the concern of the courts of this Nation, for these issues are now being litigated in the courts.

Furthermore, there are several committees of the Congress that are considering the various issues and opinions concerning this proposal.

I believe that in view of these concerns that we in this House should not permit the Executive to move forward until such time as the Congress and the courts have an opportunity to review this matter and take such action as is appropriate on this very sensitive issue.

It is believed that there will come directions from the court in the future, specifically on this issue and that there will be an opportunity to reach a consensus on this important matter in the coming months.

As the Congress considers the fiscal year 1988 authorization and appropriation bills, I would say that that is the time when this matter can definitely, first of all, continue to be adjudicated by the courts, decisions can be made and the committees of the Congress can come to some conclusion. Whatever the recommendation is it can be included in those bills in 1988.

The proposed language, of course, as it exists now would not affect policies which were in existence before September 15, 1986. Those are policies that will still remain.

This language would only apply to anything that came after September 15, 1986.

So we have in place a prohibition in the bill itself. An attempt now to strike that language would leave that complex issue wide open. We also have the situation where the courts themselves are attempting to make a final determination on these issues. And I think it is important for us to let the courts act and to let the Congress of the United States, through its various committees, come to some conclusion and make some recommendation that can be brought to this House.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROYBAL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I know there are some serious concerns about the court cases and civil rights.

The New Orleans Appellate Court ruled this week on the Customs drug testing program and ruled that it was constitutional and did not constitute an unreasonable search under the Constitution. So one of the gentleman's concerns has been addressed at least at the appellate level just this week in New Orleans.

Mr. ROYBAL. I would prefer that the matter go to the proper judicial level where a final determination can be made so that whatever recommendation is made by the authorizing committees of the House and by the Committee on Appropriations, for example, would be based on sound Constitutional principles. I think it would be based on those principles if it came from the highest court of the land, the Supreme Court of the United States.

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

Mr. ROYBAL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman has referred to the New Orleans case, the Fifth Circuit case. First of all, the gentleman is well aware, I am sure, that this is a circuit case. There are other decisions which are contrary. The Supreme Court has not yet ruled on this question. The court itself was divided. This was a 2-to-1 decision. It was the position of the Government in this case that the testing was not a search and seizure; as everybody knows the fourth amendment does not prohibit search and seizures per se, they must be unreasonable searches and seizures.

The court rejected the Government's position and said, no, even in this limited instance. The Customs case that this case dealt with was very limited.

□ 2240

That was the important reason for the court's ultimate finding. In this case, they said that the Government was wrong. This is a search and seizure.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROYBAL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the court also ruled that even though it was a search, it was a reasonable search.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] will continue to yield, the court went on to say, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] pointed out——

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

(On request of Mr. BARTON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROYBAL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the court went on to say, as the gentleman pointed out, that it was reasonable, but only because, and this is the key, and when I use my time, I will explain that, only because this particular program was very limited.

In point of fact, unlike the Executive order and the proposal that OPM has promulgated pursuant to the Executive order, it was not mandatory. It was not mandatory for any existing employee to take this test.

It was only given to those who were going to transfer and only those who were going to transfer into three very drug-enforcement-sensitive areas. In those three, if the person was requested to take the drug test, they could decide not to transfer, if they had some hesitation about taking the test, and there would be no adverse consequences.

All of those who were tested, all of them, tested negative; not one positive.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full 5 minutes, but I think it is very necessary for us to look at exactly what we are striking from the bill. We are striking an absolute prohibition against using the funds for drug testing. That is what we are talking about. We are not deciding exactly when it can be used, constitutionally or otherwise.

If you read 119 of the bill, it says that the funds shall not be used. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is shaking his head. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

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

As I pointed out a little earlier, there are extensive drug-testing programs currently in existence that would not be affected. What this says is none of the funds shall be utilized to implement the Executive order.

Now the reason for that is, which I will explain in a little greater length, much to the chagrin of all of the Members of the House, the Executive order has been further explained and devices have been adopted for implementation or proposed for implementation by the Office of Personnel Management which go far beyond the Executive order.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, if I might reclaim my time, I would ask the gentleman from Maryland if this bill is passed without the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, exactly what drug testing would be permitted?

Mr. HOYER. All drug testing that was in place prior to the Executive order or was implemented subsequent to the Executive order by other statutes.

Mr. SHAW. Reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman has pretty much made my case for me. I think that what you are looking at is very narrow windows. You are looking at prohibition of the areas under the Executive order. You are looking at a prohibition in areas of sensitive employment, excess absenteeism and everything else.

I would agree with the gentleman that these are new grounds that we are plowing. There is no question about it. Until the Supreme Court has a number of cases, we are not going to really fully know exactly when drug testing is constitutional and when it is not. But I think that what we are doing is we are taking the Federal Government out of that planning stage, which I think is very bad, and if there is one area that is most necessary beyond the question of the Fortune 500 corporations, who are more and more getting into this area, we are putting shackles on the Federal Government and saying that they cannot engage in these types of drug testing.

I might say, and I think most importantly, we are putting the Congress of the United States on record against drug testing. Let there be no mistake about it, that is what this vote is all about. That is the way it is going to be construed by the American public and that is the example that we, the elected officials of the United States, are being called upon to set for the American people.

I think this is a very good amendment. I compliment the gentleman from Texas and I intend to support it.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in that support.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered in good faith by the gentleman from Texas.

My distinguished colleague from Maryland and I represent districts with a large number of Government workers, and we have spent a great deal of time reviewing the proposed plan for the mass drug testing of Federal employees.

The administration's plan, if fully implemented, would make over half of our Nation's 2 million Federal workers subject to drug testing under its own criteria. While I support drug testing for Federal employees who hold jobs that directly affect national security or public safety, or where probable cause can be demonstrated, I am at a loss to understand why so many Federal jobs should be subject to such massive testing. Not only am I concerned about the accuracy and the cost of testing on such a large scale, but I am also concerned with the proposal to grant agency heads such wide latitude.

The President's directive strictly prohibits managers from selecting positions for drug testing in order to choose particular individuals. I agree. However, overall, the guidelines for defining which jobs should be subject to testing are too vague.

We are not considering some obscure regulations to address a marginal problem. We are examining proposals that not only affect the people involved, but could very well become models to be followed at other levels of government and in the private sector. The administration proposal has the potential of holding more than 1 million Federal workers hostage to the abusive behavior of a few. It is not the best way to deal with problems of drug abuse. Congress must have the opportunity and the time to consider this plan and its various ramifications before the administration goes ahead with any drug testing program.

The gentleman from Maryland's provision to ban implementation of the administration's plan provides Congress with the opportunity to carefully consider the drug testing of Federal employees and to decide whether changes are needed. This is a very reasonable approach, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I understand the concern of the gentlewoman from Maryland and I think she is doing an excellent job of representing her constituents, but I am a little bit confused because at one point, she says we might have to test as many as 1.1 million Federal employees. That is very true.

But at the other point, you admit that there is wide discretion that each executive branch head has discretion to determine exactly how many of those should be tested and the reason for that discretion is to make sure that no more than are necessary are tested. So that confuses me a little bit. I would like the gentlewoman's answer to that question.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, because the proposal simply says that an agency head will determine who is in a sensitive position. Sensitive position could be somebody who is a bookkeeper. Sensitive position could be a clerical worker. I do believe it should be people who are in public safety positions, who are in those positions of trust, but not just carte blanche.

We can help refine these regulations, and that is what I am asking for. I think in a supplemental budget, it is appropriate that we not give the appropriation to do that at this time.

□ 2250

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the ban on the use of funds to implement the President's Executive order mandating drug testing of Federal employees. The Appropriations Committee should be commended for recognizing the complexity of the drug-testing issue and for giving Congress time to review this matter and to take appropriate action.

Mr. Chairman, during hearings that I conducted last Congress, we heard overwhelming testimony that drug testing of Federal employees is unnecessary, inaccurate, prohibitively expensive, and unconstitutional.

First, there is no evidence that Federal employees are drug abusers. During our hearings, no one—absolutely no one—could present any evidence that Government employees are using drugs.

Second, drug tests are often wrong. The Office of Technology Assessment presented expert testimony that urinalysis screening have an inaccuracy rate of 5 to 20 percent.

If we required even 1 million Federal workers to take a test which is even 95 percent accurate, at least 50,000 workers would be falsely branded as drug abusers.

Third, the cost of drug testing is prohibitive. Testing 1 million workers just once would cost $100 million. That money could be better spent on drug education in the workplace and in our schools, and on interdiction of drugs at our borders, programs which the President wanted to cut.

Fourth, it is my conviction, and that of many Federal employee unions, that the President's Executive order violates the Constitution.

I don't have to remind those of my colleagues who have chosen to forget, that the fourth amendment says,

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

We always concentrate on houses, papers, effects, and not persons, when we talk about "probable cause" and "unreasonable searches and seizures" because heretofore no one envisioned an administration that would be so intrusive. But the Constitution, clearly and unambiguously, lists your person even before your house, your papers, and your effects to what could be violated.

Clearly, big brother needs both probable cause, and a search warrant, before he snatches your urine. American citizens do not give up their constitutional rights when they choose a career in public service.

It is incomprehensible that an administration that once pretended to want to get Government off our backs, now seeks to put big brother, not only into our bedrooms, but into our blood and our bladders. How intrusive can you get?

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Appropriations Committee ban on funding for drug testing of Federal employees.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has a very valid point on the accuracy of some of these tests.

Under the President's Executive order, there is a screening test and a confirmation test required if the screening test is positive.

The screening test does have a degree to error of approximately 5 percent, but the confirmation test is a much more detailed test, and it is 100 percent accurate.

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

Mr. ACKERMAN. I am delighted to yield to my good friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to mandatory drug testing of Federal employees.

The process is full of nightmares. They are finding terrible results and fraudulent activities within the testing facilities.

I agree totally with the gentleman in the well.

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

Mr. Chairman, in response to what my friend said, let me just call your attention to the fact that once these people are tested, they have to go through a procedure of trying to appeal.

We do not know what is going to happen with the results of these tests. Do they become part of your permanent work record that you have to fight for the rest of your life?

It becomes an absolute nightmare for public employees.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleagues who are tired of being here, and who want to vote quickly, that it is your leadership which scheduled the bill for this particular procedure. It is your leadership that can rise whenever it wants to.

We could have sheduled this bill yesterday, but just because you are tired and impatient does not mean we should not take these things seriously.

Let me further say that, as the gentlewoman from Maryland said, we are not examining some obscure proposals to affect a marginal problem.

Let me put this in context. The distinguished gentleman from New York spoke, and he is concerned about testing.

He also represents an area that the most recent estimate I have seen is that there are 200,000 intravenous drug abusers in New York City, a sufficiently large number, and that is Mayor Koch's number, a sufficiently large number that in the war on AIDS, we are seriously talking about giving away needles, because we have no other way of slowing down the spread of the disease.

The drug culture in America is a severe and direct threat to the entire society.

Now, tonight the gentleman from Texas has given us a chance to send one of two signals. We can say that yes, we are willing to go as rapidly as possible to testing. We are willing to work out procedures as rapidly as possible.

We are willing to solve the laboratory problems as rapidly as possible. We are going to do what it takes to break the back of the drug culture in America, or we can say no, let us go as slow as possible.

After all, as the gentleman said, it is the position of many employee unions, let us go as slow as the union leadership wants. Let us go as slow as the ACLU leadership wants, and make sure while many people may die in railroad wrecks, while we may have FAA controllers who are drug users and looking at three radar screens when there is only one there, and we may have a number of problems with the drug culture, let us send a signal that we are more worried about going as slowly as possible.

Let us make every error in favor of the employees union; and if that means, by the way, an extra 100,000 drug addicts, or an extra 12,000 accidents, that is just the price of going slowly and cautiously.

Read the exact language in the report. It says on page 119:

> The committee has included language which prohibits use of funds in this act to implement Executive Order 12564, relating to drug testing of Federal workers.

Let me make two points about that. Are you really comfortable going home saying that you are willing to vote to prohibit the executive branch from trying to work out the problems of driving every drug user out of the Federal Government?

Are you willing to go home and say the drug culture is so unimportant, the issue of wrecks, like the Conrail train, is so irrelevant that I am willing to vote in this supplemental to prohibit?

Finally, let me suggest to you the constitutional questions have a place in America to be solved. Earlier today in this same bill we were asked to become Secretaries of State. Now, we are asked to become a Supreme Court.

There is a Surpeme Court, I would say to my good friends, and it is right across the street. It will get to these issues. It will gradually sort them out.

That is the job of the Supreme Court. For us tonight to send a signal to the Federal bureaucracy to slow down, to send a signal to the White House to stop, to send a signal to our citizens that we do not care, I think would be a major error.

I would hope that no one would vote against this amendment without understanding clearly what signal you are sending back home about where you stand on the war on drugs.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the motion to strike the language of the proposal offered by my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland.

While there is widespread agreement that we must tackle the drug abuse problem in the workplace, appropriating Federal funds to conduct what amounts to random, unwarranted testing of thousands of Federal employees for drug abuse is clearly not the answer.

Even putting philosophical considerations about the propriety of drug testing aside for the moment, the fact of the matter is that we have not been able to develop a reliable, accurate test that is conclusive about a person having used drugs.

□ 2300

Until we do so, a person's rights and dignity lie in a precarious balance.

If I might, I would like to add a personal comment an incident that occurred when I was in the 1972 Olympics in Munich, Germany. An athletic by the name of Rick Demont had trained for 15 years to become our Nation's best swimmer and was denied a gold medal because he was tested positive while taking asthma medication for a health problem.

Clearly the problem here and the question here is not weeding out drugs from our Federal work force. The issue here is one of the efficacy of this drug testing and how that relates to the constitutional rights of our Federal employees.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate and I find it kind of fascinating to hear that under the provisions that we are being told are in the language in the committee bill, some Federal workers will be tested, but other Federal workers will not. Well, why? Why can we not test Federal workers period?

If some are eligible simply because their programs were in place before September 15, why not have all workers eligible for the test under the Executive order? To do less is to do less about the war on drugs.

If in fact we can test professional athletes, we can test basketball players and baseball players and so on, why can we not test others? Why can we not test air traffic controllers? Why can we not test Federal firefighters?

It seems to me that it might be more important to America and people who fly the airways to have an air traffic controller take a drug test than it is to have a baseball player take a drug test. That is exactly what we are dealing with here. It is whether or not we are going to have the kind of testing that assures the American people that people in sensitive positions in the Government are drug free. That is what this amendment is all about.

If you vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON] you are voting to assure us that we are testing for drugs in our society. If you vote against the amendment, you are saying, "Drug testing is not something you want to go along with; that the spread of drugs in our society is okay with you." I do not think that is the kind of signal we want to send at all.

I would urge a vote for the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of works.

Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully suggest that this amendment has been described in very, as I said, simplistic terms. The issue here is not whether you are against drugs. We are all against drugs. There is nobody here in this House who is not against the insidious, undermining of human beings that is being perpetrated in this country and other parts of the world by the trafficker in drugs.

Let me tell what this amendment does not get at. Let me tell what the President's Executive order does not get at. It does not get at the substance that undermines the most Federal employees, the most private employees, that costs this nation more than any other substance abuse known to man: Alcohol.

More lost time in the Federal service, more families destroyed, more crime committed. Alcohol. It does not affect us.

Let me say something: I do not believe the ends justify the means. I believe the constitutional issue is a very substantial one. Yes, drugs are a problem. Who is going to stand in this House and therefore say, "My home can be searched irrespective of probable cause?" Who here is going to stand for that proposition?

Our homes are our castle because our Founding Fathers said that. We are not in the Soviet Union. I just came back from the Soviet Union with the Speaker, and there they can test anybody, anytime, because their coun-

try is not like the United States of America.

We are different. We believe that individuals have particular and inalienable rights guaranteed them by our Constitution and indeed by God, and that the state cannot overcome those interests, save having probable cause. That is the difference between our Nation and the Soviet Union and some other nations.

The ends do not justify the means. But let me say what this amendment does not do. We do not say, "Stop, you cannot spend any money on drug testing." Why? Because it is a problem. We know it is a problem. We, like everybody in this House, want to solve that problem.

What we say is, however, that OPM's rules and regulations to implement this Executive order are not good ones. As the gentleman from Florida said, we are plowing new ground. Who better to protect the American public and Federal employees? Who better than this people of the House; this House of the people?

Who better to say that we ought to move carefully? All this says, ladies and gentlemen of the House, is let us wait 5 months between now and September 30 while we investigate this problem to see whether or not the committee, perhaps, and the Congress has a better solution. One which protects Federal employees.

The President said in his press conference with respect to the promulgation of this Executive order, "I do not want any Federal employees fired." OPM said that firing was a first option. Not the only option, but was, in the first instance, an option available. The President did not say that.

That is why we say wait. We are plowing new ground. In a free country guaranteeing certain rights to every individual that lives in this country. Let us stop, look, and listen to make sure that we are not infringing upon their rights.

This is not a vote whether you are against drugs. Everybody, 435 of us, are against drugs. But I hope that there are at least 218 who are also for the rights of individuals as guaranteed by our Constitution and want to move slowly and purposefully and correctly in this area.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. I want to compliment the gentleman from Maryland for an outstanding statement. I want to associate myself with him and urge the defeat of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and remind everybody that we do not need to send signals; we do not work for the railroad. We are here to protect the constitutional rights of people. That is our first duty.

I commend the gentleman for a great statement in the House tonight.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think we all heard a great speech just now and I commend the gentleman on his eloquence, but the speech was about two irrelevancies. It was about alcohol and about searches of homes. Neither of which have anything to do with the subject of this amendment I suggest.

I still have not heard an answer to the question of just exactly who it is that can be tested under prior programs. We have heard that those who can be tested under prior programs are those who can be tested under prior programs. But I do not know who those people are, and I have no idea what kind of problems may exist under those kinds of prior programs and whether we are doing anything about the problems that may exist under those prior programs.

□ 2310

In fact, we are dividing the public employees who could be tested under prior programs and those to be tested under the Executive order, and I think that it would be helpful for us to understand the distinction.

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

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

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it is important that we understand that distinction. That is exactly why we ought to take 5 months and let the authorizing committee make those distinctions. That is exactly why the gentleman from Maryland is urging that we not act precipitously on this floor tonight, not knowing so much about these very questions.

I think that it is clear that we are going to have some form of drug testing, particularly for sensitive areas of Federal employment. Let us let the authorizing committee that has already been holding hearings delineate which those groups are, proceed to protect the rights of the rest of Federal workers, and clearly define the Federal prerogative in intruding in the rights of others who happen to work for the Federal aviation authorities or others who we might agree deserve to have their rights incurred upon at least to that degree.

So I would urge the gentleman, following his own reason, to join the gentleman from Maryland and support his amendment.

Mr. KYL. I appreciate the comment. The problem is that I have heard no evidence this evening to suggest that under any of these existing Federal programs that there are any particular problems, and it seems to me that you do not withhold action for 5 months on an extremely serious problem, one that has been discussed a great deal here this evening, without some evidence that there is something that you ought to be protecting against.

It is a red herring to suggest that the issue here is not whether we are for or against drugs. I suggest that we are all in agreement that that is not the issue. But what is the issue is getting serious about this problem, and it is as serious in the Federal sector as it is in the private sector.

I do not think that we want to wait in some of the very sensitive areas. We talked about air traffic controllers, Amtrak, and others. We cannot afford to delay action in some of these critical areas, and I do not think that these are areas upon which we would have much disagreement.

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

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of the gentleman that I asked Secretary of the Treasury Baker about what program existed in the Treasury Department. He said none existed. I asked him why. He said, "Because the model that we are waiting for has not yet been promulgated."

I asked him if he thought that it could be done within the next 5 months, and he said no, they have not identified any sensitive employees or any of that nature.

This language stops the implementation of the order. One of the gentleman said something earlier about planning, this does not say anything about planning, it says something about implementation.

Our point is that we ought to look at this closely to make sure that we have a program that is constitutional and that will be effective.

Mr. KYL. So do I understand that the Secret Service, for example, would not be permitted to be tested for a period of 5 months or whatever the period is under this proposal?

Mr. HOYER. If they were acting pursuant to the Executive order, that is correct.

Mr. KYL. Well, it seems to me that this is a good example of——

Mr. HOYER. But not if there was probable cause. We are talking about mandatory random testing.

Mr. KYL. Well, clearly the Executive order would permit a program to be undertaken in this very sensitive area, and I think that it is time that when we know that the problem is as widespread as it is that we ought to get about the business of beginning a program so that it can be evaluated and so that the legal questions can be resolved. The longer we delay it, the more of a problem we are going to have and the more difficulty we are going to have in the process.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. I had hoped to stay out of this, but really part of what is involved here is an attitude that seems to come out in the discussion that since we are only talking about Federal workers, it is not real people anyhow, so they will not mind if we indiscriminately require them to do something which we are unwilling to do with the public in general.

Then we hear people saying that there was an Amtrak accident and this will lead to transportation safety. How many Members like me worry about the pilot that is flying the plane we would have been taking tonight if we had not been on this bill so long? Why does the FAA not for example require as a condition to operate a plane with hundreds of people's lives at stake the taking of a test? I guess it is because nobody wants to tangle with the pilots.

We are not yet talking about asking all law enforcement people out across the country who carry guns amongst the public to take tests, but we have no hesitancy in saying any Federal employee that any agency decides ought to have a test will have it.

I have not heard anybody say how often they want them tested. Is once a year adequate, or once in a lifetime career? How often do you have to test a person to find out whether they are a drug user? If indeed you give them 60 days' notice as the Executive order says, can they go off of it long enough to escape the consequences of their otherwise habits of abuse?

There are Federal employees that are tested. We are very sensitive with the air traffic controllers. I looked around for people from the Transportation Committee here. If a supervisor thinks that a controller is not reacting fast and he has any reason to believe that it is because of either drugs or alcohol, he can ask the man to either go home or take a test. The employee still has a choice.

The point is that no one is lined up and told en masse to get in line and take the test. Someone over there said they thought that if we tested a million Federal employees, that that would do a lot to clean up the drug problem in this country. I want to say that nobody is prepared to stand on this floor and say that drug abuse is heavier with the families of people employed by the Federal Government than it is with families in general in our society. Nobody is prepared to say that, and yet they are willing to treat them differently from everyone else.

Let us get down to what we are talking about. This is a supplemental appropriation. This delays the use of money in this appropriation for the implementation of an imperfect order which I promise you if it goes forward at the present rate will have us in court all over the place by fall.

We are working on it with the committee. My subcommittee has had extensive hearings. I do not know if any of the gentlemen who have such strong feelings about this have taken the opportunity to appear before the committee and share their concerns and tell that committee how they would structure a sensible testing program and how much they want to pay for it, because we will have to run it past OMB when we finally come to them with something.

This will only cut off the money until October 1. It is not going to do any permanent damage to the President's plans or anybody else's plans. OPM is in no way ready now except in a haphazard way to put it into effect. If we let them go ahead now as they are planning to do it, agency by agency, catch as catch can, we are asking for nothing but litigation that will ultimately end up with no drug testing as a result of court decisions. I do not think that that is what the advocates of this amendment want.

I urge the Members of the House to restore the Federal employees to first-class citizenship just like all the rest of us, and remember that some of us are indeed employees of the Federal Government and draw a paycheck from the Treasury, and vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 145, noes 242, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

AYES—145

Anderson
Archer
Armey
Badham
Baker
Ballenger
Barton
Bateman
Bennett
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Broomfield
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Chandler
Chappell
Cheney
Coats
Coble
Combest
Coughlin
Craig
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
Davis (IL)
DeLay
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Erdreich
Fawell
Fields
Flippo
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Grandy
Gregg
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hiler
Holloway
Hopkins
Huckaby
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jenkins
Kolbe
Konnyu
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Myers
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Patterson
Porter
Pursell
Ray
Rhodes
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Saiki
Schaefer
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Skeen
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Spence
Spratt
Stangeland
Stenholm
Stratton
Stump
Sweeney
Swindall
Tauke
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Upton
Valentine
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Weldon
Whittaker
Wylie
Young (FL)

NOES—242

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Bates
Beilenson
Bentley
Berman
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Campbell
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Conyers
Cooper
Coyne
Davis (MI)
de la Garza
DeFazio
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
English
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Florio
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grant
Gray (IL)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Horton
Houghton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Jacobs
Jeffords
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
Lancaster
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lowry (WA)
Luken, Thomas
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mavroules
McCloskey
McCurdy
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody

Morella	Rinaldo	Stallings
Morrison (CT)	Robinson	Stark
Mrazek	Rodino	Stokes
Murtha	Roe	Studds
Nagle	Rose	Sundquist
Natcher	Rowland (CT)	Swift
Nowak	Rowland (GA)	Synar
Oberstar	Roybal	Tallon
Obey	Russo	Thomas (CA)
Olin	Sabo	Torres
Ortiz	Sawyer	Traficant
Owens (NY)	Saxton	Traxler
Owens (UT)	Schneider	Udall
Panetta	Schroeder	Vento
Parris	Schumer	Visclosky
Pashayan	Sharp	Volkmer
Pease	Shuster	Walgren
Penny	Sikorski	Watkins
Perkins	Sisisky	Weiss
Petri	Skaggs	Wheat
Pickett	Skelton	Whitten
Pickle	Slattery	Williams
Price (IL)	Slaughter (NY)	Wise
Price (NC)	Slaughter (VA)	Wolf
Quillen	Smith (FL)	Wolpe
Rahall	Smith (IA)	Wortley
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Wyden
Ravenel	Snowe	Yates
Regula	Solarz	Yatron
Richardson	St Germain	Young (AK)
Ridge	Staggers	

NOT VOTING—46

Annunzio	Garcia	Murphy
Aspin	Gray (PA)	Neal
Bartlett	Hatcher	Oakar
Boulter	Hutto	Pepper
Brown (CO)	Jones (TN)	Rostenkowski
Collins	Kemp	Savage
Courter	LaFalce	Scheuer
Crane	Latta	Solomon
Crockett	Leach (IA)	Taylor
Daniel	Livingston	Torricelli
Dorgan (ND)	Lukens, Donald	Towns
Dowdy	Madigan	Vander Jagt
Dymally	Martinez	Waxman
Early	McDade	Wilson
Foglietta	McKinney	
Ford (TN)	Miller (OH)	

□ 2030

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Boulter for, with Mr. Torricelli against.

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 504. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated for the centralization, consolidation, or redeployment of the Customs Service Air Operations unless the Secretary of the Treasury submits a report to the Committees on Appropriations which sets forth specific details for the use of such funds thirty days in advance of such implementation.

SEC. 505. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act for the General Services Administration for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, shall be used to transfer title to the property known as the Customs House in Boston, Massachusetts, or to take any measures in preparation for such a transfer, before October 1, 1987. The limitation in this section shall not apply to any sale agreement entered into with the city of Boston, Massachusetts.

SEC. 506. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this or any other Act or otherwise appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Transportation or the Maritime Administrator for purposes of administering the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) shall be used by the United States Department of Transportation or the United States Maritime Administration to propose, promulgate, or implement any rule or regulation, or, with regard to vessels which repaid subsidy pursuant to the rule promulgated by the Secretary May 3, 1985 and vacated by Order of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit January 16, 1987, conduct any adjudicatory or other regulatory proceeding, execute or perform any contract, or participate in any judicial action with respect to the repayment of construction differential subsidy for the permanent release of vessels from the restrictions in section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended: *Provided*, That such funds may be used to the extent such expenditure relates to a rule which conforms to statutory standards hereafter enacted by Congress.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 127, after line 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 507. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this Act shall be used to close the Federal Aviation Administration's Flight Service Station located at Youngstown, Ohio.

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

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

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. The amendment is a limitation to a general appropriation bill. Under the revised clause 2(d) of rule XXI, such amendments are not in order at this time.

The gentleman's amendment is a limitation and is not specifically contained or authorized in existing law and is not in order at this time, pursuant to clause (d), since I believe that other nonlimitation amendments are pending before the Committee of the Whole. The gentleman's amendment therefore is in violation of clause 2(d) of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to talk about this in two veins; first of all will be the point of order brought forward and second of all the fact that a Democrat has stood up and brought this point of order against me.

There was a court case—I am going to tell it just like it is—there was a court case that said closing the flight service station at Youngstown Municipal Airport was endangering lives. And I was just trying to reinforce that with the limitation upon the use of any money going to close that station. I am very disappointed, I am very disappointed that the point of order was brought and I will consider whether or not, and I do not want to belabor the point with the Members here, fighting the motion to rise and calling for a vote to defeat it and I will have this amendment brought later. But I believe this amendment should be allowed to be brought out here. It is a limitation placed on funds, it is not legislating, it is limiting the funds and the way those funds appropriated will be used. And I am asking the Speaker to review that, review my claim and rule in favor of this gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PEASE). The Chair would state that a point of order has been made against the amendment. The reasons cited by the gentleman from Florida are a correct interpretation of the rules. The Chair has no choice but to rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. TRAFICANT. For clarification: If a motion to rise is defeated, would I be allowed to bring my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If the motion to rise and report is defeated, an amendment to limit an appropriation in the bill would be in order at that time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, we are here today about pork barrel, talking about money all over the Nation. Mr. DYSON pulled his amendment that would deal with safety in our skies. My airport would have been a part of that. I am not asking for a special favor, but let me just explain this to you, those of you who face these same problems. This particular airport, for a strategic location in northeast Ohio and western Pennsylvania, had action taken against it by the FAA once before. The city of Youngstown had taken it to court and the Northern District Court of Ohio ruled that it would impede safety in the skies and ordered that they desist from moving to close that airport. Now I have no other choice, I do not want to keep you here, but I am going to try and fight this thing. I am going to ask you to vote to defeat the motion to rise and give me an opportunity to bring it. I have given you those opportunities. That is all I am asking you. I do not care if you are a Republican or Democrat. We have been here a long time. It is a shame I have to do it, but darn it, if I am going to be defeated, I am going to be de-

feated with a head count. I do not care how bad it is.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2340

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAC KAY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACKAY: Page 127, after line 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 507. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act (other than by title IV) that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is reduced by 21 percent.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment cuts $2 billion in budget authority from this bill. It does this by reducing discretionary budget authority.

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

Mr. MACKAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, and that the time be equally divided between the proponent and the opponent of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACKAY] will be recognized for 15 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment cuts $2 billion in budget authority from this bill. It does this by reducing discretionary budget authority across the board by 21 percent. This is the amount required to bring the bill in line with the ceiling in the 1987 budget resolution.

This takes into account the impact of the Walker amendent, which struck the foreign aid section. The amendment does not affect title II or III, which contain mandatory spending.

It also exempts title IV. The last major vote we cast before the Easter district work period was the deficit reduction package from the 1988 budget. Now, as the first major vote when we come back from Easter, we find ourselves on a supplemental appropriation bill that not only busts the 1987 budget by $2 billion, but it also adds over $800 million in the fiscal year 1988 deficit, and that is before this bill, the fiscal year 1988 budget, has even gone to conference.

Many of us had to gag and work hard to work for the 1988 budget. It has taxes in it. Many of us who supported the 1988 budget before Easter did so knowing that it had taxes in it. We did that knowing that it was a vote that would not be a popular vote back home, and we did it relying on the fact that this House is now committed to a disciplined approach to the budget.

We believe that there would be an end to this willingness to support further budget deficit reduction if we now abandon the limitations in the 1987 bill.

We feel that passage of this bill without this amendment not only would discredit us this year, but would undercut further efforts at deficit reduction.

This amendment is no different from those offered on numerous occasions during the past 2 years by Messrs. PENNY, MORRISON, FRENZEL, PORTER, and others.

This is a critical vote, however, this year because this sets the precedent for the 100th Congress.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to show our commitment to deficit reduction by supporting this across-the-board amendment which would put this supplemental appropriation in line with the 1987 budget.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKAY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this resolution is about $2.3 billion over the 1987 budget resolution if you use the assumptions that were used to write the 1987 budget resolution.

However, if you apply today's assumptions, in other words, the information that we have at hand as responsible Members trying to plot the Nation's future, then the resoluton is $18 billion over in outlays.

In other words, this resolution will bring us as much over the 1987 budget outlay figure as we are planning to raise in taxes to meet next year's budget resolution.

What I am trying to determine is exactly what you mean by the statement that your amendment will cut this 22 percent.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will attempt to respond briefly to the gentlewoman's question.

I understand that concern. It is a concern that I had. I have carefully tried to understand how that concern arose.

We ended up last year with a statement that our deficit had been reduced to $144 billion. The gentlewoman will recall that. We started this year with the understanding that the deficit was $172 billion. That difference is the difference that the gentlewoman is talking about.

If you want to say that there is an inconsistency, you can, and there is the inconsistency. But, in fact, that inconsistency was picked up in CBO's estimate for the 1988 budget.

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

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the explanation. That is, unfortunately one of the consequences of the fact that we pass resolutions without——

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACKAY] reserves the balance of his time.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, there is a history on the Committee on the Budget that I would like to explain to you. I was one of the advocates of the Budget Act. It provided a mechanism for the Ways and Means and Appropriations Committees to get together and work these things out with representatives of the legislative committees.

It has evolved into where the committee is made up of the junior members, able members, weighted by the legislative committees.

The budget resolution is sound, but only as a target. Like many of you, I have voted for the Budget resolution as a target, knowing that it was based on assumptions and projections. The 1987 budget resolution was voted on last June. Nearly every assumption that was made by the committee has varied from what they expected and what has actually happened.

Every projection is 10 months later now. I do not think anybody in this Congress, figure that they would tie the knot in the operations of the Congress. We got permission to raise the ceiling in this bill by the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules and adopted in the House earlier today.

I say to you, we recognize the target, but if the target is going to tie the hands of the Congress to meet the need, it is time we begin to look to see whether we should abolish it.

□ 2350

Now, that does not mean that our committee has not been proud of staying within the budget. We have stayed below the President's recommendation not only here but in past years also. But we have billions in recommedations now. If we go back to an act taken by Congress that at most was only a target, at this late date we make a mistake and we raise the issue of whether we should have the Budget Act any longer.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time at this point.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, it was not very well explained when the amendment was explained. Title IV is exempted. Title IV of this bill is a brandnew welfare bureaucracy.

We are exempting $425 million of brandnew welfare bureaucracy under the MacKay amendment.

I would suggest we want to vote no on the MacKay amendment, because what that says is that that new welfare bureaucracy is more important than paying the FBI, more important than the Drug Enforcement Administration, more important than the procurement of ammunition for the Army, more important than doing something about hazardous substance response under the EPA.

It is more important than the Commodity Credit Corporation where you will lose $1.5 billion under the MacKay amendment. It is more important than student financial assistance, more important than operation and maintenance of the air interdiction program under the Customs Service for drug enforcement.

I would suggest that that kind of a vote is plain irresponsible. If we are going to cut across the board, fine; but what we ought not to be doing is selecting certain things that this amendment does, and that is saying that there are certain things that are important.

We are saying that there is one more important bureaucracy, and all of the rest of the things can be cut 20 percent. That is plain wrong.

Cut across the board, or do not come to us with this kind of a proposal. This is not an across-the-board cut.

This protects one welfare bureaucracy, as well as a lot of other welfare bureaucracies.

I would suggest a no vote on this amendment.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I am not embarrassed to say that I think the homeless who are the beneficiaries of this program, it is easy to talk facelessly about a welfare bureaucracy.

It is not a bureaucracy that is the beneficiary of this exemption. It is the homeless, the most vulnerable people in this society.

I would not expect some of my colleagues to be moved by compassion alone. Miracles do not happen before midnight.

Let me make a more technical point. The homeless program is in here in its entirety. For every other program, this supplemental is in fact a supplemental, so a 20-percent cut is not a 20-percent cut in the entire program.

It is a 20-percent cut in the supplemental part of that program. For the military, a cut of $300 billion, cutting the supplemental is a cut of less than 1 percent of the overall program.

I know the gentleman is appalled with the notion that some of us think the plight of the homeless children and the sick elderly people deserve a little extra consideration, so I am going to ask him to make it on that ground.

What we are saying is this: If you cut the homeless program by 20 percent, you are cutting the entire program. It is a 20-percent cut, not in a supplemental, but in the entire program. Whereas, with the other parts of this—and you may be for it or not—but if you cut the other parts, you are not cutting them by 20 percent in their entirety. You are cutting 20 percent of the supplement.

You are cutting from 0.2 percent of the military. They waste more in a month than we would be cutting easily, or I should say in a day. But, the point is this. With the homeless, if you include them, and I commend the gentleman from Florida for his sensitivity and his compassion, you would be cutting the entire program, because the homeless program has been cut in here, so it is a differently treated program, because it is differently in fact constituted.

Cutting the supplement to major programs by 20 percent is not the same as cutting the whole program by 20 percent. The gentleman has it correctly.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I take the time really to say to my colleagues on my side of the aisle who I had talked to about the MacKay amendment earlier in the evening, encouraging you to support the amendment.

I did that with an understanding that the amendment was an across-the-board cut; and Mr. MACKAY and I have talked since then.

He has made the change in the amendment, so there is an exemption from the across-the-board cut, and I want Members from my side of the aisle to understand that.

Those of you who indicated you were going to support the amendment, I would suggest to you because of the change, I am not going to support it.

You can make up your own mind about what you are going to do.

It has been changed from what we originally talked about, and does exempt the particular program.

I would suggest that that is not the approach that ought to be taken, and that you ought to vote against the MacKay amendment.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to thank our colleagues on this side of the aisle for giving us new life at almost 12 midnight.

It certainly does the heart good to hear you speak against a cut of 22 percent, and using as the basis for that cut, that it is not across the board, that it only cuts about 92 percent of the bill instead of 100 percent of the supplement.

It really makes us feel good; and frankly, if we have to stay here until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, let us do it.

I think you have finally been exposed for what you are. You are not interested in cutting, not interested at all.

You are only interested in playing politics. This is a true cut. This is a true cut.

This is a true cut. If you are interested in preserving what semblance there is of being involved in Gramm-Rudman, you will vote for it.

Do not fall prey to the silly argument that it is not across the board. It surely makes us feel good to know where you really stand for a change.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT].

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me that time, and I plan to be brief.

Talking about playing politics, this whole exercise today has been an exercise in politics.

This bill is never going to see the light of day, because of the spending that is in it, because of the arms control language that is in it, and because all of the problems that are in it with the waivers, so talk about politics.

Let me talk just a minute about this particular amendment. I commend the gentleman from Florida for what he is trying to do, and has tried over the years to try to have across-the-board cuts.

Like I have told the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACK], I told him earlier today, you are along the right track. Foreign aid has been taken out of this bill, so I presume his amendment would not be applicable to that. I assume this body will not turn around and reverse itself on cutting out that foreign aid section.

Now, we find out it exempts the section on the homeless which means, among other things, the gentlemen from agricultural areas, about a billion bucks will be taken out of the CCC, and if there is anything in this bill that is really urgent, and should be covered by a supplemental, that is the area where we have run out of money, so I am sorry to say to my colleagues, that the gentleman from Florida,

while his intentions were good, along the way there have been changes made that have gutted the amendment.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

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

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, it will be real interesting to see how the gentleman who talked about playing politics is going to vote on the amendment that Mr. WALKER had offered a little earlier to take the $650 million out of the bill.

We have an opportunity to see who is playing politics.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I think at this stage of the game it would be best to operate on the assumption that this bill might pass, and there are a lot of us that are not real fond of supplemental appropriations bills.

But, if it passes, it can pass with this $2.2 billion in it, or with $2.2 billion less. We can quibble about whether something is included in the across-the-board cut or not, but the bottom line is that this is a cut, a significant cut.

For those who want to cut back the spending level, even those who would prefer to kill the bill, I think we ought to take what we can get.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would notify the Members that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACKAY] has 6 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to close the debate.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a minute to talk about the scoring of this bill with respect to the spendouts of fiscal year 1987 spending and the implications to our deficit. The Congresswoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] asked the question and I was not satisfied with the answer.

This bill was scored by the committee on the basis of fiscal, on the basis of economic assumptions of February 1986 and on that basis, they concluded that the spendout of fiscal year 1987 would be at a rate that would leave it less, about $4 billion less than what was budgeted.

When you adjust the spendout estimate for the economic information data and assumptions that we have as of February 1987, we find out that we are spending out to the point where we will be around $14.2 billion over what is budgeted.

Now, properly scoring this bill, we get about a net $6.4 billion worth of spending so that if we approve this bill, it will add $6 billion to the deficit bringing the deficit total up to around $20 billion, spending around $20 billion over the budget and the $2.2 billion is a good motion. I appreciate the gentleman's interest, because 2.2 was the score overspend that came up as the committee scored the bill, and he was aiming at that target and would have come close.

These are facts of the matter with respect to the impact of this on the deficit, the impact on our spending levels with respect to the fiscal year 1987 budget. We will be about $20 billion over the budget this will add about $6.4 billion over the budget. $2.2 billion or thereabouts as the gentleman aims, will be some help.

I have to say in addition to that I too would have liked to have seen it if an across-the-board would have covered the whole bill.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

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

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment. It is $2 billion in lower spending, and it is conforming this bill to the budget; plain and simple. You may want to vote against the bill. Fine, vote against the bill. You ought to vote for this amendment if you are at all serious about the budget process. It is as simple as that.

The fact is that some are complaining that the aid to the homeless is exempt from the cut. Many of you on both sides of the aisle voted for an authorization for the homeless in this Congress just a few weeks ago for $500 million. This bill provides only $425 million for the homeless. There has already been in this Congress a $75 million cut in the program for the homeless. They have already taken their cut, and Mr. FRANK from Massachusetts pointed out, that cut that they took and any cut that they take is on the whole program, not just on the portion that is subject to the supplemental. So there is good reason why the homeless are exempted in addition to the fact of the emergency that we face in the country. They have already taken a cut between February and now, and this budget needs to be enforced and can be enforced without cutting them any further.

So you have got a budget cut of $2 billion. A budget-conforming amendment. If you believe that we ought to conform the bill to the budget, you ought to vote "yes." Otherwise, you are just not serious.

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

Mr. Chairman, the last comment that Mr. MORRISON made is the key issue here. I expect a stirring speech from Mr. CONTE in closing on the other side, and I look forward to it.

I merely want to say the issue here is this: If we were serious about last year's budget resolution, then we should cut this bill to fit it. If we were not serious about last year's budget resolution, why should anyone believe that we are serious about the one we passed this last week?

This is a time to say whether we are committed to fiscal discipline and whether we meant what we said.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I started out the day when we began debate on this bill saying I was going to vote for this turkey, and I still feel that I am going to vote for this turkey. I hope that this amendment is not adopted.

First, let the RECORD show that I stood in this well and fought with everything I had against Gramm-Rudman-Hollings some time ago. I told this House that we would find ourselves painted in a corner before it was over with and we sure are.

This is no way to go about it. Everyone of the Members of the House who have been here before this term know that I have opposed across-the-board cuts for the last 29 years. My predecessor, Frank Bow was the ranking Republican. he used to put across-the-board cuts. I would take this floor and fight Frank Bow of Ohio, because I said, "That is the wrong way to go." The committees worked long and hard on this bill. The way you have done it today, whether you agree with the Members who offer the amendments or not, that is the way to go: Amendment by amendment. Not an across-the-board cut.

Some of the across-the-board cuts that I have fought have been done with a scalpel; 1 percent, 2 percent, 3 percent. But this one, this one, you cannot find a meat axe big enough in town to whittle on this one; 21 percent.

You would cut CCC Pell grants; we put $280 million under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER]; $280 million in here for Pell grants. You are going to cut them $60 million. You go tell those kids that they are not going to get a Pell grant this year. Yet, all of you, some on that side, some on this side, boasting back home that you are for education. EPA grants. Now, there is $1,200,000,000 in this bill for EPA grants. You are going to cut it by voting for this amendment? $240 million. You go back home and tell those little towns that they are not going to get a grant this year for their sewer

collection. What a smell that is going to create.

Mr. Chairman, we have worked hard and long today. This bill has got a long way to go if it makes it tonight, and it has to get through the Senate. We are going to have to go to conference, we are going to have to work hard. We have to clean this bill up, and as I said, it is a turkey. I admit it.

I hope that we can clean it up before it gets to the White House. But do not go along with this crippling amendment. This is a crippling amendment and we cannot afford an EPA, IRS, Pell grants, Commodity Credit and right down the line.

Even if it was 1 percent I would be up here opposing this at this time. Therefore, I hope that the majority of this House will see fit to take the responsible position, defeat this amendment, and then when we get back into the House, if there is a separate amendment on the foreign aid bill, I hope you will vote against the Walker amendment.

□ 0010

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACKAY].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 263, noes 123, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

AYES—263

Ackerman
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barton
Bates
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Bruce
Bryant
Buechner
Bunning
Bustamante
Byron
Carper
Chandler
Chapman
Cheney
Clarke
Clinger
Coats
Coble
Coelho
Combest
Cooper
Coughlin
Craig
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
Davis (IL)
Davis (MI)
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLay
Derrick
DeWine
Dingell
DioGuardi
Donnelly
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Dyson
Eckart
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Fascell
Fawell
Feighan
Fields
Flippo
Foley
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Glickman
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Grant
Gregg
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hiler
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Houghton
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennelly
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Konnyu
Kostmayer
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken, Thomas
Lungren
MacKay
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCurdy
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Neal
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Pashayan
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Price (NC)
Ravenel
Regula
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Russo
Sawyer
Saxton
Schroeder
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (FL)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Upton
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Weiss
Weldon
Whittaker
Wise
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wylie
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—123

Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Atkins
AuCoin
Badham
Bateman
Beilenson
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Burton
Callahan
Campbell
Cardin
Carr
Chappell
Clay
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Coyne
Dellums
Dickinson
Dicks
Dixon
Durbin
Dwyer
Edwards (CA)
Espy
Evans
Fazio
Fish
Flake
Florio
Ford (MI)
Gephardt
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Grandy
Gray (IL)
Green
Gunderson
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hunter
Jeffords
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kildee
Kyl
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Lightfoot
Lott
Mack
Manton
Markey
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mavroules
McHugh
Mfume
Michel
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Morella
Mrazek
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Owens (NY)
Parris
Perkins
Price (IL)
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Rhodes
Rodino
Roybal
Sabo
Saiki
Savage
Schneider
Schuette
Schulze
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Synar
Torres
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Walker
Watkins
Weber
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wolf

NOT VOTING—47

Annunzio
Aspin
Bartlett
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Collins
Conyers
Courter
Crane
Crockett
Daniel
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Dymally
Early
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Garcia
Gray (PA)
Hatcher
Hutto
Jones (TN)
Kemp
LaFalce
Latta
Leach (IA)
Livingston
Lukens, Donald
Madigan
Martinez
McDade
McKinney
Murphy
Oakar
Pepper
Ray
Rostenkowski
Schaefer
Scheuer
Solomon
Taylor
Torricelli
Towns
Vander Jagt
Waxman
Wilson
Yates

□ 0020

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Ray for, with Mr. Boulter against.

Messrs. PURSELL, RANGEL, BROOMFIELD, BIAGGI, and MRAZEK changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. VENTO, SWIFT, WHITTAKER, LEWIS of Georgia, and LEWIS of California changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 0030

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this point to clarify an amendment that I offered to this bill and was adopted unanimously by the House. There has been some misunderstanding about it and I wanted to make clear exactly what it did in case somebody wanted to vote on it later. It having passed by unanimous consent after having been offered by me and supported by JOE BARTON, what it did was it allocated $2.8 million to the Texas Accelerator Operations in the Woodlands, north of Houston, TX.

It is an ongoing project for about 4 years. The total budget is about $5 million. It has been put up by local business people with a consortium of universities to do higher research in brighter beams, in magnets, in several other generic engineering design studies. The Federal contribution has been about $3 million for the last 3 years. They cut that this year, though the peer approval was a recommendation that it be approved at the full $3 million. This has nothing whatsoever to do with the super colliders, I want you to understand. There are six applicants in Texas. This cannot take any precedence or help any of those six. It is not going to be involved in that. It will not put one dime in one of those proposals, it cannot by law do that. We have no intention of it doing that. The consortium was in business before we had any proposals. And I hope it will be in business when you have all quit dreaming with the super collidal

stars in your eyes. They are not going to build 50 of those at $6 billion a piece all over this country. By the time they get that $6 billion, there will be 47 States wanting to do it instead of just 5. I am just telling you now that is what the facts are. And I hope that the Members will understand that and I wanted to make it clear.

I tried to get this passed in the Appropriations Committee, but it had already marked up the bill. The only decent way to do it was to explain it on the floor as I did briefly and then supported by Mr. BARTON and it was passed unanimously. I think we should continue to support research, generic research and continue this program.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding, I thank the distinguished dean of the Texas delegation.

Mr. Chairman, this project is in my district, it is not in Congressman BROOKS' district. It has been funded for the last 4 years by the Department of Energy and such other universities as Texas A&M, University of Oklahoma, University of Houston, University of Texas at Austin, and Rice University.

None of the funds that Congressman BROOKS is seeking to restore will be used for any of the superconductor proposals that are currently under way in the State of Texas. In fact, there is a March 26 memo by the Department of Energy that expressly prohibits any funds under contract being used for site proposals. It is a simple restoration of funding that has been funded by the Department of Energy for the last 3 years and I would urge my colleagues, if there is a vote, to support the Brooks amendment.

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

Mr. BROOKS. I will yield to my distinguished friend if I have a minute left.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding, and is it also yours, that this is both an authorization and an appropriation in the way it was offered?

Mr. BROOKS. That is has been authorized previously?

Mr. PORTER. It is not authorized previously, correct?

Mr. BROOKS. Well, it would have been subject to a point of order which was not raised.

Mr. PORTER. That is correct. Could I ask the gentleman why he did not take the matter before the appropriate subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee or the authorizing committee?

Mr. BROOKS. I did take it up with the appropriate subcommittee on the appropriating committee and it was a little late. They had already marked up the bill. So there was no way to do it except to have an amendment on the floor.

Mr. PORTER. The gentleman took it before the committee a little late.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. PORTER. And then on the floor, realizing that there may be as many as 41 States that are interested in the superconducting supercollider the gentleman was not worried that somebody might get a little concerned?

Mr. BROOKS. No—because it does not affect the supercollider. That is another issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this matter should have been brought before the appropriate committee. It is my understanding also that the subcommittee's ranking minority member, had he been on the floor when this matter came up, would have objected. I would think that understanding the sensitivities of many Representatives concerning the funding of a superconducting supercollider program and the interests of many States in that program that this matter ought to be voted upon separately and I will ask at the appropriate time that a separate vote be taken.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding. I would like to point out for the Members that we are talking about a total of 28 people, 17 professionals, 11 blue-collar workers. The primary focus of the research funded by this proposal is to conduct research on a magnet to be used to replace the CAT scanner that has some radiation side effects. It has nothing to do with the superconductor collider.

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

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

Mr. PACKARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, there are few things that have been more sensitive than the selection process for the supercollider in the variety of States that are interested.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with the money going to this particular project, but at the time when we are considering the States that will be competing for the selection may not be an appropriate time to do it. I would suggest that we remove this and then if it is still desired in the State of Texas it should be appropriated after the selection is completed so that there will be no concern as to other States having to compete. There is no question that there is the possibility that these funds, even though they would not go toward the selection process for the State of Texas, would offset funds that the State of Texas otherwise would have to use and they could use these other funds to go toward their selection process.

I certainly would hope that we would not deal with that at this critical time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MACKAY], if he would respond to a question regarding the adoption of the previous amendment.

It is my understanding that with the adoption of the MacKay amendment, that if a separate motion were made after we return to the full House to reconsider the vote, under which the Walker amendment was adopted, that because of the new parliamentary situation, the approximately 20-percent reduction which occurred in other accounts would then also occur in the chapter 4, foreign assistance section of the bill, is that correct?

Mr. MACKAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MACKAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, that is correct. Mr. WALKER and I have both checked with the Parliamentarian and have been advised that in the event that motion is reconsidered, the 21-percent across-the-board cut will apply to the foreign aid section of the bill.

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

Very simply, Mr. Chairman, what that means that if a motion is made in the full House to reconsider the vote on the foreign assistance section that if that motion passes, the foreign assistance levels which will be adopted will be reduced by 21 percent below those in the original bill so that it would not be treated more advantageously than any other section in the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0040

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1987".

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

Mr. Chairman, I did not realize at the time, but the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] had an amend-

ment that was offered at the wrong time. For that reason, it was not in order.

Many of you will recall that on one past occasion I asked the Chair to vacate proceedings so that my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], could offer his amendment. I certainly want to be fair to my colleagues.

The gentleman from Ohio says this is vitally important to his district. I do not want a technicality to keep any of my colleagues from offering amendments which inadvertently were offered at the wrong time. Therefore, I shall delay making the motion for the Committee to rise until the gentleman has the chance to offer his amendment.

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

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. COUGHLIN

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], which is nondebatable.

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 101, noes 145.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 127, after line 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 507. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this Act shall be used to close the Federal Aviation Administration's Flight Service Station located at Youngstown, Ohio.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has shown a degree of fairness after 39 years that filters down to a new Member like myself who represents a district with some rough times.

My amendment would basically delete any money that would be used to close the flight service station at Youngstown Municipal Airport. Everybody has a concern, but mine is the only airport where a court case was brought forward. In the Northern District Court of Ohio they ruled that by closing that particular airport, it would endanger the skies over northwestern Pennsylvania and northeastern Ohio.

Therefore, I have moved to limit any moneys appropriated under this act. They shall not be used to close the Federal Aviation Administration flight service station at Youngstown, OH.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to this amendment. I have a job to do. We have a national air space program. If we do not make this change to automated stations, we are going to step backwards. We have already spent $300 million on it. If we make one exception, I think we will have problems because we have refused many others and we cannot have it both ways.

I reluctantly—I understand the problems in Youngstown, OH, and I reluctantly have to oppose this amendment in good faith.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the amendment. If we start disassembling the national air space plan piece by piece, we are going to waste about $300 million, which we have already spent on this program. We are going to waste the savings that investment would have made. We are going to end up with a waste of some billions of dollars that we are investing in that plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MOAKLEY] having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1827) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1987, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Walker amendment to strike chapter IV of title I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendments?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] adding $2.8 million to the Texas Accelerator Center.

□ 0050

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOAKLEY). Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the first 15-minute vote, the other votes, if we have any, will be of a 5-minute duration.

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

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

If a separate vote is not demanded on any other amendment, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 24, after line 22, insert the following:

GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Using funds previously appropriated in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1987, Public Law 99-500 and Public Law 99-591, the Secretary of Energy is directed to make available in FY 1987 not less than $2,800,000 from the General Science and Research Activities appropriation to the Texas Accelerator Center, The Woodlands, Texas, to support ongoing research.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 97, noes 288, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

AYES—97

Akaka	Bryant	Cooper
Alexander	Buechner	de la Garza
Andrews	Bustamante	Donnelly
Anthony	Cardin	Dyson
Archer	Carr	Edwards (OK)
Atkins	Chapman	English
Barnard	Chappell	Erdreich
Barton	Clay	Fascell
Bevill	Coleman (TX)	Fields
Brooks	Combest	Flippo

Florio
Frank
Frost
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grant
Guarini
Hall (TX)
Harris
Hayes (LA)
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Howard
Hoyer
Hughes
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Mavroules
McCurdy
McMillen (MD)
Mica
Morrison (CT)
Myers
Nelson
Nichols
Ortiz
Pease
Pickett
Pickle
Richardson
Robinson
Rodino
Roe
Sawyer
Shaw
Sisisky
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (TX)
Solarz
St Germain
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Sweeney
Synar
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Traficant
Traxler
Vento
Volkmer
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Whitten
Wise
Young (AK)

NOES—288

Ackerman
Anderson
Applegate
Armey
AuCoin
Badham
Baker
Ballenger
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Biaggi
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Carper
Chandler
Cheney
Clarke
Clinger
Coats
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Conte
Coughlin
Coyne
Craig
Crockett
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
Davis (IL)
Davis (MI)
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
Espy
Evans
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frenzel
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gradison
Grandy
Gray (IL)
Green
Gregg
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hastert
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hiler
Hopkins
Horton
Houghton
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kolbe
Kolter
Konnyu
Kostmayer
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken, Thomas
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nielson
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Penny
Perkins
Petri
Porter
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Saiki
Savage
Saxton
Schaefer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (NY)
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stratton
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Swindall
Tallon
Tauke
Thomas (CA)
Torres
Upton
Valentine
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whittaker
Williams
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wylie
Yatron
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—48

Annunzio
Aspin
Bartlett
Boland
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Collins
Conyers
Courter
Crane
Daniel
DeLay
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Early
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Garcia
Gray (PA)
Hatcher
Hutto
Jones (TN)
Kemp
LaFalce
Latta
Leach (IA)
Livingston
Lukens, Donald
Madigan
Martinez
McDade
McKinney
Moody
Murphy
Oakar
Pepper
Ray
Rostenkowski
Scheuer
Solomon
Taylor
Torricelli
Towns
Udall
Vander Jagt
Waxman
Wilson
Yates

□ 0100

Mr. CLARKE and Mr. HERTEL changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. VOLKMER, WALGREN, and HERTEL changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to clarify that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] asked unanimous consent to reduce all the votes to 5 minutes. There was an objection and the votes will be 15 minutes in duration.

The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Beginning on page 25, strike chapter IV of title I.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were: yeas 204, nays 184, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—204

Applegate
Archer
Armey
Badham
Baker
Ballenger
Barton
Bateman
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boner (TN)
Brooks
Broomfield
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Coughlin
Craig
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
Davis (IL)
Davis (MI)
DeFazio
DeLay
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Dyson
Eckart
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Fawell
Fields
Flippo
Florio
Frenzel
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gradison
Grandy
Grant
Gregg
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hiler
Holloway
Hopkins
Houghton
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kolbe
Kolter
Konnyu
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Leath (TX)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCandless
McCollum
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Nichols
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Penny
Perkins
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Roemer
Rogers
Roth
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Russo
Saiki
Saxton
Schaefer
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Spence
Stallings
Stangeland
Stenholm
Stratton
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Upton
Valentine
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Weldon
Whittaker
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—184

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Atkins
AuCoin
Barnard
Bates
Beilenson
Berman
Biaggi
Bilbray
Boehlert
Boggs
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Cardin
Carper
Clarke
Clay
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
de la Garza
Dellums
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Downey
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Edwards (CA)
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Gray (IL)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Horton

Howard
Hoyer
Jeffords
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kostmayer
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lowry (WA)
Luken, Thomas
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nelson
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Panetta
Pease
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Price (IL)
Price (NC)
Rangel
Richardson
Rodino
Roe
Rose
Roukema
Roybal
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schumer
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Snowe
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Synar
Torres
Traficant
Traxler
Vento
Visclosky
Walgren
Watkins
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wise
Wolpe
Wright
Wyden
Yatron

NOT VOTING—46

Annunzio
Aspin
Bartlett
Boland
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Collins
Conyers
Courter
Crane
Daniel
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Early
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Garcia
Gray (PA)
Hatcher
Hutto
Jones (TN)
Kemp
LaFalce
Latta
Leach (IA)
Livingston
Lukens, Donald
Madigan
Martinez
McDade
McKinney
Murphy
Oakar
Pepper
Ray
Rostenkowski
Scheuer
Solomon
Taylor
Torricelli
Towns
Udall
Vander Jagt
Waxman
Wilson
Yates

□ 0120

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Boulter for, with Mr. Boland against.

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

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 178, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—208

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Anthony
Applegate
Atkins
AuCoin
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Bevill
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Brennan
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Chappell
Clarke
Clay
Clinger
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Conte
Cooper
Coyne
Crockett
DeFazio
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Donnelly
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Florio
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grant
Gray (IL)
Green
Guarini
Hawkins
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefner
Hertel
Hochbrueckner
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hughes
Jeffords
Johnson (SD)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
Kostmayer
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lowry (WA)
Luken, Thomas
MacKay
Manton
Markey
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McHugh
McMillen (MD)
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Moakley
Mollohan
Moody
Morella
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murtha
Nagle
Natcher
Neal
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Panetta
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Pickett
Pickle
Price (NC)
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Richardson
Rinaldo
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Sabo
Savage
Sawyer
Schneider
Schroeder
Schuette
Schumer
Sharp
Sikorski
Skaggs
Slaughter (NY)
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Solarz
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Swift
Tallon
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Traficant
Traxler
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Watkins
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Wise
Wolpe
Wyden
Yatron

NAYS—178

Archer
Armey
Badham
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barton
Bateman
Bates
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Broomfield
Buechner
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Chandler
Cheney
Coats
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Coughlin
Craig
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daub
Davis (IL)
Davis (MI)
de la Garza
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Dyson
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Fawell
Fields
Flippo
Frenzel
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gingrich
Goodling
Gradison
Grandy
Gregg
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hiler
Holloway
Hopkins
Houghton
Huckaby
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Kolbe
Konnyu
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Leath (TX)
Lent
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
Lungren
Mack
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCandless
McCollum
McCurdy
McEwen
McGrath
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Nelson
Nichols
Nielson
Oxley
Packard
Parris
Pashayan
Patterson
Petri
Porter
Price (IL)
Ravenel
Regula
Rhodes
Ridge
Ritter
Roberts
Robinson
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Russo
Saiki
Saxton
Schaefer
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter (VA)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Spence
Stangeland
Stenholm
Stratton
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swindall
Synar
Tauke
Thomas (CA)
Upton
Valentine
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Weldon
Whittaker
Williams
Wolf
Wortley
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—47

Annunzio
Aspin
Bartlett
Boland
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Collins
Conyers
Courter
Crane
Daniel
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Early
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Garcia
Gray (PA)
Hatcher
Hutto
Jones (TN)
Kemp
LaFalce
Latta
Leach (IA)
Livingston
Lukens, Donald
Madigan
Martinez
McDade
McKinney
Murphy
Oakar
Pepper
Rangel
Ray
Rostenkowski
Scheuer
Solomon
Taylor
Torricelli
Towns
Udall
Vander Jagt
Waxman
Wilson
Yates

□ 0140

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boland for, with Mr. Ray against.

Mr. LaFalce for, with Mr. Solomon against.

Mr. Dorgan of North Dakota for, with Mr. Leach of Iowa against.

Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Boulter against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 1205, TO RELEASE A REVERSIONARY INTEREST IN CERTAIN LAND IN FLORIDA AND CONVEY CERTAIN MINERAL INTERESTS

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until 6 p.m. today, Friday, April 24, 1987, to

file a report on H.R. 1205, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release a reversionary interest of the United States in certain land located in Putnam County, FL, and to direct the Secretary of Interior to convey certain mineral interests of the United States in such land to the State of Florida.

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

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this been cleared with the minority?

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

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, this has been cleared with the minority.

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 27, 1987

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

CHANGES TO UNIFIED AND SPECIFIED COMBATANT STRUCTURE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 100-69)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Thursday, April 23, 1987.)

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 161(b) of Title 10, United States Code, this is to inform you of changes to the unified and specified combatant structure which I have recently approved.

(1) Establishment of the unified U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOC).

(2) Establishment of the specified Forces Command (FORSCOM).

(3) Establishment of the unified U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM).

(4) Disestablishment of the specified Military Airlift Command (MAC), to be accomplished upon the certification of CINCTRANS to the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, that TRANSCOM is fully operational.

(5) Disestablishment of the unified U.S. Readiness Command (USREDCOM) with transfer of designated functions to U.S. Central Command, U.S. European Command, U.S. Southern Command, U.S. Transportation Command, and Forces Command.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 23, 1987.*

THE NEED TO CLEAR THE WAY FOR RECAPITALIZATION OF FSLIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. ST GERMAIN, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we have early resolution of issues surrounding the recapitalization of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

The Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee has reported H.R. 27 which provides much needed funds for FSLIC and establishes new guidelines for regulatory actions involving troubled savings and loan institutions in areas suffering from severe economic distress. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the House will be able to act on this legislation in the near future and that we will have the cooperation of the other body in moving a recapitalization bill to the President's desk expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that the Senate has encased its version of the FSLIC recapitalization in a larger multititled bill—S. 790—that deals with everything from interstate banking to agricultural lending practices.

To be specific:

The Senate bill addresses the so-called question of nonbank banks.

The Senate bill addresses the question of Glass-Steagall as it applies to banks and bank holding companies and provides for a moratorium on the ability of the Federal Reserve to issue any rulings allowing bank holding companies to engage in various activities some argue should be determined by the Congress.

The Senate bill contains a provision regarding the question of powers of State-chartered savings banks.

The Senate bill addresses the so-called South Dakota insurance loophole.

The Senate bill addresses the question of restrictions on savings and loan holding companies and, similarly, restrictions on unitary savings and loan holding companies.

The Senate bill addresses the question which has been considered by your Banking Committees in the past of a qualified thrift lender test for thrift institutions.

The Senate bill creates a national commission to study and report back to the President on changes needed in our financial laws to promote a competitive American financial industry.

The Senate bill addresses the question of nonbanking activities performed by foreign banks operating in the United States.

The Senate bill addresses the apportionment of funds by OMB concerning the FDIC, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the NCUA under the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act.

The Senate bill addresses the so-called interstate acquisition question of failed or failing banks and provides the FDIC with bridge bank authority.

The Senate bill addresses the question of credit union conservatorship authority.

The Senate bill addresses the question of so-called checkhold legislation.

The Senate bill addresses the question of the cashing of government checks by depository institutions.

The Senate bill addresses the question of loans and loan loss writeoffs by qualified agricultural banks.

The Senate bill has a provision establishing the full faith and credit of the Federal Government behind deposits of federally insured savings and loan institutions and, finally.

The Senate bill calls for a study of so called high yield bonds.

Mr. Speaker, this is a significant array of issues that touches, in some manner, virtually every facet of the Nation's financial industry. Frankly, I am in sympathy with many aspects of the Senate-passed bill, but it would be improper and irresponsible to ask my colleagues to accept these provisions on which there have been no hearings, no debate and no votes in the subcommittees and committee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives.

There are at least three key reasons why I think it would be a mistake to attempt to bring the S. 790 issues to the floor of the House in the form of a conference report at the present time.

First, the issues are too important to be acted on without hearings, debate and votes within the committee and on the House floor. The House should have an opportunity to work its will on each of these issues.

Second, the parliamentary procedure we would face with such a conference is so convoluted and involved to render the objective a virtual impossibility.

Third, the issues involved in the Senate bill are so controversial that such a conference would almost certainly doom chances for early action on FSLIC, something that has become very close to an emergency situation that has little room left for more delays.

Let me just outline some of the parliamentary problems facing us if we tried to deal with the S. 790 package.

Assuming passage of H.R. 27, this approach would then require the chairman to ask unanimous consent to have the text of H.R. 27 substituted for the text of S. 790 and request a conference. There is no doubt in my mind that there would be an objection to this unanimous consent request.

Assuming, and I think it is a fair assumption, the unanimous consent would be objected to, one would then go back into committee and have the committee direct its chairman to go back to the floor and move to go to conference with the Senate on their legislation. I do not believe the committee nor the House would act favorably on such a request.

But let's assume the unanimous-consent request is approved.

We then would go to conference with the Senate Banking Committee, the House containing a one-title bill and the Senate containing 10 titles, 9 of which bear no relationship to the House bill as far as the House germaneness rule is concerned.

In conference, the House conferees' hands would be severely tied. We could not seek to amend their 10 titles to more adequately, perhaps, reflect the House views, because we would run into very serious scope problems, which would completely kill the conference-reported bill in the House, and in fact force us back to conference on just the FSLIC titles in both bills.

The House conferees would be forced, therefore, to essentially adopt all of the language contained in the 10 Senate titles without any substantive change whatsoever, and report these titles back to the House.

Under the House rules, as Members of the House know, these 10 titles of the Senate bill, not germane to the House bill, would all be subject to challenge under the germaneness rule and therefore subject individually to separate votes.

Under this kind of scenario, any reasonable person would have to conclude the House would reject any and all of these 10 titles, simply because neither the House nor its Banking Committee would have had an opportunity to address these issues in a normal legislative fashion.

I have discussed these matters with a number of members of the House Banking Committee on both sides of the aisle and with the Leadership of the House.

This morning I met with the Democrats in a committee caucus. There is a strong consensus in favor of dealing with the very important issue of FSLIC now, and taking up the other issues in S. 790 in regular order—with hearings and the opportunity for the committee and the House to work its will.

It is therefore my considered opinion to proceed in regular order, to-wit: It is my intention—

(a) to seek expeditious action by the House on H.R. 27, the FSLIC recapitalization legislation, and

(b) to have S. 790 referred to the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs for its consideration.

It is my intention to have the Financial Institutions Subcommittee of the House Banking Committee proceed to full hearings on the matters contained in S. 790 as well as others.

I believe approaching this matter in a regular order fashion, is not only best for the legislative process but will provide the best legislative outcome on all of the issues.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the House has given permission that when we adjourn tonight, we adjourn to meet on noon on Monday next.

On Monday, there will be three suspensions: The Cow Creek Band of Indians judgment distribution; to express the sense of Congress with respect to the VA Home Loan Program; and to express the sense of Congress that the VA Home Loan Program fee should not be increased.

On Tuesday, April 28, the House will meet at noon and consider recorded votes on any of the suspensions debated on Monday, April 27, and to consider H.R. 3, the omnibus trade bill, subject to a rule.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, April 29, 30, and 31 the House will meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday and consider H.R. 3 to complete consideration.

CAMPAIGN DEBT

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

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you were as shocked as I was when we heard the news that Presidential candidate Gary Hart now wants the American taxpayers to foot the bill for his 1984 campaign debt.

Now, while I'm willing to admit that Mr. Hart is the only candidate for President with deficit experience—namely his own—I don't believe it was the intent of Congress, the FEC, or the American people to use Federal matching dollars to pay old campaign debts.

Here is exactly what Mr. Hart would like to do. His debt is at least $1.3 million from 1984 and he has money in his 1988 Presidential fund that he would like to use to pay the debt.

Sounds pretty simple. But that is not all that Mr. Hart would like to do.

He wants the best of both worlds. Believe it or not, Mr. Hart wants the taxpayers to match the money he has raised so far and he also wants to pay his debt with that same money. Not a bad deal—trying to get the taxpayers to pay his 1984 campaign debt.

What an interesting message we would be sending to the American people: "If you run for President, don't worry about any debts you may run up—because you can abuse the system and try to snooker the American taxpayers into paying the debt."

The hypocrisy and the irony surrounding this issue is mind boggling.

And, all this coming from a candidate who so righteously claims not to accept political action committee money.

It's not bad enough that Mr. Hart still owes over $1 million to small businesses and creditors 4 years later.

It's not bad enough that he wants to manage the affairs of this Nation when he can't properly manage the financial affairs of his campaign.

It's not bad enough that he has failed to pay creditors while at the same time raising money Hollywood style for a future political roll.

It's not bad enough that he wants to deceive contributors as to where their donations will eventually end up.

But—how does the small businessperson feel—who works everyday to pay his bills; make a living; abide by the laws; and support their families. Does the Federal Government pay their debt?

How about the farmers in Iowa? Is the Government paying their debts carte blanche?

I think it's interesting to note back in 1979 when the very controversial Chrysler bailout bill hit the Congress. What did Gary Hart have to say then?

Let me quote Senator Hart who righteously proclaimed:

"This legislation contradicts the basic tenets of free enterprise and represents bad economic and poor public policy—both for the present and the future.

Well Mr. Hart, today is the future.

He further stated and I quote:

The free enterprise system also must mean "freedom to fail" as well as the freedom to profit.

And he concluded by saying:

Providing aid to the company sets a dangerous public policy precedent.

Well Mr. Hart, why shouldn't all this great rhetoric apply to you in 1988? I would ask simply: Why should U.S. taxpayers bail you out of your irresponsible campaign spending binge?

Not to mention the fact that Chrysler was probably a better investment anyway. At least they paid back their loan guarantee—ahead of time.

Quite frankly, the behavior Mr. Hart is exhibiting in this regard is an outrageous abuse of our system.

To stop this, today I have introduced legislation which will prohibit the use of Presidential election campaign funds to pay debts from prior Presidential campaigns.

Mr. Hart brags he won't take special interest money to pay his debt. Well, that's fine. I believe the American people and the Congress should make darn sure he can't use taxpayer dollars to pay the debt. That's our special interest.

It is unconscionable that anyone—especially a candidate for the highest elected office in our Nation—would try this stunt.

I guess this whole matter is one of Mr. Hart's "new ideas." If so, he should go back to the drawing board. I remember when he was asked the question: "Where's the beef?" Well, maybe someone should ask him: "Where did you get the gall?"

Mr. Hart, withdraw your request from the FEC and pay your creditors without the matching funds.

□ 0150

NATIONAL HOME CARE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES of Illinois). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution to designate the week beginning November 29, 1987, as "National Home Care Week." I am pleased to be joined by Representatives CLAUDE PEPPER and MATTHEW RINALDO in sponsoring this resolution. Congress has approved similar resolutions in the past to recognize the valuable services of home care programs and personnel, and I look forward to congressional passage once again.

As you all know, thousands of home care agencies around the Nation have responded to the need to offer effective alternatives to our health care delivery system. By providing skilled medical assistance to those who can be properly treated outside the hospital or nursing home setting, these agencies recognize the demand for new health care options, and conserve tax dollars currently expended on needless placement in these institutions. This valuable concept of care provides a serviceable answer to the needs of our health care system, and offers a comforting, dignified environment for patients. Alternatives to our health care programs must be offered, and home care agencies have proven very effective in answering that need.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, one of the most critical issues to face our Nation today centers around our health care system. While the growing elderly population, expected to total well over 30 million by the year 2000, places greater demand on our current system, home care agencies have helped many of the elderly remain at home and in their communities. This creates an atmosphere of greater independence and dignity and promotes an easeful recovery. For this service, home care agencies and persons employed in the home care industry should be properly recognized and commended.

As we reevaluate and reform our Nation's health care programs, it is essential for us to take full notice of the benefits of home care and to act to encourage its use. I thank my colleagues for their past support in cosponsoring this important resolution, and look forward to the opportunity to again recognize this effective and humane health care alternative the week of November 29, 1987.

For the convenience of my colleagues, the text of the resolution follows:

H.J. RES. 257

Whereas organized home care services to the elderly and disabled have existed in the United States since the last quarter of the 18th century;

Whereas home care is an effective and economical alternative to unnecessary institutionalization;

Whereas caring for the ill and disabled in their homes places emphasis on the dignity and independence of the individual receiving these services;

Whereas since the enactment of the medicare home care program, which provides coverage for skilled nursing services, physical therapy, speech therapy, social services, occupational therapy, and home health aide services, the number of home care agencies in the United States providing these services has increased from fewer than 500 to more than 3,000; and

Whereas many private and charitable organizations provide these and similar services to millions of individuals each year preventing, postponing, and limiting the need for them to become institutionalized to receive these services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning November 29, 1987, is designated as "National Home Care Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

LEGISLATION ON LABELING CHANGES IN FOOD PRODUCTS

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be joined today by my colleagues, RON WYDEN, BOB WHITTAKER, BILL EMERSON, TOM TAUKE, JERRY HUCKABY, JIM JONTZ, and CHARLES HATCHER, in introducing a bill to require labeling changes in food products containing palm, palm kernel, or coconut oil, the so-called tropical oils.

This bill is being introduced with the support of the American Heart Association, the American Soybean Association, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, Public Voice for Food and Health Policy, the Corn Growers Association, the Consumer Federation of America, the National Sunflower Association, the National Cotton Council, the American Public Health Association, the National Council of Senior Citizens, the Florida Peanut Producers Association, and the Georgia Peanut Producers Association.

Over the last several years, Government, public and private agencies, and the medical community have educated the public to monitor and modify their diets to lower their cholesterol intake and reduce their risk of heart disease. Consumers have been encouraged to switch from animal fats, which are high in dietary cholesterol, to vegetable oils, which contain no dietary cholesterol and which are generally lower in saturated fats.

Not all vegetable oils are created equal, however.

Coconut, palm and palm kernel oils, which are classified as vegetable oils, are higher in saturated fats than lard; all three invite heart disease—our Nation's No. 1 killer—by raising blood cholesterol levels. Yet, these tropical oils are found in hundreds of food products, ranging from cereals and crackers to frostings and frozen fried potatoes.

Some of these products make claims of "no cholesterol" and many boast "made with 100 percent vegetable shortening." What these products' labels fail to mention is that the tropical oils they contain are high in the saturated fats which boost blood cholesterol. The unsuspecting consumer, accustomed to thinking of all vegetable oils as healthful, is easily, and probably intentionally, misled by this kind of labeling.

The bill we are introducing today will help to ensure that consumers who purchase products containing tropical oils know just what they're buying.

Specifically, this bill will:

Require the label of foods which contain palm, palm kernel, or coconut oil to indicate specifically which oil is contained in the food. This will disallow tropical oils to be listed disjunctively—the use of "and/or" and "one or more of the following"—in ingredients lists. Under the current labeling system, a consumer is told only that the product may include a tropical oil; and

Require the words "a saturated fat" to follow the names palm, palm kernel or coconut oil in ingredient lists of products containing tropical oils.

To get at misleading claims, our bill will require the label of foods which contain palm, palm kernel, or coconut oil and which make a claim that the food contains or is prepared with vegetable shortening on the principal or side panel to:

First, identify on the label making the claim which of the tropical oils is contained in the food and follow the name of the oil with the statement "a saturated fat"; and

Second, list the fat content and saturated fat content of the food per serving.

It is no mere coincidence that I, the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Wheat, Soybeans, and Feed Grains am sponsoring this bill, or that a number of commodity groups have endorsed the proposal. All of the domestically produced vegetable oils—safflower, sunflower, corn, soybean, peanut, and cottonseed—are substantially lower in saturated fats than the imported tropical oils.

Yet, in terms of use in this country, from 1984 through 1986 palm oil levels more than doubled, from 370 million pounds to 780 million pounds; coconut oil increased from 904 million pounds to 1.1 billion pounds.

What concerns American producers is that during the same period of time, oils produced from sources grown in this country either lost ground in domestic use or enjoyed only small increases.

Clearly this is an issue where producing and consuming interests merge: Domestically produced oils are low in saturated fat, which is what our health-conscious public is demanding. What's good for the American consumer is good for the American farmer. I hope the effort we are initiating today will provide not

only for an informed public, but that it will bring about a reduction in the use of tropical oils and an increase in the more healthful oils produced here at home.

FIGHTER SALE FOR HONDURAS

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration is prepared to deliver sophisticated combat aircraft, the F-5E, to Honduras. This would be the first time that the United States has sold advanced fighters in Central America. Because of the high level of tension in the region, I believe that the sale should be postponed.

The F-5E is used by such countries as the Netherlands and Turkey which face technologically advanced air forces. However, Honduras is the only country in Central America which possesses jet fighters, and its 12 super Mystere B-2 jets already provide it with unmatched air-to-air superiority

If these jets are to be replaced, I also believe that further consideration needs to be given to less advanced fighters which might be more appropriate for Honduras' defense needs.

Supplying Honduras with F-5E jets could also escalate military tensions in Central America and prompt Nicaragua to acquire Mig jets. Instead of promoting a further militarization of the conflict in Central America, we should be attempting to reduce regional tensions and providing strong support for President Arias' peace plan.

Please join me and Congressman BONIOR in signing a letter to President Reagan asking him to postpone the sale until regional tensions can be reduced.

RULE FOR CONSIDERING H.R. 1748

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

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the House that the Committee on Armed Services will be requesting a rule for consideration of H.R. 1748, the fiscal year 1988 Defense authorization bill, which we expect will be drafted along the lines of the rule adopted last year. Thus, Members should be on notice that the rule could structure a procedure for the consideration of amendments as was the case in 1986. The committee is awaiting announcement of the details by the Rules Committee.

JAPAN'S MARSHALL PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, over the past 5 years, as United States trade deficits have soared, Japan has come in for increasing criticism from the United States. For their part, the Japanese feel that they are being made the scapegoat for America's declining international competitiveness; and to a certain extent, they are right. It is painful for Americans—and particularly American politicians—to concede that most of our competitiveness problems are "Made in America."

Nevertheless, much of the criticism of Japan is valid, particularly the notion that it has been unwilling to accept responsibilities commensurate with their surging international economic power and status.

For example, in recent years the Japanese have refused to increase their imports from Third World countries; thereby exerting additional pressure on American markets to help developing countries generate enough export earnings to service their massive debt burden. In this way, the Third World debt crisis has exacerbated America's underlying trade problems.

For this reason, I was particularly pleased to read today of a new initiative announced by the former Japanese Foreign Minister, Shintaro Abe, who said Japan plans to lend up to $30 billion over the next few years to Latin American debtor countries. Next week, when the trade bill is debated on the House floor, Japan will be roundly criticized on a bipartisan basis. But today, I want to acknowledge this positive step by the Japanese, and give credit where it is due.

Indeed, at a time when large banks all over the world are worried about a deepening of the Third World debt crisis, Japan's leading banks and their Government are ready to try a novel approach to easing the crisis and simultaneously improving their international competitiveness. The first step in this new approach came last month, when Japan's 28 largest banks created a mechanism for clearing their books of nonperforming LDC sovereign loans. Japanese banks will be the first with substantial foreign loans to take losses on their Third World portfolios now rather than postpone the day of reckoning. They have established a joint factoring company that will buy the loans at a discount, enabling the banks to get large tax savings from these sales. The plan will give Japanese banks a new competitive edge; they believe the move will enable them to catch up with the tax and regulatory positions of United States and European banks. Unlike competitors, they will no longer be tying up large amounts of capital to support frozen assets that have at best an uncertain earnings potential.

Now with the second step announced yesterday, Japan has indicated their intention to help recycle their trade surpluses as growth capital for debtor countries. In short, this constitutes a "Japanese Marshall Plan" for the Third World.

As such, this action is also a dramatic example of just how much economic power relationships in the world are changing.

In October 1985, Secretary of the Treasury Baker proposed a new international lending program from industrialized countries to Third World debtors, calling for $20 billion from commercial banks over 3 years. Unfortunately, it has not materialized. Fortunately, the Japanese now appear willing to unilaterally move forward with $30 billion over roughly the same time period.

But let's understand something else, the Japanese are not doing this only out of the goodness of their hearts—such action will clearly be in Japan's long-term self-interest.

Despite the fact that the Japanese loans will apparently not be directly tied to the purchase of Japanese goods and services, you can be sure that Japanese economic influence will, in fact, expand rapidly throughout Latin America as Japanese financiers negotiate their lending packages.

In this regard, increased lending to Latin America will help Japan to maintain its export-oriented economy. At the same time, it may also reduce pressures on Japan to export to the United States, thereby reducing bilateral trade tensions between our two countries.

However, even though this new Japanese initiative is quite welcome, it is not enough. The Japanese have been recycling their trade surpluses with the United States by buying United States Treasury bonds and investing in American industry and real estate for the past several years. But they still need to open up their markets to U.S. exports. In the same way, I hope that the Japanese will also begin to open up their markets to Third World goods as well as to help finance Third World economic development.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 72D ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, columnist Richard Cohen said, "The last victim of genocide is truth."

I rise today to join my colleagues in commemoration of the 72d anniversary of the Armenian genocide. We commemorate this crime against humanity to understand the event, and thereby preclude its repetition against anyone anywhere in the world.

We commemorate to affirm a proud moment in the United States history where our Government and our people led a worldwide outcry against the perpetrators and for the survivors of Ottoman Turkey's genocide policies.

We commemorate to protect the historical record of America against those who find the truth disquieting, and we commemorate to sustain the integrity of this body who during the 54th and 66th Congresses affirmed the fact of the Armenian genocide.

At this point, it would be my intention to yield to my colleague from California [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. PASHAYAN] for taking this 1-hour special order in which we can remember the sacrifices that have been made by Armenians all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, during the month of April, Armenians all over the world

will be observing the 72d anniversary of the Armenican genocide. I am glad to be participating in today's special order in which all victims of genocide are brought to mind. In particular, we commemorate the Armenian genocide of 1915–1923.

In the latter half of the 19th century the Ottoman Turkish Government began a policy of persecution against its Armenian population. This persecution was brutal and ferocious. It resulted in many deaths of Armenians in 1894 through 1896, and in 1909. The pattern of persecution and destruction culminated in the great massacre of 1915 through 1923. At least 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children perished in this holocaust. Those who survived became homeless refugees, whose descendants, with their painful memories, can be found in many countries today.

This terrible fact of history has been documented by eyewitnesses and media accounts, including those of then United States Ambassador to Ottoman Turkey Henry A. Morgenthau. The 54th and 66th Congresses adopted resolutions deploring the massacres. President Reagan and seven Presidents before him, have spoken out against the treatment of the Armenians. In spite of this overwhelming evidence and recognition, the debate rages on over whether or not these events of history should be remembered.

Opponents of House Joint Resolution 132 fear that the legislation will hurt friendly international relations by encouraging the incidence of international terrorism. In response I can only say that as a free and democratic nation we deplore the events surrounding the Armenian genocide as vigorously as we deplore modern acts of terrorism.

We have a duty to acknowledge and affirm the historical record on this event. Denials or dismissals of genocide deeply insult those already injured and portend ominous warnings for the future. As a matter of conscience, we have a responsibility to learn from the past.

As we have done in earlier years, we take this opportunity today to pause and reflect on the Armenian experience. Cruelty, murder and genocide are terrible, terrible examples of man's inhumanity to man. We commemorate Armenian Martyrs' Day to remember this and to recognize the suffering and pain that the Armenian world community has endured. Let us commit ourselves today to a future course that prevents us from ever permitting the occurence of such horror again anywhere in the world.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I thank my colleague from California for his kind remarks, and also wish to point out that he has been a great friend and an active supporter of the Armenian community within the United States.

Everybody appreciates that, and I appreciate his participation tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague from the great State of Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity given to me by my distinguished colleague from the State of California [Mr. PASHAYAN] and also my distinguished colleague from the State of California [Mr. LEHMAN] for having given me an opportunity to address a very serious issue.

Tonight we are talking about a situation that has literally been a holocaust for a particular set of people that has shaped the lives of an entire generation of Americans, an entire generation of people that live around the world.

While I am perfectly cognizant of the fact that we are not as Americans asking that the present government, and the Turkish situation was responsible for what happened, at the same time, we must be cognizant of the fact that the Government of Turkey was indeed cognizant of the fact that there was incorporated in their particular activities from 1915 to 1923 in the Armenian empire one of the greatest genocides that occurred certainly in this century.

I think that we as Americans should take recognition of that fact, and while we should not necessarily blame the present government by any means, that we should announce to the world, and to the Turkish Government, that we as Americans recognize the importance of the facts that occurred in that part of the world during this time period.

□ 0200

We believe that recognition of the horrors of the situation that occurred, that indeed, we should not be in any way associated, nor should the Government of Turkey be in any way associated with the things that occurred during that time period.

I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. PASHAYAN] for allowing me this opportunity to talk about this very serious issue.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I wish to thank my good friend from Kentucky for his very astute remarks on the subject. I take it he agrees with me that one of the reasons that this body ought to take a formal recognition of not only that very dark and stained page in human history, but others as well at the appropriate occasions in some kind of affirmative effort to prevent it ever from happening again anywhere.

Mr. PERKINS. I think my distinguished colleague from California has once again placed his finger on the most important question that we are dealing with here tonight. That is why did this sort of thing happen in the past? We should not allow it to occur in the future. I think that is exactly what we are talking about here tonight. That is exactly the message we are trying to get across.

Mr. PASHAYAN. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN of California. I thank the gentleman. I share in his eloquent remarks this evening and also those of my distinguished colleague from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, more than 600,000 Armenians in this country and elsewhere in the Diaspora, will observe April 24 as a solemn day of remembrance for the 1.5 million Armenians who perished during and after the First World War. Today we join the Armenians in the anniversary ceremonies here in Congress. My colleague, CHIP PASHAYAN, and I are pleased to have the participation of many of our fellow Members of Congress for this special order in honor of the 72d anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

Today also marks another anniversary. On the floor of this House 17 years ago, Members began an annual commemoration of special orders to bring greater attention and understanding to the first genocide of the 20th century. In last year's special order, we looked back over the historical record relating to the Armenian genocide in Congress. We discovered that as far back as 1895, the U.S. Congress heard about the troubles of the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. Resolutions of support for the Armenians also were approved in the 54th and 66th U.S. Congresses.

We also discovered that reports by former United States Ambassador to Turkey Henry Morgenthau argued in the defense of the Armenians and feared that "the destruction of the Armenian Race" was "rapidly progressing," and in dire need of a massive relief effort. Congress responded to the continued plight of the Armenians, and with the expressed support of many U.S. Presidents during its 15 year existence, Congress established the Near East Relief Committee, formerly known as the American Committee for the Armenian and Syrian Relief. Please find enclosed an article by Susan K. Blair on the history of the Near East Relief Committee.

Therefore, the history of the Armenian destruction has been established here in Congress, However, because of the State Department bulletin in 1982 which claimed that the massacres of the Armenians were "alleged," my colleagues and I have introduced commemorative resolutions since 1983 which reaffirm historical fact and pay tribute to the thousands of Armenians

who perished under the leadership Ottoman Empire's triumvirate.

The special order reviews the historical record of the Armenian genocide, but also looks at some of the lobbying techniques employed by those who attempt to dissuade Members of Congress from supporting the resolution.

We have several speakers today, so I would like to focus on one aspect of the dispute over the historical record. I would like to insert for the RECORD a detailed, authoritative chapter from Winston Churchill's book, "The Aftermath," which is the fourth in a four-part volume detailing the events of World War I from the eyes of then Member of Parliament Churchill. He describes the disasterous result of the postwar agreements by the Great Powers for the Armenian people: Armenia was forgotten.

While the history of the genocide has been documented by diplomats of the time and has been referred to since by many U.S. Presidents, others have tried to distort it. For the past 2 years, the Assembly of Turkish American Associations has used an advertisement claiming that the language in this resolution is "misleading and/or inaccurate." 69 scholars signed this ad which appeared in the Washington Post, New York Times, and Washington Times in May 1985.

The information in the following report was compiled by the Armenian Assembly of America after corresponding with 11 of the scholars. Some of the scholars privately expressed regret that they were a part of such a campaign, and another retracted his statement and supported the resolution. They also responded in writing, with one scholar acknowledging that he cannot authoritatively answer a question on the treatment of the Armenians because the period encompassing the genocide is not his area of expertise. Since the scholars asked that their names be withheld, I would be pleased to show Members the letters if they wish.

The enclosed report also makes some striking revelations about the background and affiliation of many of the ad's signatories. First, the ad claims that all the scholars specialize in Turkish, Ottoman, and Middle Eastern studies. However, only 18 of the 69 signatories are specialists on the broad subject of pre-Republic Turkish history during the 19th and 20th centuries. In fact, only eight scholars are concerned solely with the 20th century, the period encompassing the Armenian genocide.

An even closer look at the expertise of the scholars reveals that only 4 of the 18 have dealt with the specific topic and period of history in question: The policy toward the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire during and before World War I.

Finally, the report focuses on the scholars' affiliation with Turkish organizations and institutions, 40 of the 69 scholars received a total of 65 grants from 2 prominent organizations, the Institute of Turkish Studies [ITS] based here in Washington, D.C. and the American Research Institute [ARI] based in Ankara, Turkey. I have enclosed a chart of all the signatories' grant awards.

In closing, I would like to insert a resolution adopted by the American Baptist Churches, USA, which urges congressional passage of the commemorative resolution. Along with the American Baptist Churches, the Washington Office of the Episcopal Church and the Lutheran Church of America have expressed their support.

My colleagues will address in greater detail the support by Dr. Monroe Freedman, director of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, Elie Wiesel, chairman of the Holocaust Council, and Dr. Helen Fein, executive director of the Institute for the Study of Genocide.

I commend these organizations for their support of the purpose of this resolution: To correct the historical record and to protect the dignity of all people.

Mr. Speaker, if we pass the resolution in this House commemorating the Day of Remembrance for the victims of the Armenian genocide, I think only one thing in the world with respect to the Republic of Turkey will be different on the next day. Their geography will not have changed at all. Their military situation in the world will not have changed. Their relationship with the United States will not have changed. The only thing that will have changed in the entire world if we pass this resolution is their standing in the eyes of mankind with respect to what happened in the events in the early part of the century.

They will have faced the truth of that and have it behind them as will everyone else. The only thing the Turkish Government will not have to face following passage of this resolution is the fact that they will not have to deal with the resolution again; they will have come to grips with their own history and accept this fact.

What we ask for is the dignity of the recognition of this genocide for all people in the world, and especially for those who today are the living survivors of it.

I again thank my colleague from California, [Mr. PASHAYAN], for his courageous leadership in this area and I commend him for his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the materials that I referred to earlier in my remarks follow.

AMERICA'S GREATEST ACT: NEAR EAST RELIEF IN RETROSPECT

(By Susan K. Blair)

For most Americans, the World War I events which brought about the near-extinction of the Armenian people in their ancient Transcaucasian homeland appear to have no connection with their own lives or their own national history. Yet the results of the Armenian genocide of 1914-1923 and its impact on American society may be seen in United States Government agencies, in the programs and operations of our private philanthropic organizations, and in relations between the public relations industry and the news media.

Of all the world's citizens, it was the American people who responded to the Armenian plight with the greatest show of concern and compassion. Indeed, local authorities considered American efforts to thwart the Armenian genocide tantamount to an act of war. To forget the mass commitment of the people of the United States saving the Armenian people from extinction is to forget one of the most noble acts in the history of mankind.

U.S. involvement in Armenian history began in 1828, when missionaries sent out by the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, representing several Protestant churches, arrived in Izmir, Turkey, then known as Smyrna, intent on converting the Moslem population of the Ottoman Empire. They discovered their mission could be self-defeating: conversion from Islam was a capital offense. A Turk or Arab who became a Christian would be condemned to death by his confession of faith. The Christian Greeks and Armenians, however, whose national Christian faiths had been hampered in their development by repressive laws and widespread illiteracy among their clergy, could provide a fertile field for mission work.

By basing their efforts upon an effort to educate Ottoman citizens, particularly the Christian minorities, and provide modern medical care, the American missionaries found their involvement with the Armenians particularly rewarding and fruitful. The challenge and stimulus they presented to the Armenian community of the Ottoman Empire helped contribute to a renaissance in the ancient Armenian Apostolic Church, the growth of education, and the rebirth of Armenian culture after centuries of stagnation under Turkish rule. By 1914, the Presbyterian Board of Missions, active in Syria and Persia, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) counted a total enrollment of more than 33,000 in their colleges, elementary and secondary schools, most of them Armenian. The cumulative influence of these schools over three-quarters of a century on successive generations of students and American sponsors was considerable. When tragedy struck, Armenians turned toward the American missionaries, and often sought refuge inside the walled mission compounds. And the American public needed no education about the national identity of the Armenians.

The increasing literacy, culture, wealth and influence which resulted from foreign contact and improved the educational resources among the Armenian minority provoked deep resentment toward them among their Turkish masters. Political repression stimulated the growth of national feeling among Armenians. Persecution of Armenians by the despotic Sultan Abdul Hamid II in the 1890's prompted European intervention. The "Armenian Question" proved a thorny one for the Turks. The more Europe (particularly, France, Britain and Russia) complained, the more the Armenians suffered. When the Ottoman Empire entered

91-059 O-89-34 (Pt. 7)

World War I as an ally of the Central Powers, thus freeing themselves of the traditional restraints imposed by the Entente powers on anti-Armenian policies, the oligarchic Young Turk leaders in power took advantage of the general mobilization measures and veil of censorship which they imposed to eliminate the Armenian Question by exterminating the Armenian people on Turkish soil, and wherever possible, in neighboring states as well.

As the Turkish authorities organized massacres in some areas and forcefully deported the Armenians from their homes across Asia Minor, American missionaries witnessed the tragedy. Some tried to intervene with varying success. A few succeeded in accompanying their Armenian students on the deportation route, this shaming the Turks into according the youngsters better treatment. Others wrote reports to mission headquarters or the American Embassy, and found trustworthy travelers willing to risk carrying their messages to the capital [then Constantinople]. A few, whom the authorities evidently considered too observant, were themselves deported under guard or met suspicious deaths in isolated circumstances. The majority of them did whatever they could to ease the suffering of the people to whom many had devoted a lifetime, distributing food or money as circumstances allowed, hiding as many as possible, helping some to escape, and often risking their own lives in the process.

The American Ambassador, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., proved no less courageous than the missionaries, arguing in defense of the Armenians to the point that he angered Turkish leaders, who accused him—and the American counsuls on Ottoman territory—of meddling in their internal affairs. By mid-July, 1915, Morgenthau realized the Turks were carrying out a "campaign of race extermination." By mid-August, he was convinced Turkey's German and Austrian allies would do nothing beyond make *pro forma* protests for public relations purposes. By early September, he envisioned the United States as the Moses destined to lead the Armenian nation out of the Turkish "Egypt."

Morgenthau cabled the Secretary of State that since "the destruction of the Armenian race" was "rapidly progressing" either a massive relief effort or the mass relocation of the Armenian people to the United States would be their only salvation. He asked that the State Department request five American leaders to form a relief committee to raise $100,000. His list included Phelps-Dodge copper heir and philanthropist Cleveland H. Dodge, who also happened to be President Wilson's oldest and closest friend; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, founder of reformed Judaism and Morgenthau's close friend; industrialist Charles R. Crane (elevators and plumbing), a Wilson Democrat and an ABCFM benefactor; John R. Mott of the International Young Men's Christian Association; and Samuel Dutton, a noted educator and advisor to the missionary colleges in the Ottoman Empire.

These men also invited the Rev. James L. Barton, Foreign Secretary of the ABCFM who had once served in Turkish Armenia, and consequently spoke fluent Armenian and Turkish, to join them for the first meeting of the "Armenian Atrocities Committee" held at Dodge's Wall Street district office in Manhattan on September 16, 1915. At the time World War I broke out, Barton actually supervised a larger overseas staff than did the U.S. Secretary of State. His missionaries provided him with detailed information, in regular reports, on the situation in the countries to which they were posted. The State Department often turned to Barton for information on foreign affairs. Since the missionaries served overseas for decades, they were better informed in most cases than the meager U.S. Foreign Service staff.

Before their first meeting adjourned, the men present personally pledged the $100,000 requested by Ambassador Morgenthau. But it became clear the Turks would not ease their persecution, an if Armenians were to survive, relief must continue. The result was a fund raising effort that grew as rapidly as did sympathy in the United States for the plight of the long-suffering Armenians. With publicity-conscious Barton as its chairman, the renamed American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief organized fund raising committees, recruiting Americans of influence, wealth and power, across the United States. By 1919, over 20,000 state and local committees dedicated themselves to rescuing the Armenian nation. Increasing the size and stature of the main Board of Trustees with careful additions representing all major faiths, politics and the finest social service and medical professionals, the committee wielded formidable power. Members included, at one point or another during its fifteen-year history, former President William Howard Taft, future Presidents Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Herbert Hoover; Morgenthau himself, who returned to the U.S. in 1916 to devote himself to fund raising for the relief effort; Wilson's Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, who authorized a Navy blimp to travel up and down over Manhattan trailing fund-raising banners for Armenian relief; Oscar Straus, the first Jewish member of a U.S. cabinet; New York Times editor John H. Finley; James Cardinal Gibbons; and dozens of other famous Americans. Armenian relief became news because the men who supported it made headlines. Barton and his carefully chosen staff saw to it that the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief, later known as the American Committee for Relief in the Near East, and finally, by Act of Congress, as Near East Relief, stayed in the headlines. Their public relations campaign makes many current effort seem feeble in comparison.

Instituting the "adopt a child" concept, committee leaders convinced First Ladies Wilson and Coolidge to sponsor Armenian orphans. In 1916, the committee began publication of a monthly magazine on its activities at home and abroad which continued publication for over a decade. Contributors were rewarded for their largesse with subscriptions to the "house organ," which featured emaciated faces of Armenian waifs on the cover of almost every issue.

Near East Relief leaders obtained annual presidential proclamations endorsing their fund raising campaign. Newspapers throughout the United States received complimentary engraved metal plates for full pages of articles and photographs about Near East Relief and its work. A Speakers Bureau of missionary eye-witnesses home on leave and Armenians fortunate enough to be studying in college in the United States when the genocide began provided programs for fund raising meetings in every state. Although, as one missionary bluntly stated, "it is difficult to get people to come to a meeting where they know they will be dunned," Americans responded with generosity to the organization's appeals. The most successful came in 1919, after the war had ended, when the organization raised over $19 million in one year. An entire generation of American children was exhorted to finish portions of detested vegetables with the words, "Remember the starving Armenians." And the children did remember, but not with the resentment one would expect under such circumstances. Many a child brought a filled piggybank to fund raisers, clutched carefully in little hands. Other children held streetcorner "circuses," sold lemonade, or sacrificed allowances for the benefit of Armenian children thousands of miles away whose misery they could barely begin to comprehend. Child star Jackie Coogan made personal appearances—and gave from his own resources and wardrobe—to help feed and cloth Armenians. Adult movie stars did likewise. Regular special collections in churches and synagogues benefitted Near East Relief. Theatre-owners allowed authorized N.E.R. staff and volunteers to collect funds during intermission. Special movies funded by the relief commission, but made by major film studios, vividly portrayed the Armenian predicament. Near East Relief also produced film strips and steroptican slides. Grocers placed specially marked barrels in their stores to solicit donations of bags of flour for Near East Relief. And prisoners in the Virginia State Penitentiary sacrificed their wages to help support Armenian orphans.

The organization devoted over $113 million to relief between 1915 and 1931, the equivalent of several billion today. Cleveland H. Dodge, through a magnanimous gesture, enabled the relief committee to send almost all funds raised directly to the field. He personally paid for administrative expenses from the time of that first meeting in his office until his death in 1926.

As a result of Near East Relief's impressive publicity campaign, the American people favored acceptance of a U.S. mandate over Armenia at the end of the war, but technicalities caused defeat of the measure in Congress.

Although Near East Relief did have a lasting impact on philanthropy in the United States, and produced a new sense of responsibility for the welfare of others overseas, the organization's greatest impact on history resulted from its programs abroad. At first, Morgenthau had U.S. Consuls and missionaries covertly distribute relief funds and carry out programs despite a ban on relief to Armenians imposed by Turkish authorities. Since Ottoman Turkey was a belligerent power, this amounted to an act of war. At best, it was a dangerous provocation. But when Turkish authorities complained, the determined Morgenthau, whose compassion for the Armenians was partially prompted by feelings they were "like the Jews," simply instructed the consuls to be more discreet.

Relief funds kept several hundred thousand displaced Armenians alive for the duration of the war. In 1916, the organization began a program still used by the U.S. Agency for International Development—the granting of low- or no-interest loans to businessmen whose trade was destroyed. Relief workers established industrial relief programs in Russian Armenia, where many refugees from massacres in Turkey had fled. Refugees found jobs with the relief organization as tanners or shoemakers, weavers and seamstresses to make apparel for orphans and other refugees.

When, in April, 1917, the United States entered the war, relief became more difficult. Although Turkey merely ruptured diplomatic relations with the U.S., and resisted German pressure to declare war, withdrawals of the U.S. consuls made distribution of funds more difficult. Each delay in transmission of funds literally meant death for hundreds. Other neutral diplomats filled the gap, and where American missionaries returned home, Danish, Swedish, or even German missionaries stepped in to work for Near East Relief. Many Americans refused to abandon the Armenians. In several instances, one American woman, the sole foreigner in an isolated city in the Turkish interior, managed to save a few hundred Armenians under her care in her mission compound. These women performed their heroic acts, well knowing the personal jeopardy they chose. Holy War against all non-Moslems had been proclaimed in November, 1914.

A telegram sent by U.S. Ambassador Henry Morgenthau to the Secretary of State warning that "a campaign of race extermination is in progress under a pretext of reprisal against rebellion."

The end of the war meant hope for those Armenians who had managed to survive. In January, 1919, James Barton led an investigative commission into Turkish Armenia and Syria to determine the condition of Armenians. He wrote his wife back in the U.S. that the truth of what befell the Armenians was far worse than the most horrible reports they had heard. "Turks themselves tell us so." He marveled at the fact they seemed to feel no shame in recounting the fiendish cruelties they had practiced.

A virtual army of Near East Relief workers followed the Chairman into Turkey, establishing relief stations in every major city or town where the Armenian survivors resurfaced when safety seemed guaranteed. The organization hired more than 400, and added to its staff the missionaries, Red Cross and YMCA employees stationed in the area, with parent organizations willingly keeping them on their own payrolls, but authorizing their Armenian relief activities. N.E.R. staff members, required to be college graduates 26 or over with excellent references and some administrative experience, were given training in the Near Eastern languages. Some were hired because their educational background in agriculture or pedagogy seemed ideal. Others were hired because they already spoke one of the native languages. With motivations ranging from pure altruism to a romanticist's desire to visit Tolstoy's homeland, they dedicated themselves with rare devotion to their work.

Corruption, whether among Americans or local residents hired to help, proved rare. The extreme misery they found among the Armenians, many of whom has no choice but eat grass, carrion or garbage to stay alive, served as a powerful deterrent to selfishness. Each relief station's outfit included several American staff members, including a doctor or nurse, a RED truck to transport supplies, medicines and surgical equipment, food, uniforms for personnel, so they would not be mistaken for native Christians and could be easily identified, and the bare necessities of life, including one folding cot per staff member. The resemblance between the Peace Corps and Near East Relief may be more than coincidence. Near East Relief, however, was more sophisticated in that the organization sent specialists and other more highly trained personnel, leaving less to chance.

Near East Relief's far-sighted management soon realized that if the Armenians were indeed to survive as a nation, relief should be concentrated on the orphans. The lack of political stability in the region, however, forced the organization to continue relief work as the Turks and Bolsheviks divided the fledgling Armenian state (1918-1920) anti-French uprisings took place in Cilicia and Syria, and the Turkish Nationalists virtualy drove the Armenians and Greeks out of Turkey by 1923. But when an uncertain peace returned, N.E.R. gradually closed its soup kitchens and placed greater emphasis on the orphanage program.

Assuring a stable future for tens of thousands of children, many of whom had witnessed the brutual murder of their parents, multiple rapes, or had been raped or maimed themselves would not be an easy task. Near East Relief, limited by funds, could only assume full responsibility for a fraction of them. 132,556 children [a few thousand of them Greeks or Arabs, a few dozen Turks] passed through the organization's orphanage program.

Teenaged girls released or escaped from harems, many of them pregnant, received care and counseling in special homes. Most of the children taken in by the relief organization had at least one communicable disease. "The orphanages were hospitals, the hospitals, orphanges," commented one N.E.R. doctor. The contagious eye disease, trachoma, had reached epidemic proportions. Dysentery, cholera, malaria, tuberculosis, favus, scabies, smallpox, typhus and typhoid had spread rapidly among the Armenian refugees. Those who survivied the fatal diseases contracted the less serious ones. The fact that many children suffered from venereal disease offered silent testimony to their ordeals. Near East Relief, guided by medical advisors from some of the finest American universities, sought to cure them. At the largest orphanage complex, located in a former Russian army barracks in the city today known as Leninakan, Armenian S.S.R., as many as 30,000 children were given shelter. Part of "Orphan City" was set aside for the 10,000 children with trachoma who required daily treatment. Each morning, all 10,000 filed through the clinic.

Helping these orphans recover from the emotional damage caused by their experience proved no less difficult. Some children couldn't laugh or even smile for weeks. Children would awaken at night, screaming, and frightening the others into general panic. But slowly, given good food, affectionate supervision, schooling and medical care, mental and physical health returned, along with a sense of security. Physical education programs and special summer camps helped restore a sense of well-being. Team sports were emphasized to help children accustomed to fending for themselves in the streets learn the benefits of group cooperation.

Educating the children and providing them with the means to earn a livelihood was another priority. The genocide had totally disrupted Armenian cultural traditions, in which young men so often served an apprenticeship to their fathers or uncles, and young women stayed at home. Near East Relief addressed the problem by giving each child several hours of daily vocational training. N.E.R. established the first nurses' training programs in the Near East and Soviet Armenia, and made nursing a socially acceptable occupation. Girls were also encouraged to become teachers, if their aptitudes permitted. Others were taught sewing, weaving, and rug-making. Boys were instructed in traditional trades.

N.E.R. made a determined effort to improve agriculture in the Near East by teaching orphans the latest farming methods, animal husbandry to improve productivity of livestock, and soil conservation. Shiploads of Case tractors and mules went to Near East and Soviet Armenia, where N.E.R. was the only outside organization allowed to function until as late as 1931. Orphanages in Soviet Armenia, with American experts guiding the effort, established model "collective farms." N.E.R. arranged scholarships, however, for the gifted to continue academic studies at colleges or universities.

The orphanages' academic course of study was a tribute to the wisdom of its founders, who determined that the children should not be given an education that would make them misfits in the Near East. The curriculum consequently included instruction in the children's own language, history and culture, plus the language of the country in which the orphanage was located, and where the children would one day need to make their home. Near East Relief retained a staff of Armenian teachers and other intellectuals—those who survived the genocide themselves—to teach the children.

Near East Relief consciously sought to help the Armenians, as a nation, recover from the genocide, and monitored that recovery with concern. In the late 1920's as the orphans graduated from orphanage schools and left to earn a living on their own, a new priority became evident. Without responsible leaders, that recovery could never be complete. Since Near Eastern society was structured along religious lines, with the individual defining his or her identity in terms of faith, N.E.R. leaders recognized the importance of helping the Armenian Church replace the hundreds of Armenian priests massacred by Ottoman orders. The clergy had been specially targeted. N.E.R. accordingly combined forces with the Armenian Church to establish a theological seminary in an orphanage outside Beirut, Lebanon, provide funds for operating expenses, paying salaries of the finest faculty members available, both Armenian and American, and renting the orphanage facilities to the Armenian Church for $1 per year. Today, that orphanage property is headquarters for the See of Cilicia of the Armenian Apostolic Church. The seminary's graduates are among the most effective leaders the Armenian nation has ever known. Through their special training in sociology and counseling, the seminary's graduates not only could offer advice on matters of faith, they could help their people with the very real problems they confronted as refugees in an alien culture.

It is almost impossible to gauge the extent to which Near East Relief was responsible for the dramatic rebirth of the Armenian people, who seventy years ago faced near-extermination. But the tracks which Near East Relief has left behind—the concept of Third World development, a particular concern for the world's orphans, Roosevelt's W.P.A. programs which so closely resembled Near East Relief's "industrial relief," and the American habit of collecting funds through private charities to help the victims of injustice overseas, all can be traced to one organization. That organization, a credit to the American people who created and guided it, began its existence quietly as the "Armenian Atrocities Committee."

GREEK TRAGEDY

The events which have been described in Russia and in Turkey, and which were soon to be ratified by new disasters, were fatal to the Armenian people. The Great War had carried them through hideous slaughters to the fairest and broadest hope they had ever known; and then abruptly laid them—it may well be forever—in the dust. The age-long misfortunes of the Armenian race have arisen mainly from the physical structure of their home. Upon the lofty tableland of Armenia, stretching across the base of the Asia Minor Peninsula, are imposed a series of mountain ranges having a general direction east and west. The valleys between these mountains have from time immemorial been the pathways of every invasion or counter-attack between Asia Minor in the west and Persia and Central Asia in the east. In antiquity the Medes, the Persians, the Romans; in the early centuries of the Christian Era the Persian Sassanids and Eastern Roman Emperors; and in the Middle Ages sucessive waves of Mongols and Turks—Seljukli and Osmanli—invaded, conquered, partitioned, yielded and reconquered the rugged regions in which an ill-starred race strove ceaselessly for life and independence. And after the rise of Russia to power the struggle for possession of the Armenian regions, as containing the natural frontiers of their own domains, was continued by Russia, Persia, and the Ottoman Empire.

At the moment when the Great War began Armenia, divided between Russia and Turkey, repressed by force or actual massacre, had no defense but secret societies and no weapons but intrigue and assassination. The War drew upon them a new train of evils. After the Balkan Wars the Pan-Turks cast away both 'Ottomanisation' and 'Turkification' as means for recreating the State. They attributed the disasters which the Turkish Empire had sustained in part to the opposition of the non-Turkish races in their midst. In blunt but significant language they concluded that these races 'were not worth considering; they were worse than encumbrances; they could go to the devil.' The recreated State for which patriotic Turks hoped must be formed by Turks alone. The goal, if attainable, could be reached only by a long road and a hard. The sooner therefore the Turkish people set out upon it in deadly earnest, the better. The Turks took this road from 1912 onwards; and the fact that they had done so went long unrecognized in Europe. The Armenians were however better informed. They saw that the incorporation of the Moslem areas of Caucasia in a great Turkish State would, if carried to achievement, place the Armenian plateau, including Russian Armenia, under Turkish sovereignty and jeopardise the whole future of their race. The outbreak of the Great War brought these issues to a head. The Turkish Government in furtherance of their own aims tried to secure Armenian support against Russia, particularly the support of Russian Armenians. A grim alternative was presented to the Armenian leaders. Should they throw their national weight as far as it lay in their power on the side of Russia or of Turkey, or should they let their people be divided and driven into battle against each other? They took the remarkable decision that if war should come, their people in Turkey and in Russia should do their duty to their respective Governments. They thought it better to face fratricidal strife in the quarrels of others than to stake their existence upon the victory of either side.

When Turkey attacked Russian Armenia, the Czar's Government, fearing that a successful defense of Caucasia by Armenians would dangerously inflame the Nationalist aspirations of the race, conveyed a hundred and fifty thousand Armenian conscripts to the Polish and Galician fronts and brought other Russian troops to defend Armenian hearths and homes in Caucasia. Few of these hundred and fifty thousand Armenian soldiers survived the European battles or were able to return to Caucasia before the end of the War. This was hard measure. But worse remained. The Turkish war plan failed. Their offensive against Caucasia in December, 1914 and January, 1915 was defeated. They recoiled in deep resentment. They accused the Armenians of the Turkish eastern districts of having acted as spies and agents on behalf of Russia, and of having assailed the Turkish lines of communication. These charges were probably true; but true or false, they provoked a vengeance which was also in accord with deliberate policy. In 1915 the Turkish Government began, and ruthlessly carried out, the infamous general massacre and deportation of Armenians in Asia Minor. Three or four hundred thousand men, women, and children escaped into Russian territory and others into Persia or Mesopotamia; but the clearance of the race from Asia Minor was about as complete as such an act, on a scale so great, could well be. It is supposed that about one and a quarter millions of Armenians were involved, of whom more than half perished. There is no reasonable doubt that this crime was planned and executed for political reasons. The opportunity presented itself for clearing Turkish soil of a Christian race opposed to all Turkish ambitions, cherishing National ambitions that could only be satisfied at the expense of Turkey and planted geographically between Turkish and Caucasian Moslems. It may well be that the British attack on the Gallipoli Peninsula stimulated the merciless fury of the Turkish Government. Even, thought the Pan-Turks, if Constantinople were to fall and Turkey lost the war, the clearance would have been effected and a permanent advantage for the future of the Turkish race would be gained.

The arrival of the Grand Duke Nicholas in the Caucasus at the beginning of 1916, his masterly capture of Erzeroum in February, 1916, and his conquests of Turkish territory in North-Eastern Asia Minor revived Armenian hopes. The entry of the United States raised them higher. But the Russian Revolution quenched this flicker. It is not possible here to follow the tangled conflicts of the Georgians, Armenians and Tartars which followed. Early in 1918 the Russian Army of the Caucasus abandoned the front in Asia Minor and dissolved into an armed rabble struggling to entrain for home. The Russians had gone. The Turks had not yet come. A desperate effort was made by the remaining Armenian manhood to defend their country. The Armenian elements of the Russian Army therefore held together, and with the help of volunteers succeeded for a time in holding back the Turkish advance. Their hundred and fifty thousand soldiers were already dead or scattered, and they could never muster more than 35,000 men. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in February, 1918, was the signal for a general Turkish advance eastward. The Armenian line was overwhelmed; and by May not only had the Turks recovered the districts occupied by the Grand Duke, but they had taken the districts of Batum, Kars and Ardahan and were preparing to advance to the Caspian. Meanwhile the great Allies strode forward. British, French, and United States troops beat down the German armies in France. The Anglo-Indian armies conquered Mesopotamia, Palestine and Syria. At the very moment when the Turks had reached the goal in Caucasia for which they had run such risks and to which they had waded through crime and slaughter, their whole State and structure fell prostrate. The Armenian people emerged from the Great War scattered, extirpated in many districts and reduced through massacre, losses of war and enforced deportations adopted as an easy system of killing, by at least a third. Out of a community of about two and a half millions, three-quarters of a million men, women, and children had perished. But surely this was the end.

The earlier miseries and massacres of the Armenians have been made familiar to the British people, and indeed to the Liberal world, by the fame and eloquence of Mr. Gladstone. Opinions about them differed, one school dwelling upon their sufferings and the other upon their failings. But at any rate in contrast to the general indifference with which the fortunes of Eastern and Middle-Eastern peoples were followed by the Western democracies, the Armenians and their tribulations were well known throughout England and the United States. This field of interest was lighted by the lamps of religion, philanthrophy, and politics. Atrocities perpetrated upon Armenians stirred the ire of simple and chivalrous men and women spread widely about the English-speaking world. Now was the moment when at last the Armenians would receive justice and the right to live in peace in their national home. Their persecutors and tyrants had been laid low by war or revolution. The greatest nations in the hour of their victory were their friends and would see them righted.

It seemed inconceivable that the five great Allies would not be able to make their will effective. The reader of these pages will however be under no illusions. By the time the conquerors in Paris reached the Armenian question their unity was dissolved, their armies had disappeared and their resolves commanded naught but empty words. No power would take a mandate for Armenia. Britain, Italy, America, France looked at it and shook their heads. On March 12, 1920, the Supreme Council offered the mandate to the League of Nations. But the League, unsupported by men or money, promptly and with prudence declined. There remainded the Treaty of Sèvres. On August 10 the Powers compelled the Constantinople Government to recognise and as yet undetermined Armenia as a free and independent State. Article 80 prescribed that Turkey must submit to the arbitration of the President of the United States of America the question of the frontier to be fixed between Turkey and Armenia in the vilayets of Erzeroum, Trebizond, Van, and Bitlis, and to accept his decision thereupon, as well as any stipulation he may prescribe as to access of Armenia to the sea. It has not until December, 1920, that President Wilson completed the discharge of this high function. The frontier he defined gave Armenia virtually all the Turkish territory which had been occupied by Russian troops until they disbanded themselves under the influence of the Revolution; an area which, added to the Republic of Erivan, made an Armenian na-

tional homeland of nearly sixty thousand square miles.

So generous was the recognition in theory of Armenian claims that the Armenian and Greek population of the new State was actually outnumbered by Moslem inhabitants. Here was justice and much more. It existed however upon paper only. Already nearly a year before, in January, 1920, the Turks had attacked the French in Cilicia, driven them out of the Marash district and massacred nearly fifty thousand Armenian inhabitants. In May Bolshevik troops invaded and subjugated the Republic of Erivan. In September, by collusion between the Bolsheviks and Turks, Erivan was delivered to the Turkish Nationalists; and as in Cilicia, another extensive massacre of Armenians accompanied the military operations. Even the hope that a small autonomous Armenian province might eventually be established in Cilicia under French protection was destroyed. In October France, by the Agreement of Angora, undertook to evacuate Cilicia completely. In the Treaty of Lausanne, which registered the final peace between Turkey and the Great Powers, history will search in vain for the word 'Armenia.'

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

In May 1985, the Assembly of Turkish American Associations began a lobbying campaign involving 69 academicians and an advertisement claiming that the language in House Joint Resolution 192 is "misleading and/or inaccurate." After the ad was published, the Armenian Assembly of America wrote to the signatories and looked into their academic and professional backgrounds. The information they compiled, assembled in this analysis, provides an objective view of a lobbying effort to defeat a resolution that would set aside a day of remembrance for the Armenian genocide of 1915–1923.

A brief prologue to this analysis is necessary. This ad is currently being circulated among members of the House of Representatives. Inasmuch as this ad is being used this year as a lobbying tool against H.J. Res. 132, it is important to note that the ad is specifically directed at H.J. Res. 192, last year's resolution. H.J. Res. 132 is the legislation for the 100th Congress. Therefore, the claim made in the ad that the inclusion of the word "Turkey" and the "implicit" labeling of it as guilty of the genocide is irrelevant to this year's resolution as 'Turkey' only appears in a clause clarifying the existence of the Republic of Turkey after 1923.

The ad implies that the signatories are specialists in Turkish, Ottoman and Middle Eastern studies. While they hail from prestigious institutions like Princeton and University of California, Berkeley and have impressive academic and professional credentials, 11 of the 69 "academicians" have no academic affiliation. While they may have degrees in areas of Turkish history, their careers are not in academia.

All of the signatories have at some time studied, taught, or written about some aspect of Turkey—history, anthropology, linguistics, literature, political science, or folklore. But an analysis of their areas of expertise reveals a striking fact: Only 18 out of 69 of the signatories are scholars on the broad subject of pre-Republic Turkish history during the 19th and 20th centuries. More revealing is that only 8 scholars are concerned solely with the 20th century, the period encompassing the Armenian genocide.

A closer analysis reveals that only 4 of the 18 scholars of the 19th and 20th centuries have dealt with the specific topic and period of history in question: policy toward the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire during and before World War I. These four are Philip Stoddard, Justin McCarthy, Ezel Kural Shaw and her husband, Stanford Shaw.

Of the 14 remaining scholars, 9 have dealt with issues peripheral to the Armenian theme and 5 with topics irrelevant to Armenian issues. One example is Heath Lowry, the current director of the Institute of Turkish Studies in Washington, DC. His area of expertise is 16th century Ottoman Empire.

Another striking revelation in the analysis of these signatories is their affiliation with Turkish organizations and institutions. 40 of the scholars received a total of 65 grants from two prominent organizations: The Institute of Turkish Studies (ITS) based in Washington, DC, and the American Research Institute (ARI) based in Ankara, Turkey. Attached is a chart of the signatories' grant awards.

After publication of the ad, the Armenian Assembly of America wrote to the signatories to determine their personal views on the Armenian genocide. Eleven of the scholars responded. Some privately expressed regret that they were part of the ad campaign, and one expressed displeasure that the ad had been reprinted without permission and agreed with the resolution. All of the scholars agreed that the archives everywhere, especially in Turkey, should be opened. While some objected to the singling out of Armenians as victims of man's inhumanity to man, they were well aware of the pain and death suffered by the Armenian people.

The following are excerpts from those letters. The names of the scholars have been withheld at their request. However, should any Member like to read the entire text of any letter, they can contact me and I will be happy to show them.

"I am well familiar with the events of 1915–16 and with the events leading up to 1923 and I am aware of the death, suffering and massacres of the Armenian people during this period . . . I shall never become part of any attempt to deny the victimization, massacres, or genocide of the Armenian people perpetrated between 1915 and 1923."

* * * * *

"Let me first say that I do not question that massive numbers of Armenians perished during World War I as a result of criminal and even genocidal intents. Whenever I teach my courses on this period, I always devote these events specific attention. It is also my personal opinion that high Ottoman officials pursued policies that were aimed at the effective elimination of the Armenian population in Anatolia."

"It is also my opinion that the Turkish public—unlike the German public with regard to the Holocaust—has not yet forthrightly addressed the victimization of the Armenians during World War I. I believe that Turkish democracy will be much stronger when this has been accomplished."

* * * * *

"You ask me what my understanding is of the treatment of the Armenians during the period between 1915 and 1923 . . . I cannot authoritatively answer that question. First, that period is not the subject of my own scholarly expertise. Second . . . official Turkish archives have not so far been opened for scholarly analysis."

"I sincerely believe that hundreds of thousands of Armenians lost their lives in the 1915–1923 period. I have no doubt that the three upstarts who led the empire up to 1918 had the capacity to give orders to murder Armenians *qua* Armenians."

* * * * *

"As scholars, we acknowledge that there were terrible sufferings undergone by the Armenians at this time. To deny this would be unjust. Even the word 'genocide' is not wholly inappropriate here."

* * * * *

To conclude, this analysis reveals that most of the scholars who signed the advertisement are not specialists on the subject of Ottoman policy towards the Armenians before and during World War I. In fact, nearly three-fourths of the signatories are not academicians of the historical period in question. Finally, many of them have received direct or indirect support for their academic research from the Republic of Turkey.

House Joint Resolution 132 intends to designate a day of remembrance for the Armenian genocide of 1915–1923. The opponents of the resolution argue that there is not enough historical evidence to prove that a genocide ever took place. I submit that the Turkish, Syrian, Bulgarian, and Russian archives be opened to supplement the already voluminous evidence of the genocide.

In his book, "The Aftermath," Winston Churchill was describing the Treaty of Lausanne which registered the final peace between Turkey and the Great Powers when he added, "History will search in vain for the word 'Armenia.'" The role of historians and scholars is to record history. The only way historians can help modern society learn from our past mistakes is to remember rather than forget them.

[An advertisement from The Washington Times, Dec. 2, 1985]

ATTENTION MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(The undersigned American academicians who specialize in Turkish, Ottoman and Middle Eastern studies are concerned that the current language embodied in House Joint Resolution 192 is misleading and/or inaccurate in several respects. Specifically, while fully supporting the concept of a "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man," we respectfully take exception to that portion of the text which singles out for special recognition: ". . . the one and one half million people of Armenian ancestry who were victims of genocide perpetrated in Turkey between 1915 and 1923 . . .")

Our reservations focus on the use of the words "Turkey" and "genocide" and may be summarized as follows:

From the fourteenth century until 1922, the area currently known as Turkey, or more correctly, the Republic of Turkey, was part of the territory encompassing the multi-national, multi-religious state known as the Ottoman Empire. It is wrong to equate the Ottoman Empire with the Republic of Turkey in the same way that it is wrong to equate the Hapsburg Empire with the Republic of Austria. The Ottoman Empire, which was brought to an end in 1922, by the successful conclusion of the Turkish Revolution which established the present day Republic of Turkey in 1923, incorporated lands and peoples which today account for more than twenty-five distinct

countries in Southeastern Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East, only one of which is the Republic of Turkey. The Republic of Turkey bears no responsibility for any events which occurred in Ottoman times, yet by naming "Turkey" in the Resolution, its authors have implicitly labeled it as guilty of the "genocide" it charges transpired between 1915 and 1923.

As for the charge of "genocide:" No signatory of this statement wishes to minimize the scope of Armenian suffering. We are likewise cognizant that it cannot be viewed as separate from the suffering experienced by the Muslim inhabitants of the region. The weight of evidence so far uncovered points in the direction of serious intercommunal warfare (perpetrated by Muslim and Christian irregular forces), complicated by disease, famine, suffering and massacres in Anatolia and adjoining areas during the First World War Indeed, throughout the years in question, the region was the scene of more or less continuous warfare, not unlike the tragedy which has gone on in Lebanon for the past decade. The resulting death toll among both Muslim and Christian communities of the region was immense. But much more remains to be discovered before historians will be able to sort out precisely responsibility between warring and innocent, and to identify the causes for the events which resulted in the death or removal of large numbers of the eastern Anatolian population, Christian and Muslim alike.

Statesmen and politicians make history, and scholars write it. For this process to work scholars must be given access to the written records of the statesmen and politicians of the past. To date, the relevant archives in the Soviet Union, Syria, Bulgaria and Turkey all remain, for the most part, closed to dispassionate historians. Until they become available the history of the Ottoman Empire in the period encompassed by H.J. Res. 192 (1915-1923) cannot be adequately known.

We believe that the proper position for the United States Congress to take on this and related issues, is to encourage full and open access to all historical archives, and not to make charges on historical events before they are fully understood. Such charges as those contained in H.J. Res. 192 would inevitably reflect unjustly upon the people of Turkey, and perhaps set back irreparably progress historians are just now beginning to achieve in understanding these tragic events.

As the above comments illustrate, the history of the Ottoman-Armenians is much debated among scholars, many of whom do not agree with the historical assumptions embodied in the wording of H.J. Res. 192. By passing the resolution Congress will be attempting to determine by legislation which side of a historical question is correct. Such a resolution, based on historically questionable assumptions, can only damage the cause of honest historical enquiry, and damage the credibility of the American legislative process.

Signatories of the Statement of H.J. Res. 192 addressed to the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives: Rifaat Abu El Haj and 68 others.

AMERICAN-TURKISH SCHOLARS: A CLOSER LOOK

Scholar	Affiliation	Specialization	Area/period of expertise	Grants (number)	Grants to departments/University (number)
Abu El Haj, Rifatt	California State University, Long Beach	History	Arab-Ottoman, 17–18th centuries	ITS (1)	
Atis, Sara	University of Wisconsin at Madison	Language/literature	Turkish literature	ITS (1)	ITS (8).
Barbir, Karl K.	Siena College (New York)	History	Arab-Ottoman, 18th century		
Basgoz, Ilhan	Indiana University	Folklore	Turkish folklore	ITS (3); ARIT (2)	ITS (8).
Bates, Daniel	Hunter College, University of New York	Anthropology	Cultural anthropology of Turkey		ITS (1).
Bates, Ulku	do	Art history	Seljuq and Ottoman period art/architecture	ARIT (1)	ITS (1).
Bayerle, Gustav	Indiana University	History/philology	Ottoman history, 16th century	ARIT (1)	ITS (8).
Bodrogligetti, Andras	University of California, Los Angeles	Philology/literature	Turkic and Iranian	ITS (1)	ITS (4).
Burrill, Kathleen	Columbia University	Philology/linguistics	Turkic/Persian, 14th century	ITS (8); ARIT (1)	ITS (9).
Childs, Timothy	SAIS, Johns Hopkins University	History	Ottoman, 19–20th centuries		
Daulet, Shafiga	University of Connecticut	Political science	Politics, government of Mideast		ITS (4).
Davison, Roderic	George Washington University, Washington, DC	History	Ottoman, 19th century	ARIT (1)	
Denny, Walter	University of Massachusetts	Art history	Ottoman art	ARIT (1)	
Duben, Alan		Anthropology			
Ervin, Ellen	New York University	Language/literature	Turkish language	ITS (1)	ITS (6).
Farah, Caesar	University of Minnesota	History	Arab-Ottoman, 18–19th centuries	ITS (1)	
Findley, Carter	Ohio State University	do	Ottoman, 19th century	ITS (2); ARIT (1)	ITS (3).
Finefrock, Michael	College of Charleston	do	Turkish, 20th century		
Fisher, Alan	Michigan State University	do	Ottoman-Russian, 16–17th centuries	ARIT (1)	ITS (1).
Fleischer, Cornell	Washington University, Missouri	do	Ottoman, 16–17th centuries		
Golden, Peter	Rutgers University	do	Ottoman-Slavic relations		
Goodrich, Tom	Indiana University of Pennsylvania	do	Ottoman, 16th century		
Gould, Andrew		do			
Griswold, William	Colorado State University	do	Ottoman, 17th century	ARIT (1)	
Halasi-Kun, Tibor	Columbia University	Philology/linguistics	Turkic/Hungarian	ITS (3)	ITS (10).
Hickman, William	University of California, Berkeley	Philology	Turkish	ARIT (1)	ITS (3).
Hurewitz, J.C.	Columbia University, retired	Political science	Arab-Turkish, 20th century		ITS (10).
Hymes, John	Glenville State College, West Virginia	History	Ottoman, 19–20th centuries		
Inalcik, Halil	University of Chicago	do	Ottoman, 15–17th centuries	ITS (1)	ARIT (9).
Jaeckel, Ralph	University of California, Los Angeles	Languages	Turkish		ITS (4).
Jennings, Ronald	University of Illinois	History	Ottoman-Cyprus, 16–17th centuries	ARIT (1)	ITS (3).
Kelly, James	University of Utah	Linguistics	Turkic, Central Asian	ITS (2); ARIT (1)	ITS (5).
Key, Kerim	Southeastern University	History	Ottoman, 19–20th centuries		
Kunt, Metin		do	Ottoman		
Latimer, Frederick	University of Utah, retired	do	do		
Levy, Avigdor	Brandeis University	do	Ottoman, 19th century	ARIT (1)	ITS (7).
Lewis, Bernard	Princeton University	do	Ottoman; modern Turkey; Arab		ITS (3).
Lowry, Heath	Institute of Turkish Studies	do	Ottoman, 16th century	ARIT (2)	
McCarthy, Justin	University of Louisville	History/demography	Turkey/Arab world, 19–20th centuries	ITS (1); ARIT (1)	
Mandaville, Jon	Portland State University	History	Arab/Ottoman, 16–17th centuries	ARIT (1)	ITS (2).
Meeker, Michael	University of California, San Diego	Anthropology	Turkey		
Murphy, Rhoads	Columbia University	History/language	Ottoman, 17th century	ITS (1); ARIT (1)	ITS (10).
Naff, Thomas	University of Pennsylvania	History	Ottoman, 18th century		ITS (9).
Oberling, Pierre	Hunter College of the City, University of New York.	do	Europe-Middle East, 19–20th centuries	ITS (1)	ITS (1).
Ochsenwald, William	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	do	Modern Middle East, mainly Arab	ARIT (1)	
Olson, Robert	University of Kentucky	do	Turkish, 18–20th centuries		
Peachy, William	Ohio State University	Languages/literature	Judaic, Near Eastern	ARIT (2)	
Quataert, Donald	University of Houston	History	Ottoman, 19–20th centuries	ITS (2); ARIT (1)	ITS (2).
Reed, Howard	University of Connecticut	do	do	ITS (1)	ITS (5).
Rustow, Dankwart	City University Graduate School, New York	Political science	Europe	ITS (1)	
Shaw, Ezel Kural	California State University, Northridge	History	Ottoman, 19th century		
Shaw, Stanford	University of California, Los Angeles	do	Ottoman, 19–20th centuries	ITS (1); ARIT (2)	ITS (4).
Smith, Elaine	Retired Foreign Service Officer	do	Modern Turkey		
Smith, Grace	University of California, Berkeley	History/folklore language	Turkey, 14th century	ITS (1); ARIT (1)	ITS (3).
Smith, John Masson	University of California, Berkeley	History	Ottoman, 13–14th centuries	ARIT (1)	ITS (3).
Soucek, Svat		Turcology	Arab/Ottoman	ARIT (1)	
Staab, Robert	University of Utah	History	Ottoman/Balkans, 16th century		ITS (5).
Starr, June	SUNY Stoneybrook	Anthropology	Turkey		
Stewart-Robinson, James	University of Michigan	Literature	Turkish		ITS (3).
Stoddard, Phillip	Middle East Institute, Director	History	Ottoman, 19–20th centuries		ITS (3).
Tachau, Frank	University of Illinois	Political science	International Rel., modern Turkey	ITS (1); ARIT (2)	ITS (3).
Tamkoc, Metin	Texas Tech	International law and relations	Turkey		ITS (1).
Thomas, David	Rhode Island College	History/philology	Turkey/Turkish	ARIT (2)	
Yenzke, M.L.	Dickinson College	History	Ottoman, 16th century	ARIT (1)	
Walker, Warren	Texas Tech	English	Turkish/American/Nigerian Literature		ITS (1).
Webster, Donald		History	Turkish		
Welker, Walter	Rutgers University	Political science	Turkey, 1930's		

AMERICAN-TURKISH SCHOLARS: A CLOSER LOOK—Continued

Scholar	Affiliation	Specialization	Area/period of expertise	Grants (number)	Grants to departments/University (number)
Woods, John	University of Chicago	History	Islamic/Middle East/Iranian History		ITS (9).
Zilfi, Madeline	University of Maryland	do	Ottoman, 18th century	ARIT (2)	

Key: ARIT—American Research Institute in Turkey; ITS—Institute of Turkish Studies.

Sources for chart: Middle East Studies Association Bulletins, Directory of American Scholars, and Ottoman Studies Directory.

AMERICAN BAPTIST CHURCHES, USA,
ROBERT W. TILLER DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS,
Washington, DC

The American Baptist Churches U.S.A. fully supports the passage of House Joint Resolution 132 and Senate Joint Resolution 43 designating April 24, 1987, as a "National Day of Remembrance for the Victims of the Armenian Genocide."

Based upon our belief that all persons are created in the image of God and that we are commanded to love one another as children of God, the General Board of the American Baptist Churches U.S.A. adopted a Policy Statement on Human Rights on 1976. That Policy Statement says in part:

"As American Baptists we declare the following rights to be basic human rights, and we will support programs and measures to assure these rights:

"1. The right of every person to choose a religion freely . . . and to be free from governmental intrusion, coercion, and control in the free exercise of conscience and religion; . . .

"9. The right to human dignity, to be respected and treated as a person, and to be protected against discrimination . . . ;

"10. The right of ethnic or racial groups to maintain their cultural identity . . . ;

"13. The right to be free from arbitrary arrest and detention and from torture; . . .

"14. The right to a just process for the redress of a violation of a person's or group's human rights."

Just as we remember the Holocaust of World War II, we will remember the Armenian genocide as a means to preventing future horrors. We join with other people of good will in urging the passage of these resolutions by the Congress of the United States.

ROBERT W. TILLER,

Mr. PASHAYAN. I thank my colleague from California for his remarks and for his tremendous efforts that he has made over the years.

□ 0210

The survivors of the Armenian tragedy are still among us, few in number, grateful to their adopted Nation, committed to their ancient Christian faith, and ever hopeful that justice will prevail for their people. To these citizens of the United States and on behalf of this body, I offer my deep respect and admiration for their endurance and their leadership in establishing a vital Armenian identity within the American mosaic of cultures. Some 1 million Americans of Armenian descent have been inspired and defined by this unique generation of Armenians. As one of that number, I ask that this body pause to remember their saga and their rebirth in the United States. They endured what no human being should endure. They accomplished what every human being should aspire to accomplish. In their memory, let us resolve never to again tolerate those who would attempt to commit genocide. In their memory, let us resolve to defend the inviolability of history lest we lose its tragic lessons.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation more than any other nation has a special responsibility to remember the first genocide of the 20th century. There is a profound and continuing special relationship between the United States and Armenians dispersed throughout the world. Were it not for the unprecedented efforts of our national leadership and our citizens during and immediately following World War I, tens of thousands more surely would have perished. Some 20,000 documents in our archives chronicle each stage of American involvement—first to prevent tragedy from unfolding further and, failing that, to save those who survived.

Therefore, it is with a deep sense of regret that I must point out the conduct of the administration and the Republic of Turkey in the context of genocide remembrance. Despite the clear and unequivocal record of the United States, the administration has defended the incomplete position of the State Department that the events of 1915 were ambiguous. What has been admitted in private by the administration must be acknowledged for the record—the State Department's pronouncement was in error and their recanting of it only partial. The initial error has been compounded by the administration's conduct since its original commission in 1982. Administration officials, at the urging of the Republic of Turkey, have sought to thwart every effort to resolve this monumental memory lapse. Members of Congress attempted for well over a year and a half to persuade the State Department to retract, clarify, and affirm the record to no avail. In the face of this adamance, this body is now considering a joint resolution whose sole intent is to affirm the truth. As many of my colleagues are aware, the administration is opposed to this remedy unfortunately as well.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude my remarks by saying that within the next several weeks this body will have a chance to vote on a resolution. It is the intention of the people who are endorsing the resolution to bring it to the floor we hope for the last time. If it should pass this body, if it should pass the other body, and become law, it would be our intention not to seek it again.

As for the Republic of Turkey, let me add that no effort is being spared to seize the opportunity accorded by the State Department's initial blunder. Turkey now demands that the administration, this Congress, and U.S. businesses and corporations with Turkish economic ties, block any action to affirm the long-standing position of the United States if anyone will simply look at the historical documents. By so doing, it is readily apparent that Turkey seeks to impose its will on this body and on this Nation. Her conduct is not worthy of a nation that espouses to be democratic, that espouses to be Western, and, Mr. Speaker, really that espouses to be civilized in the legalistic sense that we now take that meaning of the word.

Mr. Speaker, the 72d commemoration of the Armenian genocide will be remembered on two occasions this year, the first being this special order, and the second being the passage of the legislation that I referred to, House Joint Resolution 132. It is an obligation to the survivors, to the U.S. record, and to ourselves that we achieve this.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have joined with our colleagues in commemorating Armenian victims of the historic events that took place in the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1923. President Reagan and both Houses of the Congress have recognized what has come to be called the Armenian genocide.

In recent years this event has become controversial because of pressure from the Turkish Government which, if I understand its arguments correctly, sees this commemoration as support for, or at least encouragement of terrorists who have committed atrocities in the name of wrongs done to Armenians long ago.

Let me say I highly value the relationship between Turkey, a valuable NATO ally, and our own country. But I do not see any connection between the commemoration of a historic event and the evil acts of terrorists who may use this commemoration for their own despicable purposes. The fact that evil men use any means to attempt to justify their ends is all too well known. I cannot see that we in Congress should stop talking about a subject because that subject may be used by others for entirely different purposes.

I believe that when it comes to grave matters such as the deaths of so many innocent people, there are two major errors we can make. We can become obsessed with the evils that were done to so many and lose

sight of the future, lose sight of the need to move on, to provide a better future instead of always referring to the evils of the past. Or we can just forget, make believe evil deeds did not happen. Each approach is wrong. We cannot become consumed with past injustices; but we cannot simply ignore them and say that referring to them causes trouble.

I believe that the best way to deal with such a problem is by searching for the facts and reminding others of the facts.

I know that in recent years there has been a wide-ranging controversy about exactly what happened in the Ottoman Empire from the years 1915 to 1923. I know that there are disputes among scholars as to exactly how many died and circumstances of their deaths.

But it is clear—as clear as history can be, given the clash of facts and opinions—that in paying tribute to the slaughtered Armenians of 1915 to 1923, we are passing no judgments on any existing government or casting blame on any existing group of people. We are simply saying: This terrible thing happened. Knowing it happened can remind us that nothing like this should happen again.

Surely commemorating those innocent victims who died is in the great American tradition. So I welcome this chance to join with our colleagues in paying tribute to the Armenian martyrs. In paying such tribute we remind ourselves and the Nation that the rights of minorities, no matter where they may be, in Europe or Asia or the United States, must be protected against those who would trample on such rights.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to offer my support as a cosponsor of the resolution designating April 24, 1987, as "National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian genocide from 1915-1923." I would like to commend our colleague, RICK LEHMAN, on his efforts to bring this tragedy to the attention of the American people.

We must remember these days so as not to forget them, so that the lessons learned by the needless sacrifice of others will not be lost on generations growing up in more peaceful times. Let our memorial to the 1.5 million Armenians who died at the hands of the Ottoman Turkish Empire remind us that only through remembrance will such tragedy be avoided in the future.

But let this memorial also remind us, as Americans, of the freedoms we enjoy but so often take for granted. We must remember that only too often has this disrespect for the most basic of our human rights—the right to speak, to worship, and to believe as one pleases—led to the deaths of millions in the holocausts of this century. We must continue to hold vigil for those who have perished so that rights of all humanity will be protected in the future.

Finally, let this day stand as a tribute to the Armenian people. Armenia is a land composed largely of rock and stone, hewn out of the Earth by a million years of evolution and left to its people as the basis for the construction of one of the world's oldest and richest civilizations. The people of Armenia, like the stone out of which they have built their history, are a strong and lasting people, a people who have withstood the onslaught of tragedy. Because of the resilience of the Armenian people, they will continue to enrich our world with their tradition and creativity.

I am proud to support this day of tribute to the Armenian people.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, April 24 is a day of both sadness and of joy. It is the day that we commemorate the Armenian genocide, one of the greatest tragedies of this century.

Today is a day of great sadness because we are reminded of the deaths of over 1 million men, women, and children more than 70 years ago. I am pleased to participate in this special order because it is only appropriate to remember and honor these victims, to remind ourselves of their fate and also to stengthen our resolve that never again shall such slaughters be allowed to occur.

Today is a day of great sadness because some would have us forget this event. Some would have us rewrite history entirely, arguing that the Armenian genocide never took place. Yet, only a few days ago I received a letter from a survivor of this genocide who is still alive today, still living in my own congressional district. Who can tell him that the horrors he experienced first-hand never took place?

Others recognize what took place but would have us forget, arguing that this commemoration of the Armenian genocide is an inconvenient historical event that complicates contemporary relations with another nation. To those who so argue, our message should be clear. While it may be inconvenient for some to recall what took place, efforts to suppress the memory are doomed to fail.

Today is also a day of great sadness because we are reminded that this first genocide of the 20th century was not the last. It is perhaps the saddest fact of our age that such horrors have reoccurred—in Hitler's German, in Stalin's Soviet Union, and more recently in Pol Pot's Cambodia.

So, while our words cannot change what happened, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate to remember and honor the victims of the Armenian genocide, both to remind us of their fate and to strengthen our resolve that such slaughters should never again happen.

At the same time, even as we recognize the sadness of the occasion we commemorate today, we are also reminded that this is a day of joy as well, for it also reminds us that the tragedy that befell the Armenian people earlier in this century was not the end of the Armenian saga.

As Armenians recovered from the shock of their near annihilation and deportation from their homeland, they found themselves dispersed throughout the world, largely forgotten. In time, however, the spirit of the Armenian people revived. In time, April 24 has become a rallying point, a day of commemoration for the victims and a day of renewal for their survivors and descendants. In time, those who had not been touched by this tragedy first hand began to join and participate in the commemorative events of April 24.

So our participation in this special order today is a form of celebration, a celebration of the spirit and renewal of the Armenian people, as well as a renewal of our own commitment to fundamental human rights.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, the past is prologue to the continuing stream of history. As we reflect upon the fate that befell the Armenian people, we can draw a direct parallel between the massive genocides of this century and the savage acts of terrorism that afflict us even today.

Both involve violence against innocent people, and both reveal an alarming contempt for human life. By any standard, the massacre of more than 2 million Armenians was one of the most callous and barbarous events ever committed. Upon reflection, however, the continuing significance of the Armenian genocide lies not only in the violent events that occurred in years past, but also in the lessons such indiscriminate slaughter provide in our own times.

If the brutality committed against the Armenian people is to have a lasting effect, it must not only be a tug on our heartstrings but a call to conscience and a call to action. In that sense, Mr. Speaker, the Armenian genocide is both an historical event worth remembering and a timely lesson for us now and in the future.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my colleague's efforts to commemorate the tragedy of the Armenian genocide. Representatives RICH LEHMAN and CHIP PASHAYAN have been the driving force in this Congress to remember the historic events that took place from 1915 to 1923 under the Ottoman Empire. I salute their initiative.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, efforts to recall the Armenian genocide are frequently criticized unfairly as denunciations of the Republic of Turkey. These criticisms are simply not accurate.

The Republic of Turkey is a staunch NATO ally and a friend of this country. Today's special order says absolutely nothing about the conduct or policies of modern-day Turkey. In fact, Kemal Ataturk, the founder of the Turkish Republic has himself denounced the massacre of "millions" of Armenians. Supporters of this legislation are not denouncing the Government of Turkey any more than we are denouncing the present Government of West Germany upon recalling the horrors of the Jewish Holocaust.

Our relationship with the Republic of Turkey is strong and has been long-standing. However, we cannot conveniently rewrite history or ignore events for fear of creating temporary friction. I believe that it is important to revive the memories of massive tragedies such as the Armenian genocide becauses their proper recognition is a first step in preventing a recurrence.

I also hope that it is clear, Mr. Speaker, that in no way does this commemoration of the Armenian genocide constitute a tacit endorsement of terrorism perpetrated in the name of Armenian retaliation. Terrorism is an affront to us all and only demeans legitimate efforts by the Armenian community to remember this sad chapter in their history.

Mr. Speaker, April 23 is a solemn day for the Armenian community. Today's recollection of the Armenian genocide is an attempt to acknowledge history accurately for the benefit of future generations.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in 1915, U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire Henry Morgenthau notified Secretary of State Lansing that the "Deportation of the excesses

against peaceful Armenians is increasing and from harrowing reports of eye witnesses it appears that a campaign of race extermination is in progress under a pretext of reprisal against rebellion."

In 1916, the State Department instructed the Embassy to inform the Turkish Government that the United States may make public details of the persecution of Armenians if they do not cease.

In 1926, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, the founder and "Father" of modern-day Turkey, stated that the Young Turk Party "should have been made to account for the lives of millions of our Christian subjects who were ruthlessly driven en masse from their homes and massacred."

Today, in 1987, a very expensive lobbying effort is underway to distort a historically documented occurrence and to erase it from our collective memory. Adolf Hitler is proof of the danger of such inaction. At the outset of his "great resettlement policy", Hitler recalled the extermination of the Armenians and the lack of response from the world community thus justifying his conclusion that "masses of men are mere biological plasticine."

Since the introduction of House Joint Resolution 132, many survivors have written to me recalling their personal accounts of the genocide, of how they managed to escape while others could not. These letters tell of the soldiers who came to Armenian homes on April 24, 1915 and took the men away. Others tell of the forced marches "relocations" through the deserts without food and water. Still others tell of the auctions where young Armenian girls were sold into slavery. The stories continue and grow sadder. However, the lives of these survivors will not continue indefinitely.

In honor of the survivors and in remembrance of the victims, I cast my vote in support of House Joint Resolution 132, National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide of 1915–23. By refusing to forget, we will send a message through time that the United States stands opposed to the policy of genocide and holocaust.

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California, Mr. LEHMAN, for requesting this special order.

It is unfortunate that legislation like House Joint Resolution 132 is necessary. If it were not for the many instances when man has committed atrocious acts against his fellow man, there would have been no need to introduce this resolution.

From 1915 to 1923, a 9-year period, 1½ million Armenians were brutally murdered by agents of the Turkish Ottoman Empire. We have chosen April 24, 1987 to memorialize the loss of over a million lives.

Unfortunately, April 24 is not the only day that could have been chosen. The history of the world is tainted with mass murders of innocent people. People who were murdered because of their race, religion, or creed. Stalin tried to destroy the Kulaks because they interfered with his political goals. Hitler focused his wrath on the Jews. Pol Pot massacred his own people because they stood in his way.

It is not possible for us to return to the Turkish Ottoman Empire, Stalinist Russia, Nazi Germany, or Cambodia. If we had this capacity, perhaps we could have prevented the unjust murders of millions of men, women, and children from history. However, we cannot return nor can we right the wrongs of the past.

We can do everything in our power to prevent such atrocities from occurring again. I admit that it is not enjoyable to reflect on these horrible incidents, but if we forget, in effect we are condemning our children and our grandchildren to a repeat performance.

I encourage everyone to take a moment to think about the unnecessary loss of valuable human lives that resulted from these massacres. We must pledge to never allow a similar incident to happen again. If House Joint Resolution 132 will allow us to achieve this goal, we must support it.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend my colleagues, Representative RICHARD LEHMAN, and Representative CHIP PASHAYAN, JR., for sponsoring this special order to commemorate the tragic events of 1915–23, which brutally killed 1.5 million Armenians in a systematic, orchestrated genocide.

By adopting House Joint Resolution 132, "A Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide" we are offering a forceful, yet eloquent statement of remembrance of the many Armenian men, women, and children who fell victim to this genocide. This statement does not serve as an indictment of or a reflection on the present Turkish Government or its leaders. It is a long-over-due recognition of a heinous and tragic experience suffered through by all Armenians as a part of their historical human experience. As a free and compassionate people, we are morally obligated to demonstrate fidelity not only to the memory of the 1.5 million Armenian victims but to our own values which hold a deep respect for individual human rights.

It is with a sense of solemn obligation that I am once again compelled to join the Armenian-American community in recognition of the inhumanity that was perpetrated upon them. The Armenian plea for recognition of these terrible acts which they endured represents not a muddled sense of outrage but a clear vision of history. To those who choose to dispute this historical event, the declarations made by Mustapha Kemal, founder of modern Turkey, must also be denied. Addressing the Young Turk Party in 1926, he stated, "we must be made to account for the lives of millions of our Christian subjects who were ruthlessly driven en masse from their homes and massacred".

As we prepare to celebrate the 200th anniversary of our Constitution, let us continue to help advance the cause of individual liberty and respect for human rights, basic tenets, upon which this country was founded and upon what the peace of the world ultimately rests.

As we recall the words of Elie Wiesel as he noted that "the opposite of love is not hate, but rather indifference," let us not allow history to judge that we were indifferent in confronting inhumanity, but that we provided for a future liberated from the shackles of genocide.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with great resolve that I join my colleagues today in this special order commemorating the 72d anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

I would venture to say that most of my colleagues, even 72 years after the fact, are aware of the events surrounding the genocide perpetrated against the Armenians by the Ottoman Turkish Government. The deaths of 1½ million Armenians between the years of 1915 and 1923, and the causes of those deaths, are well documented. The permanent displacement of 500,000 Armenians from their homeland within the Ottoman Empire is hardly a recent revelation. These are simply the distressing facts; facts which are a part of history, and which are alone worthy of our reflection and acknowledgement as we ponder the past incidences of man's inhumanity to man.

The cruel irony of our gathering to remember and mourn the Armenian genocide, however, is that the world's history gives ample evidence that the lessons of genocide, have not been understood. The recurrences of genocide in the 20th century are easily illustrated. Adolph Hitler referred to the Armenian genocide as a precedent, one which he followed in his wholesale extermination campaign against the Jews during World War II. That precedent was followed again in Cambodia.

What is not as easily recognizable, however, is the present-day suffering of Armenian people which stems from the failure of the Turkish Government to even acknowledge the action of its predecessors. The refusal of that Government to admit even that the genocide took place not only prolongs the suffering of a persecuted people, but abets the future of genocide by failing to raise public consciousness to its reality.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my participation today in this memorial has two objectives. First, to demonstrate a recognition by the United States of the Armenian genocide in hopes that it will spur a more forthright view by the Turkish Government. And second, to urge the world to recognize the terrible lessons and consequences of genocide so as to diminish the chances that they will be repeated in the future.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, April 24, is the day Armenian Americans call Martyr's Day. On that day members of the Armenian community in my district close their shops, schools, and markets and go to church. They are remembering their ancestors and relatives who were killed at the turn of the century in a massacre that swept their homeland.

There is dispute about how many people were killed and why. Armenians say the Ottoman Turks, in an effort to make the Anatolian Peninsula racially homogeneous, killed at least a million members of the Christian minority. Turks, who admit that the killings happened, say the Christians were aiding the invading Russians during World War I. They place the number who died in the hundreds of thousands. Armenians see little point in arguing over the numbers, and refer to what happened as genocide.

Armenia, a land that occupies what is now a corner of Iran, the U.S.S.R, and Turkey, lost its independence as a result of the Russo-Turkish Treaty in 1921. Many Armenians es-

caped the trials of their countrymen and the subsequent dissolution of their nation by emigrating to areas like Boston, MA, where almost 40,000 Armenian Americans now make their home. The national archives of Armenia are in a building in Watertown MA called the Fatherland House, and the community contains six Armenian Christian churches, three elementary schools where students learn the Armenian language, and two Armenian-language newspapers.

Two years ago the House of Representatives considered a resolution to direct the President to proclaim April 24 as a "National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide." The measure contained an amendment to explain that the massacres occurred under the Ottoman Turks, and had nothing to do with Turkey's present government. Nonetheless, the measure never made it to the House floor. This year's resolution, which I cosponsored, is essentially the same piece of legislation, and should come up for a vote in June. I cosponsored it because I understand how much it would mean to Armenian Americans to have a national day of recognition for the many who have died.

When Ronald Reagan was Governor of California, he recognized Armenian Martyr's Day, so it would not be unreasonable for the Congress to jog the President's memory by passing this resolution. Armenians came to America because the essence of democracy is in creating a place for persecuted people to make a home in. That is what they have done here in places like Watertown, MA. By recognizing their day, we commemorate not only their suffering, but their achievement.

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to join my colleagues in solemn recognition of the over 1.5 million Armenians murdered at the hands of the Ottoman empire.

As we commemorate this macabre and heinous crime which nearly wiped out the entire Armenian population between 1915 and 1923, we reinvigorate our stern commitment to eradicate genocide forevermore. Indeed, the dark hand of genocide has scarred the 20th century. The very fact that atrocities of this magnitude and greater could have been committed with or without the knowledge of our global community points to the need to recognize, discuss, and learn why and how this could have ever happened. We must do more than just posthumously honor the victims of genocide—we must make sure this will never happen again.

By recognizing "Armenian Martyr's Day," we are reminding the world of the horrors levied upon the Armenian's by the cruel Ottoman government. Moreover, we remind ourselves of history's lessons and, hopefully, ways in which we can work or resolve these historic shortcomings. So, Mr. Speaker, as I join my colleagues in remembrance of this sobering occasion, I say with conviction that the Armenians did not die in vain.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues, especially my California colleagues, Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. PASHAYAN, JR., for organizing the special order to commemorate Armenian Martyr's Day.

This year marks the 72d anniversary of the Armenian genocide, in which 1.5 million men, women, and children suffered violent executions in Turkey, between 1915 and 1923. The genocide began with the arrest and execution of leading intellectuals and clergymen, and murders of the young men drafted to serve in the Turkish Army followed. By 1923, one-half of the world's Armenian population had been massacred on its ancestral land which it had inhabited for more than 3,000 years.

Today we memorialize the Armenian martyrs. What happend 72 years ago was the first 20th century display of international neglect and passivity in the face of genocide. Unfortunately, we failed to understand the profound impacts of such a disaster, and the tragedy was later repeated in Germany and Cambodia. It is essential that not only Armenians, Cambodians, and Jews remember the atrocities of genocide, but that the rest of humanity also remember these events. We have a moral responsibility to draw our attention to the tragedy of genocide and remind ourselves of its consequences so that it will not happen again.

Our Presidents, statesmen, and legislative bodies have repeatedly recognized the atrocities of the Armenian genocide. Henry Morganthau, U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire at the time, sent a telegram to the Secretary of State which stated that "deportation of and excesses against peaceful Armenians is increasing and from harrowing reports of eye witnesses it appears that a campaign of race extermination is in progress under a pretext of reprisal against rebellion." President Reagan, in a 1981 proclamation regarding the victims of the Holocaust stated that "like the genocide of the Armenians before it, and the genocide of the Cambodians which followed it—and like too many other such persecutions of too many other peoples—the lessons of the Holocaust must never be forgotten." Most recently in Congress, a resolution was introduced on February 4, 1987, to designate April 24, 1987 as a "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man" especially for remembering the Armenian genocide by the governments of the Ottoman Turkish Empire.

It is our moral obligation to remember the tragedy of the Armenian genocide and work toward the prevention of mass human destruction. The consequences of this act have deeply changed the lives of not only surviving Armenians and their relatives, but for all of mankind. We must heed our own warnings and do all that we can to ensure that no other race, ethnic group, or nationality is forced to face the atrocities which the Armenians faced 72 years ago. Therefore, it is imperative that we join together in remembering this tragic event with the hope that our combined efforts will help prevent such a recurrence.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the date that the people of Armenian ancestry commemorate the death of some 1.5 million victims of genocide at the hands of governments of the Ottoman Empire.

A resolution passed by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee yesterday designates April 24, 1988, as the date to remember man's inhumanity to man and all the victims of this genocide.

We settled on the 1988 date because it was obvious we could not complete the matter in the House by Friday.

When a similar resolution to commemorate the genocide came up in the House in 1985, it received 233 votes, but it was defeated under suspension of the rules. There was a good deal of criticism from Members who felt it offended the present Turkish Government. To ensure that the language in no way could be considered offensive by our ally, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, during reconsideration, adopted an amendment to strike the reference to "Turkey" in the resolution and replace it with the "governments of the Ottoman Empire."

I am satisfied that this still makes perfectly clear that the resolution deals with the past and in no way reflects on the present Government of Turkey. I am convinced as well that the amendment answered criticism from the State Department, which expressed concern that the resolution could damage United States-Turkish relations. From the beginning I was not persuaded by their arguments. And I am confident that the amendment should allay all concerns about harming any relationship. House Joint Resolution 132 incorporates this amendment.

There have been attempts by some to rewrite history to say that there never was a genocide that annihilated 1.5 million Armenians. And some of my colleagues argue that the issue has never been definitively settled by historians.

To this I say tommyrot. To believe this one would have to ignore such eminent historians as Arnold Toynbee and Winston Churchill.

The central question, of course, is whether the government then in power set out to systematically destroy a race of people. Said Toynbee:

> The atrociousness of the two great twentieth century wars was aggravated by genocide (i.e. the wholesale extermination of civilian populations). In the First World War the Turks committed genocide against the Armenians; in the Second World War, the Germans committed genocide against the Jews.

And Churchill had this to say:

> In 1915 the Turkish Government began and carried out the infamous general massacre and deportation of Armenians in Asia Minor.

President Theodore Roosevelt said, "The Armenian Massacre was the great single crime of World War I."

Now I find it quite ironic that President Ronald Reagan, whose State Department is now seeking to block this resolution, on April 22, 1981, had this to say:

> Like the genocide of the Armenians before it, and the genocide of the Cambodians which followed it—and like too many other such persecutions of too many other peoples—the lessons of the Holocaust must never be forgotten.

Based on the overwhelming evidence to the contrary, I am at a loss to understand how reasonable people could conclude that what happened all those many years ago was anything but a genocide.

This resolution passed by the committee is very important to the thousands of Armenian-Americans who have contributed and continue to contribute much to our Nation. For my part I do not want to have to tell them that the House, which has passed many holocaust-type resolutions in the past, refused to recog-

nize the terrible atrocity that occurred from 1915 to 1923. Memorializing this genocide is no more anti-Turkey than was memorializing victims of the Holocaust anti-West Germany.

Many of the Armenian-Americans are themselves survivors of the horrible massacres. Many others are the children of those who witnessed the atrocity.

If we fail to recognize that terrible time we will be breaking faith with these people.

We must keep in mind that the massacres are still vivid in the minds of many of the survivors who are alive today.

Frankly, I don't think the House wants to be in a position where it recognizes one genocide and turns its back on another. Our position on the Holocaust is very clear. In this case I don't think we can simply step back and say that this is something that happened a long time ago, and it would be better if we simply forgot about it. Doing this would make us vulnerable to charges of discrimination.

We have a chance to speak for history. And I believe we should say that what happened all those decades ago, when people turned against their own in a national orgy of bloodletting, is against all that America stands for.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, once again we gather this year to commemorate Armenian Martyrs' Day. Our objective today, as in the past, is not to provoke and embarrass our allies in Turkey. Nor should our words be misconstrued as an expression of tolerance for radical Armenian terrorist groups. No, rather we come here today to speak of this black mark on world history in order to prevent a similar atrocity from occurring in the future.

The ghastly figures of this atrocity speak for themselves. During a 9-year period between 1915 and 1923, the Ottoman Turkish Government unleashed a brutal and fierce attack upon the Armenian race within its borders. In the end, this merciless genocide claimed the lives of 1.5 million innocent men, women, and children.

In the past, accounts of the Armenian genocide were lost in the back pages of history books. The world's ignorance and denial of this event during this century left us vulnerable to equally horrible tragedies. In the 1940's, 6 million European Jews were brutally murdered in Adolph Hitler's concentration camps, and 30 years later millions of Cambodians fell victim to the vicious Khmer Rouge government.

The uncovering of these atrocities shocked and angered the world. Yet, if these latter events are closely studied, similarities with the Armenian genocide because tragically obvious; the names and faces may have changed, but the senseless waste of human life on the grounds of racial, ethical, and political ideological differences unfortunately remained the same.

Many question why we continue to discuss an event that occurred over 70 years ago. No one has the ability to alter what has occurred in the past, and we certainly do not intend to challenge this axiom. Instead, we come here today to acknowledge the Armenian genocide as means to protect ourselves and our children for the future.

It is true that the perpetrators of these past crimes against humanity no longer pose a threat. However, intolerance, bigotry, and discrimination remain constant in the world, and as long as they exist so does the possiblity of another genocide. In order then to ensure that history does not repeat itself, we must never forget the lessons it has taught us. Ignorance of the past consign us to the same deadly path tomorrow. We owe it to the memory of the Jews who died in the the Holocaust and the Cambodians massacred by the Khmer Rouge to protect generations to come from the same tragic fate.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, our task here today is to again recognize and bring to light the Armenian genocide for all to understand. We do not stand at this podium today to point an accusative finger at the Turkish Government and those of Turkish descent. But rather, our words are directed at the children of this Nation and those from across the globe to make them aware of these brutal, despicable moments in world history in a hope that they never feel the pain and sorrow experienced by millions of Armenians, Jews, and Cambodians.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in taking this time to commemorate one of the most brutal events of the 20th century—the systematic massacre of more than 1½ million Armenians by the Ottoman government.

We have ample documentation of this horrendous event. Yet, today, over 65 years later, it is still difficult to comprehend the enormity of the events that transpired from 1915 to 1923. But we must comprehend these events. We must acknowledge what they tell us about ourselves as humans, about political and national movements which espouse racial, cultural, and national superiority, and about the capacity of governments to persecute those whom they should protect.

Just this morning we have more disturbing news from South Africa; the apartheid regime has claimed another six victims—railway workers who were on strike gunned down by policemen in an attempt to break the strike.

What can the events of 1915–23 tell us about contemporary South Africa? For my part, I am afraid that the administration has been too slow to understand the nature of apartheid, just as the Great Powers in 1915 were too slow to respond to the Armenian genocide and the world in the 1930's was too slow to respond to the Holocaust.

I would like to commend my colleagues, RICHARD LEHMAN and CHARLES PASHAYAN for taking this time today. I can only hope that we take this opportunity to reflect on the world we are making for our children and that we seize this opportunity to commit ourselves to the proposition that we can never again allow a people to become victims of genocide.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, during the years between 1915 and 1923 many Armenian people were displaced from their homeland or killed. When an entire race is affected so drastically, we must all realize the impact of such suffering.

The tragedies faced by the Armenian people have been great. As a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 132, I see the need to recognize the hardships and loss felt by Armenians everywhere.

The Armenian genocide is truly one of the great tragedies our world has ever endured, and those who suffered through it should always be remembered. By recognizing injustice, wherever it occurs, we will reduce the chances of seeing it repeated.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I join today with my distinguished colleagues in commemorating the tragic slaughter of 1.5 million Armenians, and I should like to thank Representatives LEHMAN and PASHAYAN for organizing this special order. Furthermore, I use this occasion to express again my deep regret that this Congress has not yet passed a resolution making April 24 a National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide.

In December 1985 this Congress considered at length a resolution designating a National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man and particularly the Armenian tragedy. To its shame, this Congress voted down a friendly amendment, 206–213. There were many reasons outlined in the hours of debate on the resolution—this would alienate and wound our ally Turkey; it would devalue the term "genocide" since these were "events that happen in war"; it would give sustenance to Armenian terrorists.

The intention of this resolution is not to wound our ally, Turkey; it specifically states that it was a genocide "perpetrated by the governments of the Ottoman empire between 1915 and 1923 prior to the establishment of the Republic of Turkey."

We must not rewrite history. It has been less than 75 years since this tragedy which wiped out 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children and yet the truth of this tragedy is already being questioned. The proof of these massacres was established at the time by the records of this Congress and by our own Ambassador to the Ottoman empire in 1915. The truth must survive the eyewitnesses. When someone suggested to Hitler that world public opinion would be hostile to his "final solution of the Jewish problem," Hitler responded "Who remembers the Armenians?"

We must remember the Armenians. Every day I receive moving testimonies from my own constituents who are survivors of this tragedy and were eyewitnesses to some of its horrors. Some of those letters are written by children or friends as the survivors are becoming too old to write for themselves.

One letter I received recently is particularly moving and I should like to reprint a portion of it here:

> I am a first generation American-Armenian whose parents came to this country in 1925 * * * My young years were devoted to the usual childhood experiences; however, I heard often of the atrocities the Turks committed to my parents' loved ones, friends, and relatives. The reason I did not have many aunts and uncles was because they were slaughtered.
>
> One story in particular stands out: Mariamanam, a sparkly eyed elderly Armenian lady who was a family friend, told me one day "how her hair turned white." She was 24 years of age when the Turks entered her village and began killing and sacking. Her husband was shot before her eyes and then her two children were bayonetted like shishkebabs by a soldier and her home was sacked and burned. For some unknown reason she was spared and thrown in a Turkish jail. That night, while in prison her

hair turned white. Completely white and it has been that way ever since. Eventually she came to America and married and bore four children * * * She gives thanks every morning for God's grace in enabling her to have so beautiful a family and home in this land, but every morning she prays as well for her first husband and children who died so wretchedly; never will I forget, she says.

My constituent goes on to say the Mariamanam has died, but to honor her, her first family, my relatives, and over 1 million Armenians slaughtered from 1915–23 by the governments of the Ottoman empire, please pass House Joint Resolution 132.

I would hope that this year we can honor the memory of these dead and tortured Armenians and establish for all times that history cannot be rewritten to fulfill geographical obligations. If we acquiesce to this blackmail, we shall be a nation stripped of our morality.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I make this statement in remembrance of the Armenian genocide. It has been 72 years since 1½ million Armenians perished at the hands of the Ottoman empire. We all know of the genocide of the Jewish people in the Holocaust, and the million and more Cambodians killed by the murderous Pol Pot regime. For some reason, however, the massacres and persecution of the Armenians during the World War I era is the forgotten genocide.

There can be no disputing the facts as to what the Armenian people suffered. Uprooted from their homeland, slaughtered by the thousands, the Armenians suffered as much as any people in this bloody century. American Presidents, early in the century and in our time as well, have decried the Armenians' treatment, and vowed that the United States shall never forget this horrendous event.

The Armenian genocide must no longer be the forgotten genocide. The descendants of the Armenian community who came to this country, settled here and became a thriving American community must not be the only Americans who recall this ultimate outrage. We must all remember it. We cannot stand by and let this memory fade from the world's conscience. We must commemorate it this year, next year, and every year for as long as mankind survives. For if we do not remember it and all other genocides, mankind may be forced to endure ever more genocides.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in union with Armenain Americans in my district, with Armenian people all over the world, and with the breadth of humanity who are willing to take a painful yet necessary look at the Armenian genocide of 1915–23.

House Joint Resolution 132, National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide of 1915–23, is one of the most important issues of the 100th Congress. It is important because it forces us to remember the shame of humanity's capacity for hate and murder. Our tendency is to hide our shame by trying to forget. This bill will not allow us to forget. It rightfully calls attention to one of the most grave and cynically obscured events of our century.

The integrity of the U.S. Government has never shown brighter than when we dare to point squarely to human rights violations wherever they occur, regardless of our relation to the perpetrator. Our Government cannot allow mass violations of human rights to be submerged in silence, from which they are almost certain to resurface in future tragedies.

The political factors involved in recognizing such incidents are real and weighty. Why resurrect a crime when the offenders no longer exist, and when doing so could threaten our strategic interests? Such considerations must be weighed in full and sober view of the facts. We face every day the task of managing conflicting legitimate interests, and we know that the solution is not to negate either one, for that is no solution. We know that the answer is to affirm the legitimacy of each cause in a spirit of good will, tolerance, and above all, justice. Justice demands that the amply confirmed crime against the Armenians be recognized. Tolerance demands that the Turkish government recognize that this is not an indictment against it or against the Turkish people.

Several of our colleagues have registered their opposition to House Joint Resolution 132. Their motives are genuine: that the question of the Armenian genocide is disputed, that the resolution may encourage Armenian terrorists, and that the repercussions may weaken our vital military alliance with Turkey. I believe, however, that their reservations are a frightening distortion of the issue.

First, many historians and officials point to the ambiguity surrounding events in Turkey during World War I. Many concede that hundreds of thousands of Armenians were forcibly rounded up and evacuated, and that many perished; but deny a policy of extermination. Yet their views are belied by our own Ambassador to the Ottoman empire. In a July 16, 1915, telegram to the Secretary of State, Ambassador Morgenthau wrote, "it appears that a campaign of race extermination is in progress under the pretext of reprisal against rebellion." Mr. Morgenthau was so disturbed by Western complacency that he quit his post in 1916 to spread word of what had happened. His appraisal has since been vindicated by eight U.S. Presidents, including Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Jimmy Carter, and Ronald Reagan, who referred to the genocide of the Armenians. Both Houses of Congress have passed bills condemning the genocide and the massacre of the Armenians.

Second, terrorism by Armenians or by anyone else is to be condemned in the strongest terms. But should policymaking be so influenced by the fear of terrorism? The minute that Armenian terrorists determine our policy on such an issue, then we truly have become servants of their abhorrent tactics.

Third, it must be clarified that recognizing a crime that occured in the Ottoman empire in no way indicts the people or current Government of Turkey. Kemal Ataturk himself, founder of the Turkish Republic, said, "These leftovers from the former Young Turkey Party * * * should have been made to account for the lives of millions of our Christian subjects who were ruthlessly driven en masse from their homes and massacred." The perpetrators are gone, but the history remains. Calling attention to it will inevitably cause strains in United States-Turkish relations. However, periodic strains in relations between allies are the norm rather than the exception. They can and should be overcome by reaffirming the friendship, mututal respect, and defense commitments between us. That which binds our nations will prove far stronger than any tensions created by such a resolution.

Armenians in the United States today do not seek gratuitious revenge or harm; they only seek recognition of their sufferings, and some assurance that it will not happen again. This resolution does that, and it is our obligation to take a whole and compassionate look at what it means to us, to our Nation, and to humanity.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, more than 45 year's have passed since Adolf Hitler began his war against the peoples of Europe. And 45 year's after the fact we do not comprehend what has happened. It's nearly impossible to imagine the senseless murder of over 25 million people.

We have read books such as "Music in Terezine" and heard poems such as "The Butterfly." We have seen pictures of emaciated corpses stacked together by the thousands. But even after all of this we didn't understand. Pavel Friedmann did. He went to the gas chamber at Auschwitz, Septembert 29, 1944. But before he died, Pavel Friedmann left us with the poem "The Butterfly." In the poem Friedmann laments, "For seven weeks I've lived in here, penned up inside this ghetto but I have found my people here. The dandelions call to me and the white chestnut candles in the court. Only I never saw another butterfly. That butterfly was the last one. Butterflies don't live in here, in the ghetto." Butterflies. A beautiful symbol. A symbol of freedom and of the sanctity of human life. Only Pavel Friedmann never saw another butterfly. Neither did over 25 million other people. The Holocaust was an atrocity in history which we have remembered. But what of the others.

The Holocaust was not the only genocide of the twentieth century. On April 24, 1915, the Turkish Government began its systematic extermination of the Armenian ethnic minority. The growth of Armenian nationalism was the precursor to the genocide. In 1876 the Armenian quarter in Constantinople was burned to the ground. Shortly thereafter, a series of barbaric massacres began. Over the next 2 years, over 200,000 Armenian's were needlessly butchered. In 1908 the Young Turk revolution brought with it hope of Turkish-Armenian reconciliation. However, in 1909 the massacre of Armenians would resume. World War I would bring about the virtual end of the Armenian ethnic minority in Turkey. The Armenians embraced the Allied cause during the war and the result was the Turkish regimes attempt to exterminate all remaining Armenians within Turkey. When it was all over, over 1,800,000 Armenians were dead.

Few today remember the Armenian genocide. For over 70 year's the United States has postponed its recognition of the brutal and senseless display of bigotry and hatred that have surrounded the Armenian genocide. It is time for us—Americans—to recognize the atrocities committed against Armenians by the Ottoman Empire. We must strive to ensure that atrocities like these never happen again.

Despite one's religion or ethnic philosophy, we all deserve to be treated with honor and

respect. Only by remembering can we prevent another genocide. On April 24, 1987, we have a chance to do just that. We can take steps to ensure that atrocities like the Armenian genocide never happen again. Let us use this day to recognize man's inhumanity to man and commemorate the Armenian genocide. Let us remember these words: Never Again!

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 72d year that has passed since the "Young Turks" regime of the Ottoman Empire began its systematic extermination of the Armenian population. Culminating in the murder of 1½ million men, women, and children, the tragedy ushered in the 20th century propensity for genocide. Adolph Hitler used the Armenian example to buttress his doctrine of racial superiority and justified murder: "Who today remembers the Armenians?"

April 24, 1915, marked the date when the carnage began. An edict was issued by the Interior Minister Talaat Pasha ordering the complete destruction of all Armenians living in Turkey. In 1923, when the slaughter stopped, almost one-half of the world's Armenian population had been slaughtered in Turkey—their ancestral homeland of some 3,000 years. Their only crime was to be culturally and religiously different from their Turkish oppressors. Many were forced to march from Turkey to the distant and desolate Syrian desert or were resettled in remote areas of the interior. Countless died along the way from exposure, lack of food and water, and attacks from brigands organized and abetted by the Turkish Government at the time.

President Woodrow Wilson was so horrified and shocked by the cables of then Ambassador to Turkey Henry Morgenthau that he actually favored sending in American troops to protect the Armenians and stop the killing. Since that time, American Presidents, statesmen, historians, journalists, and many other prominent persons have all recognized and condemned the actions of the Turkish regime. Our present leader, President Reagan, compared the tragedy of the Armenian people with that of the Jewish and Cambodian peoples.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad, tragic, and dangerous state of affairs that modern-day Turkey refuses to recognize that such carnage took place. While an important friend and NATO ally, Turkey persists in believing that no genocide ever took place and even goes as far as to exploit the activities of a few Armenian extremists who have murdered innocent Turkish officials. Only with a conscious effort to be honest with its Armenian population and with the world can Turkey attempt to deal in any effective manner with this terrible piece of its past.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in the memory of over 1 million Armenians who lost their lives in Turkey during and immediately after World War I.

One of the great strengths of America is our devotion to human rights—not just here, but around the world. As part of this effort, we not only criticize current human rights abuses but commemorate past ones. For this reason, it is particularly important that the United States officially recognize the genocide perpetrated on the Armenian people earlier this century.

In past years, Congress has passed annual resolutions to commemorate this tragedy; since 1985, however, strong objections by the Government of Turkey have prevented further action. Turkey claims not only that such a commemoration would encourage Armenian terrorism, but that the genocide never took place.

These arguments are unacceptable. The pain of the Armenian people cannot be denied after 70 years; its recognition makes violence by a few extremists less likely, not more. I have consistently supported the efforts of the Armenian community to have its history recognized. In the 100th Congress, I am an original cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 132, which designates April 24, 1988, as National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man. I have consigned a letter to my colleagues urging them to support this legislation, and will work closely with other Members of Congress to ensure passage of this important resolution.

Half a century ago, Hitler said that no one would object to his plans for genocide because no one remembered the Armenian genocide. We have the chance to show that he was wrong. By recognizing the tragedy of the Armenian people, Americans can demonstrate that genocide anywhere will be neither tolerated nor forgotten.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will be taking part in ceremonies in Hartford, CT commemorating the Armenian Genocide. I am pleased to be able to join the Connecticut branch of the Armenian National Committee and its honorary chairperson, Secretary of the State Julia Tashjian, in remembering this tragic event.

Also joining us at the ceremonies will be Professor Marjorie Housepian Dobkin of Barnard College. Professor Dobkin is a well-known historian and expert on the events of 70 years ago.

On April 24, 1915, over 200 Armenian religious, political and intellectual leaders were arrested in Constantinople and in Armenian centers throughout the Ottoman Empire by its rulers. These pillars of the Armenian community were then either deported or murdered, leaving the Armenian people leaderless.

In May 1915, the deportation of all Armenians was ordered. The resulting death march, consisting mostly of women, children, and the elderly, wound its way across Asia Minor and Turkish Armenia into the Syrian desert. Countless gruesome atrocities were inflicted upon the defenseless Armenians, including rapes, drownings, and torture. The road was strewn with Armenian bodies. Able bodied Armenian men serving in the Ottoman Empire's armed forces were segregated into labor battalions, disarmed and either killed outright or worked to death.

Henry Morgenthau, the United States Ambassador to Turkey during 1913–16, had no question that the treatment of the Armenians was part of a calculated plan to exterminate them. In 1918 he wrote, "When the authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race. They understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact." Morgenthau, who tried desperately to stop the horrible slaughter, asserted that these events "surpass the most beastly and diabolical cruelties ever before perpetrated or imagined in the history of the world."

During the years between 1915 and 1923, 1½ million Armenians were systematically massacred, and another 500,000 deported by the Ottoman Empire. Successive Turkish governments, in an attempt to rewrite history, have tried to cover up these events by denying their very occurrence. Where this has failed, they have warned of damage to Turkish-American relations should the United States persist in reminding the world of this terrible tragedy.

When Hitler embarked on his final solution, he claimed that people's memories are short, that no one remembers the Armenian genocide. We must prove him wrong. We have a responsibility to remember such events as examples of the cruelty that humans are capable of inflicting on each other.

Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that such cruelty never recurs, I have cosponsored House Joint Resolution 132, legislation which designates April 24, 1987 as a National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and thus let the world know that we shall never forget.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my numerous colleagues in the House in demonstrating my support for the Armenian Genocide Resolution, House Joint Resolution 132, and to commemorate April 24 as Armenian Martyrs Day. For the past 5 years, my colleagues and I have been working to get this resolution passed by Congress and to have this genocide of 1.5 million be recognized.

Perhaps if we look back to the incident which resulted in the need for such a resolution, we can better understand the symbolism which this resolution represents to the Armenian community. In 1982, the State Department published a note in one of its bulletins which unnecessarily created an ambiguity with regard to our national policy concerning the recognition of the Armenian genocide. Basically, the State Department said that the historical record was ambiguous in regard to the question of the Armenian genocide. Of course, the Armenian community was outraged by such a statement. Do we tell all of those survivors who fled to America that what they witnessed was ambiguous? The intent of the officials of the Ottoman Empire and their actions were clear; they sought to wipe out the Armenian people. How is it that several decades later the State Department chooses to try to change history?

Since 1983, my colleagues and I have worked hard to make others aware of this policy change and the need to correct it. The intent of the resolution is to recognize the genocide of the Armenian people during the period of 1915–23 and to commemorate it. However, unfortunately, the Turkish Government and its officials have taken affront with this resolution and deemed that its passage by Congress would result in harming United States-Turkish relations. I have always marveled that a simple commemorative resolution recognizing the Armenian genocide and those

people who gave their lives could cause such a problem between the United States and Turkey. The truth is that the Armenian genocide is historical fact; United States documents from the period of 1915–23 provide the documentation. We are only commemorating the tragedy out of respect for the Armenian community.

But the bigger tragedy is the lobbying and public relations campaign which the Government of Turkey has conducted as a result of the introduction of this resolution and each time the resolution has been reintroduced in subsequent Congresses. The Turkish Government has sought to deny what is historical fact. But even more so they have conducted an effective propaganda campaign to try to prevent the passage of this resolution. In 1983, the Government of Turkey secured the Gray & Co. public relations firm to represent its interests in Washington, which included lobbying for U.S. military and economic aid and to assist the Turkish ambassador, Sukru Elekdag, in countering any campaigns or activities which might be detrimental to the interest and image of Turkey. Unfortunately, Gray & Co. has spent a great deal of its time in working against any efforts to get the Armenian genocide resolution passed. Representatives of the firm have consistently lobbied Members of Congress and their staffs on the hazards of this resolution and made it clear that Turkish officials have not been pleased with such a resolution. Over the past several years, the Turkish Government has made it a point to take over to Turkey several delegations of Members of Congress in order to educate them about the genocide and to make them aware of the importance of Turkey to the United States. But even more so, we have consistently heard threats from high-ranking Turkish officials that the damage to United States-Turkish relations would be irreparable if the resolution were passed.

In 1985, Turkish Prime Minister Turgut Ozal visited the United States in the beginning of April 1985, coincidentally just weeks before the designated April 24th commemorative day. It was the first time in 13 years that a Turkish leader had visited the United States. Although he came to argue Turkey's case for more military aid from Congress, the resolution was a major topic of discussion and he said that the resolution was unacceptable to Turkey.

However, even more recently in the last few months, the threats from Turkish officials have increased. Turkish President Kenan Evren was planning a trip to the United States in May, but it has been reported that he will cancel his trip should Congress pass the resolution. In March, Turkish Foreign Minister Vahit Halefoglu visited Washington to lobby for increased aid to Turkey. In his speech at the Brookings Institution, he did allude to congressional resolution and Congress' attitude toward Turkey.

I have been actively involved in the effort for the past several years to get the Armenian genocide resolution passed and it concerns me that the Turkish Government continues to work against any efforts to recognize the genocide. It is unfortunate that there are still those, particularly Turkish officials, who prefer that this grave blemish in their history be overlooked and that history be rewritten in a fashion that would ignore the ruthless destruction of lives and property. This shameful occurrence cannot be forgotten by those who continue to bear the scars of the genocide, nor should it be by civilized nations around the globe.

The Armenian genocide is a fact which is well-documented. We cannot let the efforts by those who wish to deny the truth to obscure the purpose of the commemoration of this day. Not only the Armenian people who reside in my congressional district, but those throughout the Nation, have become interwoven in the fabric of our society while retaining their own special heritage through their language, religion and ethnic customs. By so doing, in virtually every field of endeavor, the Armenian people have excelled and greatly enriched our national cultural heritage. By commemorating April 24th as Armenian Martyrs Day, we recognize the contributions which the Armenian people have made. It is for these reasons that I have pursued the passage of this resolution and will continue to do so.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my two colleagues from California, Representatives LEHMAN and PASHAYAN, for reserving time for this important special order.

I am proud today to honor the memory of those Armenians tragically killed at the hands of the Ottoman Empire during the period 1915 to 1923. This was a seminal event in this century, for it foreshadowed the sort of systematic killing that was later to occur in Germany, Cambodia, and too many other places as well.

There has been frequent debate over whether what happened to the Armenians constitutes a genocide. Frankly, no single word can adequately summarize the horror of such a mass killing of innocent people. I hope that there is no debate over the point that over 1.5 million Armenians died senselessly and that we owe it to their memory to stand here today to mourn the loss.

But our mourning serves another purpose and that is to provide meaning for what happened. Deaths that provide meaning and guidance to future generations cannot be in vain. Thus we give meaning to the Armenian tragedy by pledging today that we will come back every year on this date to honor the dead—and we will do everything we possibly can to see that such a tragedy never occurs again.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 132, a resolution to designate April 24, 1987, as a National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide of 1915–23.

During 1915–23 an act of genocide was committed against Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire. Approximately 1.5 million Armenians perished as a result of this systematic persecution and massacre by the Ottoman Turkish Government. At the beginning of World War I, there were approximately 2,500,000 Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire. Since the Armenian genocide, fewer than 100,000 declared Armenians reside in Turkey. The Armenians of the Ottoman Empire were virtually eliminated from their ancestral homeland as a consequence of the government's calculated plan of extermination.

This is not the first time the United States will have recognized the tragedy of this historic event. Several U.S. Presidents, the House of Representatives, and other officials have repeatedly condemned the actions of the Ottoman Turkish Empire. This resolution is important in that it reaffirms our recognition of this tragedy, and demonstrates to the world that the United States has not forgotten this abhorrent period in history.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friends and colleagues, Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. PASHAYAN, for organizing today's special order to commemorate the events that took place in the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1923 when 1½ million Armenians died during the first genocide of the 20th century.

As a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 132, I strongly believe that this genocide can never be ignored or forgotten. We must never forget the victims of this genocide who died solely because of their ancestry. House Joint Resolution 132 commemorates the victims of the genocide and honors thousands of Americans of Armenian descent, many of whom reside in my district, the Ninth Congressional District of New York, who are survivors of the genocide. We have a duty to the memory of the victims and a duty to their families and to the survivors. We must never again let the world forget this great tragedy.

There are those who say that the Armenian genocide did not occur. However, the evidence tells us otherwise. The American Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire during the period of the genocide reported extensively on the continuing massacres and on his efforts to bring them to an end. More recently, last year a United Nations human rights panel in Geneva specifically cited the Armenian genocide. Both President Carter and President Reagan have reaffirmed American recognition of this great tragedy.

We in America have a special role to play in ensuring that this tragic chapter in human history is not forgotten. The survivors of the genocide who emigrated to the United States have helped to build a strong, prosperous and free nation. Furthermore, as a leader of the free world, the United States must remember all victims of tyranny and injustice.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow ignorance, prejudice or short memories to rewrite history. Today's special order reaffirms our dedication to the principles of personal and religious freedom and to our commitment to promoting peace and liberty throughout the world. I pledge my personal commitment to those goals and I will continue my efforts to ensure that the Armenian genocide is never again forgotten.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in commemoration of all the Armenian people who were victims of a terrible campaign of genocide during the early decades of this century. It is important that we remember those who died, both to honor their memory and to prevent similar tragedies in the future.

There should be no doubt about the extent and terrible nature of the crimes that were committed against the Armenian people during the rule of the Ottoman Empire. The historical record is full of appalling details of the cruel genocide that was waged against Ar-

menians. The cables of our own diplomats who were there bear grim testimony to the tragedy.

As the scale of suffering became known, the American people responded with genuine sympathy and support for the Armenian people. We made every effort to stop the killing, and opened our country as a refuge from persecution. Thousands of Armenians came to the United States in search of a new life—they and their children and grandchildren are now successful, contributing members of our communities. I am pleased that my congressional district is home to one of the largest Armenian communities in America, and I am honored to represent them. They exemplify the highest standards of family life, educational achievements, and American patriotism.

Later this year, just as in previous years, the House will consider legislation that would designate a day of remembrance for the Armenian victims of genocide. I would like to take this opportunity to urge all my colleagues to support this bill. This legislation deserves our support, not only because of our sympathy for the Armenian victims of genocide, but also because the best way to prevent future genocide is by condemning past genocide. There should be no question where the United States stands on this critical human rights issue.

In closing, I would like to thank my colleagues from California for sponsoring this special order. By reminding the House and the Nation of the Armenian genocide, you promote respect for human rights for all people.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, the term "genocide," coined in 1944 by a man who had 49 members of his family put to death simply because of their race and religion, denotes the deliberate practice of exterminating an entire race. Even before the coinage of this term such an atrocity was flagrantly in use.

From 1915 to 1923, 1.5 million Armenians living in Turkey under the Ottoman Empire were systematically and purposely massacred. Hundreds of thousands of Armenians were uprooted from their homes and either killed outright, worked to death in one of the labor camps or sent into exile. During the general mobilization of the Turkish Army, Armenian men like their Turkish counterparts were called into service. However, these Armenian men were then disarmed and massacred.

The term used during that period for such horrors was resettlement. The similarity in the resettlement policy in Turkey and that in Hitler-ruled Germany is eerie.

Just as we must never forget the Holocaust that took the lives of 6 million Jews and 7 million other Europeans, so we can never forget the horrible plight of the Armenians. To commemorate the genocide of the Armenians perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire is to recognize past injustices and learn from them. Only then can we ascertain that history will not repeat itself and efforts at historical revision will be repelled.

Mr. Speaker, with a strong penchant for accurate history, I give my wholehearted support to the Armenian genocide bill.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today we take a moment to remember a tragedy befallen upon a people. From 1915 to 1923 the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire, in what is now Turkey, was systematically targeted for persecution. This action by the Ottoman government resulted in the deaths of more the 1.5 million Armenians and the forced exile of 500,000 others.

I have received many letters from constituents who lost members of their families in this politically and racially motivated program of mass murder and hatred. The heart-wrenching tales of people who lost grandparents, parents, brothers, sisters, and cousins are too numerous to mention in full, yet the sadness and despair of their losses tell the real story of the horrible legacy this event has left behind.

Ten United States Presidents, including Ronald Reagan, have publicly recognized the Armenian genocide. The U.S. Congress has called for a day of remembrance which would call national attention to this 20th century tragedy that became a forerunner to Nazi Germany's genocidal campaign against the Jews. We must join in this call to insure that such a calamity will never again be permitted to happen.

Setting aside April 24, 1987 as National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide of 1915 will serve as a reminder to us all of the horrible atrocities suffered by these people. I ask those of my colleagues who have not yet joined House Joint Resolution 132 to do so today.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in this special order commemorating Armenian Martyr's Day. It was on April 24, 1915, that agents of the Ottoman Empire rounded up 200 leaders of the Armenian community in Constantinople and exterminated them. This was but the beginning of the genocide of the Armenian people which lasted 8 years and claimed 1.5 million lives.

Today, 72 years later, we have gathered to pay homage to the Armenian victims of this brutal campaign of extermination. We must never allow the memory of this horrible incident to fade because genocide forgotten is genocide condoned. In this context, I am also a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 132, designating April 24, 1987, as "National Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide of 1915–1923."

Mr. Speaker it saddens me to think that the Armenian genocide was only the first of a series of these most heinous crimes perpetrated in the 20th century, including similar outrages in Stalin's Russia, Hitler's Germany, and Pol Pot's Cambodia. As a civilized nation, it is our duty to memorialize these crimes against mankind, starting with the Armenian genocide. We must never allow future generations to forget that these events occurred.

By remembering, we teach a lesson that genocide must never occur again. Let us hope that future generations learn this lesson.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleagues for calling this special order on the Armenian genocide, and I am grateful for the opportunity to express my continuing support for passage of House Joint Resolution 132, which commemorates the tragic events that led to the death of over a million Armenians.

It appears that there are three primary points of contention in this debate, arguments that at times contradict each other. Let me address these issues individually.

The first argument comes from those who question that the genocide ever occurred. But there is no denying recorded history. The events of the genocide are well documented by American historians. Both political parties acknowledged as much in their national party platforms of 1920, 1924, and 1928. Presidents from Woodrow Wilson up to and including Ronald Reagan recognized and condemned the genocide. The United Nations and even the Turkish Government that immediately followed the Ottoman Empire also officially acknowledged the events.

The second argument is that even if the genocide did occur, we should let the memory sleep. To turn away from this tragedy would be unconscionable. We study and retell the Holocaust to perpetuate the memory of its victims, not to condemn the current German administration. By recognizing the Armenian genocide we seek only to assert for posterity that these events did surely take place. And we must always be on guard not to let history repeat itself.

Indeed, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council has chosen to include the Armenian genocide as part of its museum, and has verified the chronology of events of the genocide. Let me read from their statement:

The fate of the Armenians should be included in any discussion of genocide in the 20th century.

The third and final argument suggests that we offend and even embarrass our allies, the Turks, with House Joint Resolution 132. Clearly, this is not an attempt, as some would portray it, to exact revenge on Turkey by condemning the current regime. In fact, the resolution plainly distinguishes the historical role of the Ottoman Empire from the policies and practices of the modern-day Turkish Republic.

The genocide cost the Armenian people not just a huge proportion of their population, but also a large measure of their culture. The survivors are a continuing reminder and verification of the events that did take place. Each time another survivor from the genocide passes away, we lose a piece of history and a first-person testimonial to the events that we all know did in fact occur.

We in the Congress will continue to reconfirm our universal condemnation of man's inhumanity to man; whoever the victim, whoever the perpetrator, wherever and whenever the crime occurs.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

REPORT OF THE HONORABLE WALTER E. FAUNTROY, CHAIRMAN, CONGRESSIONAL TASK FORCE ON HAITI, ON CONSULTATION MISSION TO HAITI

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within 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 the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege as chair of the Congressional Task Force on Haiti to travel to that nation during the recently concluded Easter recess. I am pleased now to report to you, my colleagues in the Congress, and the American people both my findings and my recommendations as to how we may best continue assisting Haiti through its delicate and challenging period of transition to democracy.

I need not remind you that after 29 years of repressive, exploitative rule by the Duvaliers, the courageous and long-abused citizens of Haiti gave the world on February 7, 1986, an instructive example of how a brutal dictatorship can be overthrown without resorting to violence. In response, the United States Congress, led by our bipartisan Congressional Task Force on Haiti, moved through what we called a fleeting window of opportunity to assist the valiant Haitian people by appropriating a total of $101.8 million in economic assistance through the provision of economic support funds, development assistance, Public Law 480 food aid, funding for the Peace Corps, and the Inter-American Foundation. We have also made available $1.5 million in heavily conditioned and monitored nonlethal military assistance for fiscal year 1987. Parenthetically despite this conditionally, I remain concerned about evidence which indicates that changes in the command and control structure of the armed forces have not led to positive reforms. I am particularly concerned about reports that officers accused of human rights abuses have been promoted rather than disciplined. This doubling of the assistance level from the last Duvalier year was designed to encourage the Haitian people as they embarked upon an extremely critical and delicate transition to a free and open democratic society. Our goal was to help lay the foundation for stability based on justice, economic security, and democracy for all Haitians.

My trip to Haiti during the Easter break, April 12 through 17, was for the purpose of assessing the progress being made, and to meet with various sectors of the Haitian population to ascertain how they feel the United States can best administer its aid and trade programs to benefit Haiti. Toward that end, I met with members of the National Governing Council [CNG], religious leadership, representatives of business and labor, those working in the country side for bottom-up development, political leaders, journalists, and representatives of multilateral development institutions.

I come away from my factfinding mission with both hopes and fears about the future of Haiti. My hopes stem from the boundless enthusiasm for the democratic process and the disciplined determination of the Haitian masses to break with Duvalierism that was demonstrated in the March 29 referendum on the new constitution for Haiti. Thanks to the brilliant work of the Constituent Assembly that drafted the document, the thorough exposure of its content to all by a just and committed press, and the noninterference of the military in the balloting process, the tracks leading to a democratic society free of the old Duvalierist exploitation and political repression have been firmly laid. In order to continue this process toward democratization, it is important that the rights of democratic institutions, such as a free press, human rights organizations and election monitoring groups, be respected as the electoral process proceeds. With some notable exception, it appears that the interim government under Gen. Henri Namphy is keeping his stated commitment to work for "the flowering of a real and functional democracy, founded on absolute respect for human rights, press freedom, the existence of free trade unions, and the functioning of organized political parties."

If the soon to be named elections commission does its job as well as did the Constituent Assembly, and if the press and the military perform as well as they did during the referendum, I have every reason to believe that the elections for local officials in late July and the election of a President, the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies in November 1987 will place the engine of democracy firmly on the track that leads to a more just society, political stability, economic recovery, and long-term employment for the Haitian people. These are my hopes.

My fears, however, are that if a serious economic crisis that is engulfing Haiti at this very moment is not dealt with in the next 2 months, the Haitian people may not be able to place the engine of a stable elected government on the tracks of freedom so magnificently laid by the referendum on the constitution. Let me now outline two dimensions of that crisis and two steps that I believe the United States and the multilateral development institutions must take immediately to assist Haiti.

THE ECONOMIC CRISIS: CONTRABAND AND STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT

To the credit of the CNG, the interim government has moved decisively to rectify many of the economic and fiscal practices of the fallen Duvalier regime which favored a ruling elite to the detriment of the poor majority. It has taken several initiatives to liberalize the economy and promote private sector investment. For example, the highly regressive export tax on coffee has been reduced; the intention is to abolish it altogether by October 1987. The archaic system of quotes on imported commodities which raised the cost of essentials for the Haitian consumer far above world market prices is being eliminated. The ports of Gonaives, Petit Goave, and Miragoane have been reopened and a national system of tariffs is being erected. A new income tax law has eliminated high marginal personal tax rates in favor of a new broader based lower marginal rates.

For example, to halt economic and financial losses and to enhance consumer purchasing power, two major public industrial enterprises, the Darbonne Sugar Mill and the ENAOL vegetable oil plant were closed. In both cases workers were offered severance pay and in the case of ENAOL, its 200 workers were offered the option of running the factory as a cooperative. That's the good news.

The bad news is however twofold:

First. The shock of the new economic freedom and, perhaps, a too quick and rigid application of free market principles have created a contraband market that threatens to throw tens of thousands of Haitian workers and farmers out of work which would create so much chaos that scheduled elections could at worst be canceled or at best produce an elected government faced with insurmountable economic and public order difficulties.

Second. Precisely because the United States has tried so hard to help in Haiti in this period of transition, our detractors are successfully marketing the unfounded myth that the contraband and other economic difficulties being experienced by Haiti are the result of an insidious American plan to undermine and subjugate Haiti.

With respect to the latter, I find myself leaning heavily on the words of Rudyard Kipling:

> If you can keep your head when all about you are losing theirs and blaming it on you; if you can trust yourself when all men doubt you, but make allowance for their doubting too . . .

In an effort to keep my head and keep my eyes on the prize of democratization and economic recovery, I have developed recommendations for two sets of steps that the United States in cooperation with Haiti, other donor nations and the multilateral development institutions can take to help resolve the bad news part of my findings. Before laying out the emergency short-term and the prudent long-term actions that, in my view, need to be undertaken, let me outline in more detail the growing contraband and anti-Americanism problem in Haiti.

CONTRABAND

Contraband trade was always a problem during the Duvalier years; it was exclusive illegal trade engaged in by the Duvaliers, their associates, and the Ton Ton Macoutes. It was an activity that enriched a few, and corrupted and impoverished government. The opening of the ports, the elimination of costly monopolies and other trade barriers have served to democratize contraband—now everybody is getting into it. The result is that, while the masses of Haitian consumers are getting a much needed reduction in the cost of such staples as rice and sugar, Haitian rice and sugar producers are being priced out of the market. Tensions are mounting rapidly between those whose jobs are threatened and those engaged in contraband trade, and many thousands are picking up bad habits of corruption and deceit that could spell serious trouble for economic and political stability in the future.

Let me give you a couple of examples. Miami Rice has become a household word in Haiti during the past year. U.S. rice merchants are loading tons of surplus U.S. rice on ships in Miami and sailing them to the newly opened and poorly guarded ports of Gonaives, Petit Goave, and Miragoane. For the first time in decades, these cities are now bustling centers of economic activity not only because the poor have jobs unloading a variety of contraband items including rice and stolen bicycles, but also because they can sell Miami rice across Haiti for $24 per 100-pound sack compared to $28 per 100-pound sack for rice grown in the Artibonite Valley. The prevailing wisdom is that the Army is taking over the role of the Macoutes as participants in and protectors of the illegal contraband trade.

The result has been that Haitian farmers are now selling their rice at a loss or at significantly lower profit margins, calling into question the future of Haitian rice production. It should be noted that as early as December 1986 it was estimated that 36,000 metric tons of rice or one-third of the national production could not be sold. An estimated 200,000 Haitian farmers are losing their livelihood. I was told of two bloody confrontations between rice farmers and poor participants in the contraband rice trade in which Army personnel shot and killed Haitian rice growers. Tensions are mounting daily.

Another example of the destabilizing effect of contraband is sugar. The drastic reduction of the United States sugar quota for Haiti's neighbor on the island, the Dominican Republic, has resulted in a large surplus of refined sugar which is being dumped on the Haitian market as contraband at a cost of between $20 and $24 per 100-pound sack. Haitian sugar is selling at $27 per 100-pound sack. As a consequence, only last week, on April 15, Hasco [Haitian American Sugar Co.] closed down its sugar mill throwing 3,000 sugar plant workers on the streets and jeopardizing the livelihood of tens of thousands of sugar growers throughout Haiti.

If allowed to proceed unchecked because of its short-term benefit to the Haitian consumer and to corrupt, illegal traders, contraband could develop into such a long-term liability as to create not only permanent political and economic instability but also to make of Haiti a literal buccaneer nation.

ANTI-AMERICANISM

Added to the contraband problem and indeed feeding upon it, is a growing anti-Americanism by which the United States is, in my view, unjustifiably blamed for a variety of problems confronting the Haitian people. This anti-Americanism is made plausible by the widely held perception that for far too long the U.S. foreign policy establishment was tolerant of the Duvalier dictatorship. The U.S. cannot and should not be held responsible for corruption and malfeasance that inhibits development programs which could create jobs and improve agricultural production. Let me cite for you a couple of examples of what I mean.

PIG REPOPULATION PROGRAM

In 1980, an African swine flu epidemic had so infected the Haitian pig population that it was deemed a threat to swine herds throughout Latin, Central, and North America. The Government of Haiti agreed to an international program to eradicate the entire Haitian pig population on condition that the Inter-American Development Bank would provide a $20 million concessionary loan to pay for a complete pig repopulation program. Three years into the eradication program—Peppadep—it became clear that the IDB had not designed a repopulation program that could secure the return of pigs to small scale farmers.

To maintain the integrity of the international community and to restore to Haiti an important sector of its economy and culture, the United States agreed on a bilateral basis to design and implement an "interim pig repopulation project." Administered by United States AID, the program built pig repopulation centers throughout Haiti, provided them with initial stocks of disease free United States pigs, trained Haitian farmers in the care and cultivation of the pigs, and began distributing pigs free of charge to the small scale farmers from whom infected pigs were taken. To date, we have redistributed more than 70,000 pigs to rural Haiti.

Due to the failure of the IDB to meet its commitment, however, three crises with respect to the pig program have developed for which the United States is being blamed. The first is the unavailability of affordable feed for the growing pig population. The second is the absence of a swine husbandry extension program that emphasizes the appropriate production of swine feed stuffs in association with food crop production on the Haitian farm. The third is the absence of a national veterinary service to provide health surveillance to detect and prevent disease among the livestock of Haitians farmers.

United States detractors have concocted the myth that part of the American plan was to kill all the pigs in Haiti, replace them with huge American pigs whom they could not feed and who would end up eating the farmers' children. This ridiculous killer pig theory is apparently gaining currency among Haitians who have been misled and denied knowledge of all the facts. The fact is that the United States pigs will be of more value to the Haitian farmer because it is bigger and more prolific, that is it produces an average litter of nine piglets, two times per year, as compared to the four piglet litter, one time every 18 months, of the traditional Haitian pig.

To produce this good result naturally requires more food. Thus when a feed production program is incorporated into the Haitian farming system, it will enrich both the farmer and the pig producer who will have a much larger pig to sell and more of them.

CONTRABAND—THE AMERICAN PLAN

Another part of the anti-Americanism theme being struck by a growing number of frustrated Haitians is the idea that the contraband invasion is part of an American plot to destroy the rice and sugarcane industries in Haiti, increase dependency, and turn the people against one another and destabilize Haiti so completely that elections will never be held and power will revert to a repressive Duvalerist military that will reduce Haiti to a cheap labor workshop for American imperialists. As ridiculous as such a thesis sounds, there are those who point to Miami rice, stolen bicycles and ending the Dominican Republic sugar quota as evidence of the existence of an American plan.

So there you have it—two bits of bad news from Haiti: A severely destabilizing economic crisis brought about by contraband trade that threatens to derail the process of democratization and economic recovery in Haiti; and a growing anti-Americanism in Haiti that unjustifiably attributes this crisis to an insidious American plan.

U.S. POLICIES AND THE MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS: THE TWO POINT FAUNTROY PLAN

To help remedy this situation, I will attempt to persuade the United States Government and certain multilateral development institutions to propose to Haiti, in the next 2 months, a short-term emergency economic program and a medium-term economic recovery program to assure that a newly elected government has a reasonable opportunity to develop; and implement its own program in a relatively stable environment.

SHORT-TERM EMERGENCY PROGRAM OF STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT

My short term emergency plan has four features:

First, that we help deal with the contraband problem by making all as yet uncommitted fiscal year 1987 economic support funds for Haiti available for a cooperative effort between United States Customs and Haiti Customs to provide the following:

The training of an adequate cadre of Haitian customs officials.

Adequate radar equipment, coast guard vessels and new barracks where necessary.

Second, that structural adjustment loans be made to Haiti by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund [IMF] to do the following:

Provide credit to offset the negative consequences of the liberalization of tariffs and duties.

Compensate raw material producers in Haiti for losses they incurred as a result of investments they made last year not anticipating the contraband crisis.

Finance a feasibility study of short- and medium-term alternative uses to which both land and available capital might be profitably put.

Compensate laid off workers and retrain them for new jobs, especially in enterprises offering the potential for technological transfer, capital formation and upward mobility. Industrial development with a potential for linkages throughout the Haitian economy should be targeted.

Finance investment by displaced raw material investors in the factories or other viable investment activities suggested by the above-mentioned feasibility study.

Use any available ESF funds in conjunction with the World Bank, and IMF structural adjustment loans to accomplish the above.

Third, send a high level delegation of United States officials to Haiti to discuss this two-pronged offer of emergency assistance and thus demonstrate by our willingness to help the CNG implement such a program that the United States is not behind the destabilization that increased contraband activity threatens to produce.

Fourth, that the U.S. sponsor serious discussions with the World Bank and other economic interests in the region to determine what domestic food and export opportunities may exist for balanced agricultural production. The World Bank has already done research on this subject. (World Bank Report No. 5601-HA.)

MEDIUM-TERM PROGRAM: DEVELOPMENT OF A 5-YEAR PLAN FOR HAITIAN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

To be of assistance to the elected government that is to take office in February 1988, the United States, other donor nations and the relevant multilateral development institutions should begin now to develop with key persons in the interim government a research and information base for decisions that the elected government will have to make during its first 5 years. To that end, I propose that the United States and the CNG convene a meeting of representatives of key donor nations, the IMF, the IDB, the World Bank, and U.S. AID to do the following:

Assess what is being considered by each nation and multilateral institution in terms of assistance projects with and for Haiti.

Determine the compatibility of the various projects being planned and how they relate to one another.

Organize consultations between the international community and key institutions within Haiti, including the religious community, the business sector, labor organizations, and the interim government to assure that all understand the nature of the data that is being developed as an information base for the new elected government.

The coordination of the various aid projects and the data developed should, in my view, make job creation the first order of business. It would seem to me that the Government's role in that quest would be infrastructure development: The building of roads, schools and health care facilities, and the provision of personnel and services pursuant thereto. Another respectfully suggested role of the interim government would be to convene business organizations and labor unions to assess comparative labor costs and to assist union development in Haiti.

Data for such a 5-year plan should identify prospective markets for agricultural production and any new, viable sectors of job creating activity that might develop within or come to Haiti.

Finally, the international grouping that I ask the United States Government to convene should suggest the best combination of aid and trade relationships that Haiti should have with other countries to promote long term stability and growth. I say this because outside assistance alone can never enable Haiti to cope with the vagaries of poverty, weather, commodity price fluctuations or the availability of the investment needed to finance a certain level of growth. That capacity can come only with reliance on trade relations with others in the region, including the United States of America.

PLAN ECHOES RECENT MULTILATERAL BANK AGREEMENTS

As chairman of the House Banking Subcommittee on International Development Institutions and Finance, I am keenly aware of several multilateral development bank agreements reached last year during negotiations for MDB replenishments and capital increases that will not only encourage the two point plan I offer but would also afford the World Bank an opportunity to implement the new agreements on a pilot basis in Haiti.

As Deputy Assistant Secretary for Developing Nations of the Department of Treasury, James W. Conrow stated at a hearing before my subcommittee earlier this month:

> Over the past year and a half we have enhanced multilateral cooperation considerably. We have put in place new arrangements for closer economic policy coordination. These mutual efforts—and the U.S. leadership that drives them—must continue and be extended if we are going to resolve the problems confronting the international economy.

Haiti is a prime example of what Deputy Assistant Secretary Conrow describes as one of the "many underdeveloped countries that are nurturing infant democracies and need support to sustain their efforts." Among the new arrangements reached by the MDB's that would encourage reforms while coordinating and catalyzing other sources of finance to promote growth, development and stability in Haiti are:

A new IMF/World Bank Policy Framework Program that calls for the development of a "single comprehensive package" that will address the macroeconomic and structural needs of the lowest income countries. The recipient country, the IMF and the World Bank are urged to negotiate medium-term plans supported by the lending arrangements of the IMF structural adjustment facility, and bilateral aid agencies—coordinated by the World Bank. This agreement tracks perfectly with point 2 of my plan; $3 to $3.5 billion of the IDA VIII replenishment is to be used for adjustment lending which fosters the ability of IDA recipients to achieve sound, sustainable growth. This agreement tracks perfectly with point 1 of my plan.

A Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency [MIGA] is established under the auspices of the World Bank. What an incentive that will be to encourage private sector equity investment in Haiti in both the short and medium term in Haiti!

Underdeveloped countries like Haiti that are nurturing infant democracies will benefit from policy changes such as these that will improve incentives and reduce economic distortions that tend to discriminate against them. The social costs, institutional and political difficulties and financial requirements for Haiti to make much needed policy changes and sustain itself through adjustment process are indeed extensive.

The application of these kinds of new agreements reached by the multilateral development institutions with Haiti represents an enormous challenge but one that must be undertaken to establish there the foundation for the sustained economic recovery necessary to the promotion and well-being of a democratic Haitian nation, and provide there the stability necessary for bringing that great country into a full democratic system of government, free of the old Duvalist repression and exploitation.

□ 0250

With that, Mr. Speaker, may I thank the House for this opportunity to share with them and with you our new plan, an emergency short-term plan to deal with the economic crisis presently upon Haiti, and a medium-term program that could result in a 5-year plan that the newly elected government could embark upon once it is elected, and begins to serve in February of 1988.

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from the District of Columbia for arranging this special order to maintain public focus on the situation in Haiti. Mr. FAUNTROY has been an outstanding leader in the effort to bring social justice, economic development, democracy, and respect for human rights to Haiti and has made a tremendous contribution in this regard.

As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, I am deeply concerned over the plight of the Haitian people and have worked to promote democracy and human rights in that country. Subcommittee hearings have poignantly depicted the severe economic and political conditions which Haitians have long endured.

Haiti is now at a turning point. There is a real opportunity for economic growth and the establishment of democratic institutions to guarantee fundamental rights. The Haitian people have removed the chains of despotism and are engaged in a process that will ensure political stability and economic viability.

Clearly, the United States has a role to play. We must listen to their concerns and be ready to provide necessary assistance to ensure sustainable growth. A new constitution is in place. Local and national elections are scheduled, as well as a presidential inauguration.

Nevertheless, the situation remains tenuous and can be exploited and manipulated by the opponents of democracy. I am confident, however, that the courageous and enthusiastic Haitian people will continue to surmount the remaining difficulties and achieve the type of society they aspire. We should be prepared to help and I stand ready to work with my good friend from the District of Columbia toward this objective.

GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1987: STOPPING THE HIGH-TECH GIVEAWAY

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

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, and Mr. KOLTER in introducing the Government Patent Policy Act Amendments of 1987.

The purpose of this bill is to close a loophole that exists in current law that permits contractors who develop patented inventions funded by Federal Moneys to circumvent the domestic manufacturing clause under section 204, title 35 of the United States Code, the Government Patent Policy Act.

The Government Patent Policy Act Amendments of 1987 would extend the current domestic manufacturing requirement to all contractors, assignees, and exclusive licensees of patented inventions developed with Federal R&D assistance.

Last January, Members of the Senate discovered that our own Government increased the U.S. trade deficit by awarding $9 billion in military contracts for equipment purchases from and research and development work to foreign companies in 1986.

The finding prompted Senator JEFF BINGAMAN of New Mexico to say, and I quote:

To the extent that we're contracting out and depending upon foreign companies to accomplish our research, we are losing our cutting edge in technology.

Senator BINGAMAN's concerns are legitimate, outflows of U.S. research and development moneys to foreign contractors subsidize our economic competitiors to finance commercial products that will compete with American products in our very own domestic market.

My attention was drawn to this issue during a similar but separate investigation involving the Strategic Defense Intiative Research Program [SDI]. Two years ago, Armed Services Committee Chairman LES ASPIN and I wrote to Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger regarding U.S. patent right policy pertaining to research and development by foreign participants involved in SDI projects.

In our letter, we asked the Secretary:

What would be the terms of agreement of property-rights ownership of potential technologies developed from research conducted by foreign participants? And how do they compare with terms agreed to by U.S. contractors?

I was stunned by Secretary Weinberger's response. Our own Defense Department was going to permit contractors—"whether U.S. or foreign—to retain title to the patents on inventions developed in the course of U.S. funded research."

In other words, Defense was going to allow foreign contractors to retain the patent rights to 21st-century technologies funded entirely at U.S. taxpayers' expense.

So incredible did I find this policy I continued to pursue this matter in committee hearings and through further correspondence. In responses received from DOD dated February 24 and August 28, 1986, the Defense Department defended its policy on the grounds that it was adhering to existing statutory and regulatory policy.

After directing a fourth interrogatory to the Pentagon, Assistant Secretary for Defense Acquisition and Logistics James B. Wade informed me that DOD would reverse gears on the patent policy question.

Instead, he said, on contracts performed outside the United States, the Government will now acquire title to SDI-generated technologies invented by foreign contractors.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why our policy on patent rights to foreign contractors is confusing and remains unclear is because of the simple fact that we have no policy at all. Despite DOD's contradictions and reversal, an Unclassified version of a memorandum of understanding [MOU] between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany reveals that our Government may have already forfeited the commercial rights to cutting edge technologies developed by foreign contractors.

Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection, I would like to have appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a copy of the MOU between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany on the agreement of technology transfer and the strategic defense initiative, as reprinted in the Cologne Express. I recommend to my colleagues to read and study this document carefully. According to a Congressional Research Service analysis of this agreement, ". . . retention of (patent) title by the foreign contractor is specifically permitted in the memorandum; it is therefore arguable that a West German contractor would possess all commercial rights for any patented invention resulting from research funded by United States Government money, subject to the minimum rights and march-in rights possessed by the United States."

What this means is that our Government—which is willing to foot the entire bill for the research, development, and deployment of SDI—has very little equity position in the commercial technologies generated from SDI. That is a heavy price to pay for allied cooperation. Bear in mind that SDI represents the most advanced and costly military undertaking since the early days of the Space Program and the Manhattan project, which created the atomic bomb.

What this means is that we are pursuing a military research and development policy that ultimately finances our own international economic competition. Given the character of the

SDI project, I find this policy foolhardy and unacceptable. Congressional critics of foreign contracting have suggested that the United States restrict offshore research and development to a limited percentage basis. That might be worthwhile, but such alternatives miss the point.

The point is: Who owns the technology developed under federally funded foreign contracts? Instead, I suggest that we need to look at the rights' stuff—what conditions do we place on inventions by foreign participants made with U.S. assistance?

The American people need assurances that their investments in Government-sponsored research and development will not rob them of their jobs, bankrupt whole industries in their communities, or advance the industrial base of our international economic competitors. The field of patent rights is complex and often times overlooked. Industrial societies measure their progress both in terms of scientific advances and innovation.

Patent rights and other intellectual property protections are integral to making scientific and innovative advances available to the public and are pivotal to stimulating future economic growth. Indeed, patent rights are essential to commercializing many new technologies and bringing them to the marketplace. President Abraham Lincoln saw the value of U.S. patent policy when he said:

The U.S. Patent System added the fuel of interest to the fire of genius.

DOD is a major developer of high technology. We have invested substantial national wealth to augment defense-related research and technology development. This one agency absorbs almost one-third of a trillion dollars national budget and nearly three-quarters of the 55 billion dollars Federal R&D budget, DOD's primary mission is national defense; but it is also in the unique position of enhancing the U.S. worldwide technological position.

DOD is the flagship agency in protecting our international security obligations. It can use its policies to pursue short-term, global objectives by reducing incentives for developing new technologies, or, even worse, it can unwittingly relegate this country to a second-class economy by making commercially valuable technology available to our economic competitors.

The consequences of these policies serve to transmute the U.S. quest for military cooperation and security into direct and perverse financing of our potential economic defeat. This undermining of our world-class economy should give pause to those offering uncritical support to the geopolitical assumptions of our current military procurement policies.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve an equity position in their country's investment in cooperative research and development ventures, particularly when it is they who are expected to pay. The Government Patent Policy Act Amendments of 1987 is a small step to ensuring that the American people will receive a fair dividend on their investment.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and to join me and my five colleagues in cosponsoring the Government Patent Policy Act Amendments of 1987.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY-UNITED STATES: AGREEMENTS ON THE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY AND THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE[1] [MARCH 27, 1986]

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

On March 27, 1986 the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Government of the United States signed two Agreements in Washington, D.C., the Joint Agreement in Principle (concerning the Transfer of Technology) and the Agreement on German Participation in Research on the Strategic Defense Initiative. These Agreements, as well as accompanying letter, e.g. between Richard Perle, Deputy US Defense Minister and Lorenz Schomerus, of the Federal Ministry of Economics, were drawn up in English and German.

The Governments seemingly decided not to make public said Agreements. There was considerable pressure on the German Government to make the text available to the public.

On April 18, 1986 the Cologne daily newspaper, "Express" published a German version of the two Agreements and, on April 20, 1986 the exchange of letters between Perle and Schomerus followed. The "Express" claimed to be in possession of the authentic versions. Officials who asked not to be named confirmed that the published versions were authentic.

The "Express" version served as the basis for the translation into English, though the German text was also published by a Bonn-based newsletter. The translation indicates a few misprints or unclear passages in the "Express" version. Also, the translation follows meticulously the graphic structure of the "Express" version without, however, emphasizing certain paragraphs by using bold print, as the "Express" did, with the exception, again of headings.

This Introductory Note refrains from commenting upon the contents of the SDI Agreements. It should be noted, however, that Richard Perle, in the last paragraph of the letter reproduced, comments upon the legally binding character of the Joint Agreement in Principle under public international law. The "Express" makes it clear in its edition of April 18, 1986, that there are more accompanying letters with regard to the SDI Agreements not reproduced in full.

Finally, the reader should bear in mind that the following texts are translations of the German versions, the English texts not having been made public. Hence, the English original will differ in nuances from the translations reproduced; e.g. the "Agreement" may be a "Memorandum of Understanding" and alike. The aim of the translation is merely to make available the contents of the already published SDI Agreements to the interested English-speaking international community.

AGREEMENT ON THE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY

Joint Agreement in Principle between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Government of the United States of America, done in Washington, D.C. on 27 March 1986.

1. Preamble

In the course of their consultations the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Government of the United States of America re-affirmed the long-standing cooperation between the Governments of the two countries, their industries, research establishments and other entites in the areas of industry, science, technology and security. In the realization that the continuation of this cooperation will promote the growth of their national economies and strengthen their technological capacities and security, the Governments hereby re-affirm certain principles for the cooperation, such as most-favoured nation treatment for free competition, non-discrimination and joint security interests. These principles are laid down, inter alia, in the following existing bilateral agreements: the Treaty of Amity, Commerce and Navigation of 29 October 1954; the Treaty on the Protection of Secrets of 23 December 1960 with supplements, and the rules of procedure with special regard to the protection of secrets in industry of 16 April 1970 with supplements; the Treaty of 23 August 1973 on Mutual Assistance between the Customs Authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America; as well as in multilateral agreements and treaties to which both Governments are parties.

2. New Challenge for this Cooperation

Modern industrial and technological development necessitates a dynamic process of cooperation, especially in the fields of research, development, production, distribution and export, and the exchange of scientific knowledge and information. The Governments will in particular endeavour—whilst safeguarding their security interests—to promote the free exchange of goods, scientific information and technologies between their two countries. They will endeavour to increase the effectiveness of their laws, provisions and procedures relating to exports, and thereby to keep the administrative burden connected therewith to a minimum.

When exercising their discretionary powers, the Governments should, in the spirit of the bilateral cooperation, take the interests of both sides into account. They will endeavour to settle any disputes in a way which is satisfactory to both sides. The Governments are of the opinion that this cooperation must be encouraged and that it should be secured by means of continued development and the implementation of effective regulations for the protection of strategically sensitive technologies.

The Governments wish to make it known that they anticipate that the strengthening of the mutually profitable cooperation in the fields of industry and research will bring with it an increased cooperation in the application and enforcement of agreed restrictions regarding the export to prohibited destinations of sensitive technologies which affect their common security. To this end they will take effective steps with the aim of further strengthening the protective measures for sensitive technology, and ensure strict application and enforcement of existing laws and other legal provisions in

[1] [The unofficial English translation and the Introductory Note were prepared for *International Legal Materials* by Gerhard Wegen, I.L.M. Corresponding Editor for the Federal Republic of Germany, partner of the law firm of Gleiss, Lutz, Hootz, Hirsch & Partners, Stuttgart, admitted to practice in New York and Stuttgart. The unofficial German text appears in the Cologne *Express*, April 18 and 20, 1986. The help in translation given by Miss E. Richomme is kindly acknowledged.

[The Agreement on the Transfer of Technology appears at I.L.M. page 959, and the exchange of letters concerning this agreement appears at page 974. The Agreement concerning the Strategic Defense Initiative appears at I.L.M. page 962.

[Other countries which have either concluded, or are in the process of concluding, memoranda of understanding similar to the agreements concluded by the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States are: Israel, Italy, Japan and the United Kingdom.]

this context. The Governments will take the principles mentioned into account when creating mechanisms for the promotion of this cooperation. The Governments hereby declare that they are prepared to help each other and their industries and research establishments to fully comprehend the pertinent laws and other legal provisions, as well as the purposes to which said laws and legal provisions were introduced. Both Governments recognize that to inform the other government in advance about important decisions or acts which affect its material interests in a useful means towards achieving joint objectives in the spirit of the cooperation. The Governments will hold consultations promptly and at an appropriate level, particularly in emergencies, in order to settle differences of opinion in a way which is satisfactory for both parties. Hereby, they will endeavour to implement the steps necessary for a successful conclusion of their consultations.

In order to facilitate communications concerning the questions of cooperation mentioned in this Agreement, each Government will designate special appointees, whose responsibility it will be to determine the areas which, in keeping with the mentioned principles and objectives, may need further clarification from time to time. For this purpose, the special appointees shall meet regularly and be prepared to meet at short notice if one of the two Governments so requires.

The consultations and other mechanisms of information laid down in this Agreement shall not affect other bilateral or international consultation mechanisms at the disposal of the two Governments.

4. Review

After a period of one year the Governments shall review their experience with all matters treated in this Agreement.

5. Validity for the Land of Berlin

This Joint Agreement in Principle also applies to the Land of Berlin, subject to the rights and responsibilities of France, the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, unless the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany makes a contrary (in German: "gegenseitig"=mutual) declaration to the Government of the United States of America within three months after the signing of this Agreement.

Signed in Washington, D.C. on 27 March 1986. For the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, Martin Bangemann, for the Government of the United States of America, Caspar Weinberger.

II. SDI AGREEMENT

Agreement between the Federal Minister of Economics, acting on behalf of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, and the Minister of Defense, acting on behalf of the Government of the United States of America, Concerning the Participation of German Industries, Research Establishments and Other Entities in Research on the Strategic Defense Initiative, Done Washington on 27 March 1986

1. The Federal Minister of Economics, acting on behalf of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany. In view of the standpoint of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on the research programme for the Strategic Defense Initiative, as expressed in its statements of 27 March, 18 April and 18 December 1985, and the Minister of Defense, acting on behalf of the Government of the United States of America, recalling that, in this capacity, he formally invited allied nations to participate in the defense research programme known as the Strategic Defense Initiative. Expecting that such a participation will lead to a material improvement of the quality, the timely implementation and the cost effectiveness of this research. Declaring the joint interest of both parties in the creation of a broad basis for as comprehensive a participation as possible of German industries, research establishment and other entities which wish to take part in the SDI research programme.

Wishing to deal with questions of procedure and fact recurring in this context, they hereby agree on the following guidelines:

2. Implementation

Separate project contracts and, if the necessity arises, other implementing agreements will be concluded for the individual SDI research projects pursuant to this Agreement. These contracts and other implementing agreements shall be facilitiated by this Agreement and they shall be in harmony with it. In the case of inconsistencies between this present Agreement and any implementing agreement, the Governments will enter into consultations to remove these inconsistencies.

3. Existing Agreement

3.1 This Agreement shall be implemented in conformity with the laws in force, with other legal provisions of national policy as well as the international obligations of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Government of the United States and, as regards the United States, in compliance with the American-Soviet ABM Treaty of 1972.

3.1.1 In case of inconsistencies between the application of this present Agreement and laws in force, other legal provisions of national policy and international obligations, the governments will enter into consultations to remove any such inconsistencies.

3.2 Both governments agree to have recourse to, if possible, existing agreements when drafting the special provisions to be inserted in contracts on research projects and other implementing agreements pursuant to this Agreement. In this context, in particular the following two sides (bilateral) of the agreements apply—where applicable—accordingly (in German the text is not clear).

3.2.1 The Agreements on the Protection of Secrets of 23 December 1960 with supplements and rules of procedure, with special regard to the protection of secrets in industry of 16 April 1970 with supplements.

3.2.2 The Agreements of 17 October 1978 on Principles of Mutual Cooperation in the Area of Research and Development, Production, Procurement and the Logistic Support of Military Equipment.

3.2.3 Annex 5 of 6 December 1983 to the Agreement on Principles of Mutual Cooperation in the Area of Research and Development, Production and Procurement, and the Logistic Support of Military Equipment (principles of contract administration).

3.2.4 Annex 6 of 6 December 1985 to the Agreement on Principles of Mutual Cooperation in the Area of Research and Development, Production and Procurement, and the Logistic Support of Military Equipment (Agreement on Mutual Administrative Assistance in the Area of Examination of Prices/Costs in Orders for Defense Purposes).

3.2.5 The Agreement of 4 January 1956 on the Facilitation of the Exchange of Patents and Technical Experience in the Area of Defense.

4. Definitions

4.1 "Classified information": information which must be protected in the interests of national security. Such information is designated by the United States as "top secret", "secret" and "confidential", by the Federal Republic of Germany as "streng geheim", "geheim", "VS-vertraulich" and "VS nur für den Dienstgebrauch".

4.2 "Technical data": Information of all kinds, including inventions or discoveries, whether patented or not, which can be used for the design, manufacture, use or reproduction of objects or materials, or which can be processed for these purposes.

4.3 "Computer sofeware": Computer programmes and data stores for computers.

4.4 "Background information": Technical data and computer software required or useful for a specific research project, however prior to the commencement of the research project or outside the documents relating thereto.

4.5 "Foreground information": Technical data and computer software produced in the course of work being carried out on the basis of a contract or a specific research project, including any invention or discovery, whether patentable or not, and which was developed during the course of work being done on the basis of said contract or research project or which became applicable in practice for the first time in connection therewith.

4.6 "Information protected by proprietary rights": All background and foreground information which is protected under private law as intellectual property, as well as all information which is normally treated confidentially by the contractor, unless it is common knowledge or is generally accessible from other sources or was already made available by the party providing the information or a third party without any agreement on the confidential treatment.

4.7 "German participation: All German companies, industries, research establishments or other entities which are carrying out agreed SDI research projects, be it on the basis of contracts, subcontracts, joint ventures, partnerships or in any other way. For the purposes of this Agreement the term "possible German participation" shall also mean entities which make a bid for contracts for SDI research projects or which are negotiating the same.

5. Mechanism for cooperation and acquisition in SDI research

5.1 There are various different methods of participation in the SDI research programme, inter alia:

5.1.1 The Government of the United States can conclude contracts directly with German industries, research establishments and other entities. The Government of the United States shall conclude such contracts in conformity with American laws and other legal provisions, and with its obligations arising from the Agreement.

5.1.2 Principal contractors can conclude subcontracts with industries, research establishments and other entities in both countries. All subcontracts shall be concluded in conformity with the laws in force and other legal provisions, as well as with the provisions of the relevant main contract.

5.1.3 German and American industries, research establishments and other entities may agree upon joint ventures, partnerships and other forms of cooperation.

5.2 This present Agreement is intended to facilitate the participation of German industries, research establishments and other entities on the basis of fair and genuine competition. It does not preclude the conclusion of other mutual contractual arrangements in conformity with the laws and other legal provisions, and the policies of the two governments, if the German participants so wish.

5.3 Subject to compliance with American laws and other legal provisions of national policy and international obligations, the Government of the United States will endeavour to make it possible for German and American industries, research establishments and other entities to bid under equal conditions for contracts awarded within the framework of this Agreement. In order to facilitate said competitive participation, the Government of the United States hereby agrees, in collaboration with the competent German authorities—insofar as this seems appropriate and necessary—to provide German industries, research establishments and other entities in due course with all information which they need to be able to compete for participation.

5.3.1 Principles and procedures for the placing of contracts shall be in keeping with the 1978 Agreement on Principles of Mutual Cooperation in the Area of Research and Development, Production, Procurement and the Logistic Support of Military Equipment. Price and cost controls will be carried out in conformity with the Agreement of December 1985 on Mutual Administrative Assistance in the Area of Price and Cost Control for Orders for Defense Purposes.

5.3.2 The U.S. Federal Acquisitions Regulations (FAR) and the Department of Defense Supplement (DFAR) contain guidelines for the awarding of contracts by the American Ministry of Defense, including the information which must be produced as evidence of the price for a certain article or service.

5.4 In accordance with the principle of procurement on the basis of fair and genuine competition, with the terms laid down in this Agreement, with the applicable American technical requirements and with the availability of corresponding appropriations, the Government of the United States agrees to do all in its power to facilitate the participation, so that the extent of the participation of German industries, research establishments and other entities will correspond to the available German industrial research capacity.

5.5 As regards possible follow-up contracts, the Government of the United States will apply its laws and other legal provisions in the same way to both American and German contractors.

6. Exchange of information and intellectual property rights.

6.1 In accordance with the laws in force and other legal provisions of national policy and international obligations, and subject to third-party intellectual property rights, the Governments shall use their power of discretion to promote the cooperation. The technical data and computer software needed for the implementation of project contacts or other implementing agreement pursuant to this Agreement will be supplied to the participants concerned in accordance with said contracts and other applicable implementing agreements and in harmony with the relevant procedures laid down in this present Agreement. For each project contract or other implementing agreement the following rules apply:

6.1.1 Exchange of information: To the extent provided by this Agreement and in accordance with American and German laws and other legal provisions and national policy, both Governments shall do their best to ensure that the exchange of information is efficiently organized.

6.1.2 Visits: Visits shall be organized in accordance with the Protection of Secrets Agreement of 23 December 1960 with supplements.

Prior to the conclusion of a specific contract or of any other implementing agreement pursuant to this present Agreement, applications made by either Government for permission to visit in connection with said contract or said implementing agreement will be processed as quickly as possible in accordance with the relevant procedures. Once a contract or any other implementing agreement has been concluded, both Governments can grant the governmental staff or contractors' employees of the other side a bloc authorization for further visits to its authorities and contractors. Once the bloc authorization has been granted, the details of further visits can be arranged directly with the competent authorities or the contractor concerned.

6.1.3 Conferences: Representatives of the Governments and the contractors of both States shall be given equal opportunities to participate in conference in which they are authorized to participate and which concern cooperative SDI programmes and contracts. In order to facilitate the participation in such conferences the Governments shall ensure that these representatives fulfill the requirements necessary for taking part in such conferences.

7. Protection of information

7.1 Both Governments recognize the danger which the risk of an unauthorized transfer of sensitive SDI technology to prohibited destinations represents for their joint security. In consequence, they agree, in harmony with their national security interests, their laws and national policy, to take all necessary and appropriate steps to prevent such unautherized transfer of sensitive SDI technology to prohibited destinations.

7.2 Technical data and computer software designated as classified information exchanged or produced in the course of an SDI project contract or another implementing agreement pursuant to this Agreement shall be protected in accordance with the Protection of Secrets Agreement of 23 December 1960 with supplements and rules of procedure, with special regard to the protection of secrets in industry of 16 April 1970 with supplements. Each Government has the authority to designate the background information which it transmits to the other Government or its contractors according to this Agreement. The Defense Ministry of the United States shall issue designating instructions separately for each contract and each implementing agreement. If any questions arise in connection with designating which are not clearly settled in the contract or other implementing agreement, then these questions can be discussed between the parties to the contract or implementing agreement. The final authority for designating foreground information lies, however, with the Defense Ministry of the United States.

7.2.1 With regard to the designating of the results of research as classified information, both Governments hereby agree that certain information must be protected against unauthorized disclosure. However, both Governments are of the opinion that excessive use should not be made of the possibility of designating information as classified information, and that information should only be classified as such when there is reason to believe that the disclosure of the information would jeopardize the national security of one of the two States.

7.3 Both Governments will take all legal steps at their disposal in order to prevent confidential information transmitted in connection with this Agreement being disclosed on the basis of a statutory provision, unless the other Government and, if applicable, the contractor providing the information consents to a disclosure of the information.

7.4 As a contribution to this desired protection, the information transmitted by one Government to the other will be designated as classified information in accordance with the Protection of Secrets Agreement of 23 December 1960 with supplements and rules of procedure, with special regard to the protection of secrets in industry of 16 April 1970 with supplements, according to the appropriate national classified matter designating system. if the information concerned is not classified, attention will be drawn to the fact that the information supplied in connection with this Agreement is confidential.

7.5 Confidential background information which is nonclassified shall be protected in a way which guarantees its protection against unauthorized disclosure. Said information may include technical data and computer software which is not designated as classified information and which is subject to American export control laws. It will be labelled and protected in such a way that reexport or dissemination which contravenes the terms of the contract or of another implementing agreement is made impossible without the consent of the Government transmitting the information or of the contractor.

7.6 Both Governments shall endeavour, subject to their municipal laws and implementing provisions, to avoid a policy for the protection of information which would have a retroactive effect on information transmitted within the framework of this Agreement.

8. Intellectual property rights and utilization of information

8.1 Background Information: Background information, once transmitted, shall be protected and may not be used or passed on for purposes which are not laid down in the contract or in another implementing agreement without the consent of the owner. The participation in an SDI research project shall not affect the author's rights of ownership and use of this information.

8.2 Information protected by proprietary rights is subject to the rights of the owner and such rights of use as can be claimed in favour of each Government and each contractor. The recipient of such information shall obtain the consent of the party transmitting the information before using or disclosing said information and before divulging it to third parties.

8.3 Foreground information

8.3.1 Proprietary rights in technical data and computer software produced in the course of SDI research contracts shall be offered to the contractor who produced the technical data and computer software concerned. This shall apply unless the Government of the United States, in conformity with its municipal laws and implementing provisions, has in respect of the right to the

intellectual property provided otherwise for contracts financed exclusively by it.

8.3.2 German Participation: German participants can, in connection with SDI research projects, decide to participate in contractual arrangements which are financed exclusively by the United States. In conformity with American laws and implementing provisions, and under provisions and terms which are not more unfavourable than those applicable to American contractors, such contractual arrangements normally require that the Government of the United States receives unlimited rights to the technical data and computer software produced within the framework of SDI contracts, i.e. royalty-free rights to use, copy or disclose this information in whole or in part in any way and for any purpose. This does not preclude the right of the contractor to use technical data and computer software he has produced, subject to the special conditions of the contract in question and the security regulations in force.

8.3.3 The Government of the United States shall endeavour, in accordance with the security interests, the laws and the policy of the United States and subject to third-party proprietary rights, to allow the use, for non-military purposes, of the results of non-classified research projects in the field of SDI technologies.

8.3.4 The Government of the United States and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany shall make every effort to support negotiations on the necessary licenses, royalties and the exchange of technical information with their respective enterprises and other holders of such rights.

8.3.5 The transfer of the results of research obtained within the framework of SDI contracts by subsidiaries of German parent companies domiciled in the United States will be facilitated, subject to compliance with the laws and other legal provisions and the policy of the United States.

9. Additional information

In recognition of their joint security interests and in order to facilitate the effective implementation of these Agreements the Defense Ministry of the United States and the Federal Ministry of Defense of the Federal Republic of Germany shall arrange a mutual exchange of information on areas of SDI research to be agreed upon between the two sides. In addition, they agree to exchange know-how in areas of SDI research which shall be laid down by mutual agreement and which the two sides deem useful for the improvement of conventional methods of defense, in particular air defense. This exchange of information will take place in accordance with the American and German laws in force, the other legal provisions and national policies and with international obligations and third-party property rights.

10. Entry into force and termination

10.1 This Agreement, which is drawn up in English and German, each version of which is equally controlling, shall come into force upon the date of the last signature.

10.2 Each Government may terminate this Agreement by informing the other Government with three months' notice. The provisions relating to the termination of a specific research project are contained in the separate agreements for the relevant project.

10.3 In the event of the termination of this Agreement, the provisions relating to the protection and the security of information shall remain in force.

Done in Washington D.C. on 27 March 1986. For the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, Martin Bangemann and for the Government of the United States of America, Caspar Weinberger.

III. THE SECRET LETTERS

1. Letter from Richard Pearle, Deputy US Defense Minister, to Lorenz Schomerus of the Federal Ministry of Economics.

DEAR LORENZ, I am writing to you concerning our discussions on the subject of the Joint Agreement in Principle. In order that the American side may be comprehensively informed about the measures you intend to take to increase the effectiveness of your national export controls for sensitive technology, it would be extremely useful if you would outline certain points in more detail than was possible in the Joint Agreement in Principle.

Could you in particular describe the structural changes in German law which you want to introduce in order to improve export controls? Would the export of technology covered by the COCOM embargo be a breach of German law pursuant to the amendments you intend to propose, were it to be done without official government permission? Does the government intend, according to the new laws, to punish infringements with the severity necessary to act as a sufficiently strong deterrent against inadmissible non-authorized exports?

Could you describe the measures you plan to take to improve control over the COCOM embargo? Do you intend to increase the number of staff employed to implement the embargo and to conduct permit controls?

It is our opinion that the cooperation between our two governments, as described in Article 3 of the Joint Agreement in Principle, would be facilitated by an additional agreement stipulating that bilateral talks should be held for the purpose of coordinating our positions when deliberating on the COCOM list before questions of importance are brought before the COCOM (Coordination Committee for Multilateral Export Controls). We sincerely hope that you will give your agreement to this.

It is also our opinion that the undertaking referred to in Article 3 of the Joint Agreement in Principle should contain an agreement stating that, prior to the conclusion of the urgent discussions, neither side will take irrevocable steps which would make the discussions ineffective. This means that, in cases of emergency, both sides would be prepared to refrain for an appropriate length of time from granting permits for the shipping of goods which fall under the embargo, which would make it impossible for them to be re-obtained.

As regards to the question of international law, the Government of the United States sees the Joint Agreement in Principle rather as a political declaration of intent than as a legally valid document.

2. Letter from Lorenz Schomerus of the Federal Ministry of Economics, to Richard Perle, Deputy US Defense Minister

DEAR RICHARD, Thank you for your letter concerning some of the questions which remain to be discussed following the conclusion of the Joint Agreement in Principle. Let me explain a few points in connection with the questions you mention. We are in the process of introducing improvements in the control of products blocked by an embargo, which are brought into the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, including appropriate measures for the transport of goods from, to and inside Berlin.

As regards the details, we intend to introduce approval procedures for sales of blocked goods and technologies for certain groups of foreign nationals. This will also include the members of diplomatic or consular missions.

We shall also request improvements in the regulations concerning transit operations with blocked goods.

Furthermore, talks have been initiated with the competent authorities with a view to increasing the penalties for violations of the export control laws. In this connection we are also currently examining the possibilities for changing the question of the burden of proof so as to make it harder to avoid prosecution.

These changes must be approved by parliament in order to be effective. The Bundestag has authorized us to increase the number of staff employed to deal with questions of COCOM and export controls at the BAW (German abbreviation: Bundesamt für die gewerbliche Wirtschaft = Federal Agency for the Manufacturing Industries).

In addition, I would like to point out that the following authorities employ full-time staff to deal with questions of security, export controls, *issuance* of approvals and investigations: Federal Ministry of Economics, Federal Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, various customs authorities as well as 16 regional internal revenue offices. These various agencies employ a total of approximately 2,500 persons for this purpose, whereby the employees concerned are civil servants of various different levels and with varying specialized qualifications.

We agree with you that further joint efforts are required in order to make COCOM (Coordination Committee for Multilateral Export Controls) an even more effective instrument and to increase the degree of day-to-day cooperation between COCOM members. Hereby we shall also draw on the experience gained in the course of bilateral talks on specific questions relating to COCOM.

The successful deliberation on the Third World Initiative underlines our constructive attitude.

I agree with your interpretation of Article 3 (of the Joint Agreement in Principle) subject, naturally, to its conformity with German laws and provisions.

As regards the last paragraph of your letter, I would indicate that we agreed to hold discussions with the other allies. The Federal Government will then treat the document in accordance with the agreed methods of procedure.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCKINNEY (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. HUTTO (at the request of Mr. FOLEY), as of 8 p.m. on April 23, on account of official business.

Mr. MCDADE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut)

to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes each, on April 28 and 29.

Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOLLUM, for 60 minutes, on April 27.

Mr. GINGRICH, for 60 minutes, on April 27.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LEHMAN of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GLICKMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAFALCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BONKER, for 60 minutes, on April 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BADHAM, on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty on H.R. 1827.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut) and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.
Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
Mr. SHUMWAY.
Mr. COATS.
Mr. WHITTAKER.
Mr. ARCHER.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. GUNDERSON.
Mr. THOMAS of California.
Mr. PORTER.
Mr. LIGHTFOOT.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mr. GOODLING in two instances.
Mr. FISH.
Mr. MICHEL in two instances.
Mr. MCEWEN.
Mr. LUJAN.
Mr. BOULTER.
Ms. SNOWE.
Mr. ROGERS.
Mr. MCCANDLESS in two instances.
Mr. TAUKE.
Mr. FRENZEL in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LEHMAN of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN in three instances.
Mr. FLIPPO.
Mr. JENKINS.
Mr. LAFALCE in two instances.
Mr. HOYER in two instances.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. PANETTA in two instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. COELHO.
Mr. ST GERMAIN.
Mr. BORSKI.
Mr. FASCELL.
Mr. TORRICELLI in two instances.
Mr. LELAND.
Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.
Mr. KOSTMAYER in two instances.
Mr. GEPHARDT in two instances.
Mr. SCHEUER.
Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.
Mr. FLORIO.
Mr. LOWRY of Washington.
Mr. ANNUNZIO.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. FEIGHAN.
Mr. LANTOS in two instances.
Mr. MOAKLEY.
Mr. PEPPER in two instances.
Mr. ASPIN.
Mr. MACKAY.
Mr. STALLINGS.
Mr. SYNAR.
Mr. FAUNTROY.
Mr. WALGREN in four instances.
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.
Mr. OBERSTAR.
Mr. GEPHARDT.
Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. BONKER.
Mr. BIAGGI.
Mr. SKAGGS.
Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 240. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Santa Fe Trail as a National Historic Trail.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to designate the month of April 1987, as "National Child Abuse Prevention Month", and

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 26, through May 2, 1987, as "National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 53 minutes a.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 27, 1987, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1233. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of an alleged violation of the Anti-deficiency Act in accounts of the Child Nutrition Programs, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1234. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report that the appropriations to the Department of Justice, as listed therein, have been apportioned on a basis that indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1515(b)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1235. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting three reports of violations, two of which occurred in the Department of the Navy, and the other in the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1236. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Legislative Affairs), transmitting a report detailing the findings of a study on the feasibility of prohibiting depository institutions from accepting, receiving, or holding a deposit account from any South African national, pursuant of 22 U.S.C. 5097(b); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1237. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notification of proposed antiterrorism assistance to the Government of Pakistan, pursuant to FAA, section 574(a)(1) (97 Stat. 972); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1238. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affair; transmitting notification of proposed antiterrorism assistance to the Government of Jordan, pursuant to FAA, section 574(a)(1) (97 Stat. 972); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1239. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notification of the intention to add the Central African Republic and Uruguay to the list of approved participants in the Anti-Terrorism Assistance Program, pursuant to FAA, section 574(a)(1) (97 Stat. 972); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1240. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notice of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to the Government of Taiwan, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1241. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a list of all General Accounting Office reports issued during the month of March, 1987, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1242. A letter from the Assistant Administrator (Administration and Resources Management), Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting notification of a new Federal records system, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1243. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the commission's annual report of 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.

1244. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the commission's annual report of its compliance with the Government in the Sun-

shine Act during calendar year 1986, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1245. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Department's calendar year 1986 report of its activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1246. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of offshore lease revenues in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1247. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339b; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1248. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1986, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1249. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's ninth report on railroad-highway demonstration projects, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 130 nt; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1250. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the fiscal year 1986 annual report of the Department's Solar Energy and Conservation Bank, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3617(a); jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

REPORT OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veteran's Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 78. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the Veterans' Administration Home Loan Program (Rept. 100-63). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veteran's Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 79. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the sense of Congress that the 1-percent fee charged by the Veterans' Administration to veterans obtaining a home loan guaranteed by such Administration should not be increased. (Rept. 100-64). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ECKART (for himself, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. GREGG, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. WHEAT, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. GEPHARDT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. BATES, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. WEISS):

H.R. 2141. A bill to amend the Price-Anderson provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to provide for unlimited liability in the event of an accident at a nuclear power plant, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILBRAY:

H.R. 2142. A bill to designate certain lands in the State of Nevada as wilderness, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Agriculture.

By Mr. BRYANT:

H.R. 2143. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to establish rational criteria for the imposition of the sentence of death in cases of espionage and treason, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COURTER (for himself, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. WALKER, Mr. KYL, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 2144. A bill to prohibit the employment of nationals from Warsaw Pact countries at United States diplomatic and consular missions in those countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. SCHULZE):

H.R. 2145. A bill to impose a civil penalty for the making of false statements during United States International Trade Commission proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. RIDGE):

H.R. 2146. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the transition period for the Veterans' Administration readjustment counseling centers program, and for the other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 2147. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to release of those hospitalized following a verdict of not guilty by reason of insanity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLICKMAN (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. HATCHER):

H.R. 2148. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require certain labeling of foods which contain tropical fats; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY of Illinois:

H.R. 2149. A bill authorizing the city of Chester, IL, to reconstruct, repair, or improve an existing toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Chester, IL; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. SUNDQUIST):

H.R. 2150. A bill entitled the "Trade and Export Enhancement Act of 1987; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Foreign Affairs, Education and Labor, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Public Works and Transportation, Small Business, and the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACKAY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. MOODY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PENNY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. WISE, and Mrs. BOXER):

H.R. 2151. A bill to establish a coordinated National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Program, and a comprehensive plan for the assessment of the nutritional and dietary status of the U.S. population and the nutritional quality of the U.S. food supply, with provision for the conduct of scientific research and development in support of such program and plan; jointly, to the Committees on Science, Space and Technology, and Agriculture.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 2152. A bill to permit teachers to change employment across State lines without substantial loss of retirement benefits; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself, Mr. ROE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. WISE, and Mr. KOLTER):

H.R. 2153. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to provide for payment for reservation of nursing home beds under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RINALDO (for himself, Mr. COURTER, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey):

H.R. 2154. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide for the specific listing of certain benzenoid chemicals with other specifically listed chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut:

H.R. 2155. A bill to prohibit use of Presidential election campaign funds to pay obligations arising from prior Presidential elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIKORSKI:

H.R. 2156. A bill to amend the Direct Student Loan Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for partial loan cancellation for full-time volunteer service with a tax-exempt organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 2157. A bill to amend the direct and guaranteed student loan programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to publicize the current loan deferral program for full-time volunteers with the Peace Corps, VISTA, and tax-exempt organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2158. A bill to amend the Congregate Housing Services Act of 1978 to permanent-

ly reauthorize the Congregate Housing Services Program; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WALGREN:

H.R. 2159. A bill to amend the Stevenson-Wydler Act to establish the National Technical Information Corporation as a wholly owned Government corporation under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Science, Space and Technology.

By Mr. WALGREN (for himself and Mr. BOEHLERT):

H.R. 2160. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Secretary of Commerce for the programs of the National Bureau of Standards for fiscal year 1988, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space and Technology.

By Mr. WHEAT:

H.R. 2161. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to withholding certain city or county taxes from the pay of Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WORTLEY:

H.R. 2162. A bill to expand the group eligibility requirements for worker trade readjustment allowance to include workers for parts and services suppliers, and to lengthen by 13 weeks the period in which such allowance may be paid if training is being undertaken; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. BONKER, and Mr. ROYBAL):

H.R. 2163. A bill to revise and extend the Older American Indian Grant Program under the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 2164. A bill to advance the national prosperity and welfare, to establish a Department of Science and Technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WOLPE):

H.R. 2165. A bill to advance the national prosperity, quality of life, and welfare, to establish a National Policy and Technology Foundation, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 2166. A bill to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. WHITTAKER):

H.R. 2167. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to assure sufficient resources to pay benefits under that act, to increase the maximum daily benefit provided under that act, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LELAND, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. TAUKE):

H.R. 2168. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to limit the dispensing of certain drugs by practitioners; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.J. Res. 250. Joint resolution designating the week beginning October 25, 1987, as "National Adult Immunization Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLORIO:

H.J. Res. 251. Joint resolution designating July 2, 1987, as "National Literacy Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.J. Res. 252. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Federal aid for refugee assistance programs should not be reduced, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H.J. Res. 253. Joint resolution designating the week of June 1 through June 7, 1987, as "National Polio Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.J. Res. 254. Joint resolution to designate the month of November 1987 as "National Diabetes Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. TALLON, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LELAND, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. RITTER, Mr. RUSSO, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LENT, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. ROE, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.J. Res. 255. Joint resolution designating the third week in May 1988 as "National Tourism Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself and Mr. SHUMWAY):

H.J. Res. 256. Joint resolution designating October 20, 1987, as "Leyte Landing Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.J. Res. 257. Joint resolution designating the week beginning November 29, 1987, as "National Home Care Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COURTER (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WEBER, Mr. ROE, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MACK, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the construction of a new chancery building in Moscow; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KOLBE (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

H. Res. 149. Resolution relating to the abolition of the compensatory financing facility; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. BUSTAMANTE and Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 17: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 18: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. YATES, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 20: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SABO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARR, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. OLIN, and Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 21: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SABO, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. OLIN, and Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 39: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 47: Mr. MANTON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MACKAY, and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 52: Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DICKS, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. GEPHARDT.

H.R. 70: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GRANT, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.R. 74: Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. TALLON, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. MFUME.

H.R. 176: Mr. COOPER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MRAZEK, Mrs. MYERS of Kansas, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 190: Mr. ST GERMAIN.

H.R. 281: Mr. BOSCO, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WISE, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. COELHO, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 372: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 442: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ATKINS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 457: Mr. FRANK and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 497: Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 515: Mr. BRENNAN.

H.R. 537: Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 570: Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 592: Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. ECKART, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. CONTE.

H.R. 593: Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland.

H.R. 627: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 637: Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 639: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 666: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 691: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 792: Mr. PRICE of Illinois.

H.R. 809: Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. GRANDY.

H.R. 925: Mr. FRANK, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DIXON, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.R. 950: Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 956: Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 971: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 975: Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. YATES, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 977: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 998: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ROBINSON, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 1009: Mr. ROBINSON.

H.R. 1048: Mr. BUECHNER and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 1078: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. COURTER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WEISS, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1103: Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1115: Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. WHITTAKER, and Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 1197: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DYSON, Mr. DAUB, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1201: Mr. WALGREN.

H.R. 1212: Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1228: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TALLON, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SHAW, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARR, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. KONNYU, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OLIN, Mr. KYL, Mr. HILER, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1234: Mr. OWENS of New York and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1235: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1241: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 1242: Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 1259: Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. LIVINGSTON Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1272: Mr. STARK, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 1301: Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OWENS, of New York, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 1310: Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 1340: Mr. SCHUETTE, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 1342: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 1371: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1417: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RITTER, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. VENTO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MFUME, Mr. WOLPE, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1425: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1432: Mr. HERTEL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. LEHMAN of California.

H.R. 1445: Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. LEATH of Texas.

H.R. 1452: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. VENTO, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. FISH, Mr. WISE, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. FAZIO.

H.R. 1481: Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 1516: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

H.R. 1517: Mr. GARCIA and Mr. DREIER of California.

H.R. 1588: Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1606: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. DENNY SMITH.

H.R. 1638: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 1639: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1707: Mr. LUJAN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1722: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 1723: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 1752: Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. DAUB, Mr. FISH, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 1755. Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. DYMALLY, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1772: Mr. MCEWEN.

H.R. 1807: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mr. OLIN.

H.R. 1823: Mr. HENRY, Mr. KYL, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 1834: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FRANK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. WHEAT, and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1873: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1874: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1885: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 1917: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. TALLON, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1941: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BADHAM, and Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 1960: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. PASHAYAN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1961: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. OBSESTAR, Mr. ROE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H.R. 2016: Mr. STARK, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2038: Mr. GRAY of Illinois, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 2059: Mr. SWIFT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. KASTENMEIER.

H.J. Res. 17: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. HENRY, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. TALLON, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COELHO, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. OLIN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GREEN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. DYSON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GREGG, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. BURTON, of Indiana, Mr. LEACH, of Iowa, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. DOWDY, of Mississippi, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FUSTER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. HEFNER and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.J. Res. 42: Mr. PEPPER.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.J. Res. 61: Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. GRANDY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.J. Res. 114: Mr. NATCHER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. STALLINGS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DYSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. HILER, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. PERKINS and Mr. WELDON.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. TORRES, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. CARR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr.

CAMPBELL, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. YATRON, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SABO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. BRENNAN.

H.J. Res. 150: Mr. COATS, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MACKAY, Mr. TORRES, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. REGULA, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. HOLLOWAY, and Mr. GARCIA.

H.J. Res. 165: Mr. DENNY SMITH.

H.J. Res. 180: Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.J. Res. 193: Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. STANGELAND.

H.J. Res. 201: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. VOLKMER Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. LUJAN.

H.J. Res 224: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOTT, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, and Mr. HOWARD.

H.J. Res. 228: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. RAY, Mr. EARLY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. KASICH, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. GINGRICH.

H.J. Res. 229: Mr. MATSUI.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ANDREWS Mr. THOMAS A. LUKEN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MAVROULES, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ROE, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. HERGER.

H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. SKELTON and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. MICA, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. JONTZ.

H. Con. Res. 79: Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. MICA, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PENNY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. JONTZ.

H. Res. 53: Mr. Wolpe.

H. Res. 110: Mr. THOMAS of Georgia and Mr. LANCASTER.

H. Res. 131: Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. WISE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. WALGREN, and Mr. HOYER.

H. Res. 140: Mr. LENT.

H. Res. 145: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FISH, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. SOLARZ.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

47. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to the completion of Navajo roads N-5 and N-36 on the Navajo Reservation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

48. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to State regulation of oil and gas exploration and production wastes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

49. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, relative to legally due use taxes on interstate sales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

50. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the establishment of a motor carrier administration; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

51. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to the erosion of Indiana's Lake Michigan shoreline; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

52. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, relating to the opening of the Arctic national wildlife refuge coastal plan to environmentally responsible oil and gas exploration, development and production; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

53. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, relative to a national program of commercial nuclear power development; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs; Energy and Commerce; and Science, Space, and Technology.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

33. By the SPEAKER: Petition of State Representative Ray Meyer, House of Representatives, Bismarck, ND, relative to fractional reserve banking practices; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

34. Also, petition of the Rio Grande Compact Commission, Santa Fe, NM, relative to appropriations for drainage works at Cochiti Pueblo, NM; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

35. Also, petition of the Chicago Urban League, Chicago, IL, relative to the proposed administrative rules of the Internal Revenue Service which redefine lobbying by public charities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3

By Mr. ROBINSON:

(Amendment to proposed trade bill.)

—At the appropriate place in the bill insert the following:

SEC. . STUDIES RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE POSTURE OF THE UNITED STATES.

(a)(1) The United States International Trade Commission shall conduct a study of the wage, rates, labor costs, and other labor practices of each foreign country which had surplus trade balance with the United States for calendar year 1984 that exceeded $4,000,000,000. Such study should consider labor practices existing throughout the economy of each such country and the labor practices of the industries in each such country that were responsible for such surplus trade balance.

(2) The study conducted under paragraph (1) shall include, with respect to each foreign country, analyses of—

(A) the effects of the labor practices of the foreign country on the competitive position of United States exports in foreign markets and in United States markets;

(B) the relationship between—

(i) the wages and other compensation paid to workers in United States industries producing goods that face substantial competition from products of the foreign country, and

(ii) the wages and other compensation paid to workers in the foreign country who produce such competitive products;

(C) the relationship, if any, between the labor practices of the foreign country and the cultural, religious, and political practices or values of the foreign country;

(D) the extent to which such labor practices are encouraged or enforced by the government of the foreign country;

(E) the history, duration, and extent of such labor practices; and

(F) the extent to which private or public forces that are anti-competitive encourage such labor practices.

(3) By no later than the date that is 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States International Trade Commission shall submit a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1) to the Congress, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce.

(b)(1) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce shall each conduct a separate investigation—

(A) to identify each of the labor practices discussed in the report submitted under subsection (a)(3) that—

(i) is illegal under existing laws of the United States or of any State, or

(ii) should be prohibited by all countries under an international labor law code;

(B) to determine what labor principles and rules should be included in an international labor law code; and

(C) to determine the issues involved in, and the prospects for achieving, the elimination of labor practices identified under subparagraph (A) through negotiations with foreign countries.

(2) By no later than 3 months after the date on which the report is submitted under subsection (a)(3), the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce shall each

submit to the Congress a report on the investigation conducted under paragraph (1).

(c) The Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce and the heads of such other Federal agencies as may be appropriate, shall undertake and complete a study, and submit a report thereon to the Congress, within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act regarding the extent of job loss in the United States that has occurred since 1981 as a result of actions by multinational corporations entailing—

(1) the relocation of corporate operations from the United States to foreign countries; and

(2) the reduction of corporate operations in the United States because of the establishment of operations abroad.

The report shall include recommendations for reversing the trend of eliminating or reducing operations in the United States by multinational corporations in favor of foreign operations, and an estimate of the job savings in the United States that would result if that trend can be substantially slowed.

(d)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury shall undertake and complete a study, and submit a report thereon to the Congress, within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act regarding the revenue loss to the Treasury of the United States since 1981 resulting from—

(A) the foreign tax credit;

(B) depreciation applied to new operations established in foreign countries; and

(C) the loss of jobs in the United States because of the elimination or reduction of operations in the United States by multinational corporations in favor of foreign operations.

(2) The report shall include—

(A) a breakdown by number and type of United States corporations that utilized the foreign tax credit during the period covered by the study; and

(B) the revenue loss under paragraph (1)(C) shall be calculated on the basis of income tax revenues and payments of unemployment compensation and trade adjustment assistance benefits.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

—Page 417, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 418, line 10.

H.R. 1777

By Mr. COURTER:

—Page 27, after line 13, insert the following new section:

SEC. 137. CHANCERY AT THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY COMPLEX IN MOSCOW.

(a) UNCOMPLETED UNITED STATES CHANCERY IN MOSCOW.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the uncompleted chancery building of the United States Embassy complex in Moscow is not secure and may be impossible to secure; and

(2) the chancery building should never be accepted by the United States.

(b) AMERICAN CONSTRUCTION OF NEW CHANCERY.—If and when a new United States chancery is constructed in Moscow, it shall be built under American supervision and exclusively with American plans, materials, and labor.

—page 27, after line 13, add the following:

SEC. 137. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN EMPLOYMENT AT UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR MISSIONS IN WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—(1) After September 30, 1989, no national of a Warsaw Pact country may be employed as a foreign national employee at United States diplomatic or consular missions in any Warsaw Pact country.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to any foreign national employee who is not permitted access to—

(A) United States embassy or consulate grounds, vehicles, or buildings which are sited in the compound of the embassy or consulate (including living quarters);

(B) the residence, wherever located, of the chief of mission or the deputy chief of mission.

(b) WARSAW PACT COUNTRY.—For the purposes of subsection (a), the term "Warsaw Pact country" means any country which is a signatory to the Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Co-operation (done at Warsaw, Poland on May 14, 1955; commonly referred to as the "Warsaw pact").

(c) ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR HIRING UNITED STATES PERSONS.—The Congress expresses its willingness to provide additional funds to the Department of State for the expenses of employing United States citizens to replace the indiviuals let go by reason of subsection (a).

H.R. 1827

By Mr. SCHUMER:

—Page 55, line 9, strike "$6,653,189,000" and insert $6,221,189,000".