HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, March 27, 1985*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Lift our eyes, O God, to see the hope and beauty of a better world; open our hearts, O God, to understand the needs of all people; encourage our minds, O God, to seek truth and honor; lead our hands, O God, to do those good works that glorify You and heal the hurt of our world. 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.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1239, URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR EMERGENCY FAMINE RELIEF AND RECOVERY IN AFRICA

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1239) making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, for emergency famine relief and recovery in Africa, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, NATCHER, OBEY, TRAXLER, MCHUGH, CONTE, KEMP, and Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1239, URGENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR EMERGENCY FAMINE RELIEF AND RECOVERY IN AFRICA

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 1239) making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, for emergency famine relief and recovery in Africa, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

STOP THE USE OF PLASTIC BULLETS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, when Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Britain visited this Chamber in February, she spoke sincerely of her desire and intention to reach a peaceful settlement of the Northern Ireland conflict. We should all applaud that sentiment and support her goal, but there is much that can be done to facilitate that process that Prime Minister Thatcher continues to ignore.

In recent years, violent clashes between British forces in Northern Ireland and angry demonstrators in Belfast and elsewhere have resulted in terrible and unnecessary losses. In seeking to control uneasy mobs or combat a threatening situation, British forces have resorted to the use of plastic and rubber bullets to break up a throng. These bullets, labeled innocuously as "crowd control" can and do maim and sometimes kill innocent people. In recent years, plastic bullets fired by British security forces have killed more than 10 people, some of them children under the age of 15. Some 160 others have been badly injured, some permanently, by these projectiles which can cause brain damage, internal injuries, and easily take out a person's eye.

Many of these civilians have been shot with plastic and rubber bullets in nonriot situations. That is inexcusable. Moreover, the British Home Secretary has described plastic bullets as "lethal." British forces do not use plastic bullets to control riots in England; their use has been exclusive to Northern Ireland. What's more, the European Parliament voted overwhelmingly in favor of a ban on the use of these bullets against civilians. Why do the British authorities continue to be intransigent on this issue?

The use in Northern Ireland of methods to control a situation that would be unacceptable in England may have many causes; it could be that the British security forces have a lower tolerance for or understanding of disturbances or volatile situations in foreign areas of the British Commonwealth. But it is untenable, when other means are at a security forces disposal for dealing with a riot situation, that the British police should continue to have these weapons as a first resort. It is too easy, Mr. Speaker, for plastic bullets to be used before a crowd becomes a riot, as the most effective way of dispersing what may be an orderly crowd.

The Congress has spoken out before on this issue, and yesterday I introduced a resolution calling on the Government of the United Kingdom to ban the use of plastic and rubber bullets against civilians. This is no more than a confirmation of what has been said by this Congress time and time again: That we abhor the use of excessive force against civilians, that we object to the indiscriminate use of lethal weapons by a government against its people, and that plastic and rubber bullets constitute an irresponsible and unnecessary use of lethal force in Northern Ireland.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort, to send a strong message to our oldest and most faithful ally, that because of our friendship and because of our common commitment to peace and peaceful coexistence, we hold them to the very highest standards of conduct. That conduct must not include using these weapons against the civilians of Northern Ireland. Peace cannot come from without until peace is the standard within.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO GRANT LORI BURR, OF EL PASO, FULL U.S. CITIZENSHIP

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to grant Lori Burr, of El Paso, full U.S. citizenship.

Lori Burr was born in Mexico on April 30, 1966, and was abandoned by her natural mother. She was adopted immediately by a missionary, Mr. William Burr, and his wife, in May 1966, and Lori has been their daughter ever since. They believed that they had legally adopted Lori, and, until this time, there had never been any question about the legality of the adoption.

When Lori applied for a Social Security card, the Immigration and Naturalization Service challenged her citizenship and is now preparing to deport

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

her to Mexico despite the fact that she has no other family and is without any relatives in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, is it justice to tear apart the Burr family by deporting Lori, who grew up in the United States, was raised since infancy by American parents, and who has never known anything except the American way of life?

Surely, we cannot let bureaucratic redtape stand in the way of justice. Let us see if we can make the wheels of government turn on behalf of those who need its help the most.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House and in the Judiciary Committee to support this bill.

U.S. COMPANIES SHOULD HAVE RIGHT TO PURCHASE TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT IN JAPAN

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, in the Saturday past Washington Post, the following headline appeared: "Japanese phone negotiations seen making little progress."

The article goes on to point out that an internal U.S. document notes "few aims achieved."

I think it is outrageous that there is even a question about the right of the U.S. companies to bid and participate in the sale of telecommunications equipment in Japan. In the past year, 30 percent of the total trade deficit of almost $37 billion, the United States was incurred with Japan.

□ 1210

Japanese manufacturers sold about 1.8 million automobiles in the United States, to say nothing of millions and millions of dollars worth of electronics, and yet they want to deny U.S. firms even a miniscule right to participate in the telecommunications market.

These are examples of nontariff barriers that are constantly erected against the companies that would sell into the Japanese market. I think it is very typical of agreeing to do nothing or agreeing to do something and then erecting barriers to make it impossible to achieve the objectives.

It is about time that we no longer tolerate this kind of conduct. We should either say to the Japanese open up your markets or risk being closed out of ours. Free trade must be fair trade.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 885

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Congressman GERRY SIKORSKI's name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of the bill, H.R. 885, the Professional Franchise Community Sports Team Protection Act.

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

There was no objection.

PATRICIA ROBERTS HARRIS

(Ms. MIKULSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the House's attention that today is the funeral of a very gallant woman: Former Secretary of Housing and also Health and Human Services, Patricia Harris.

On behalf of the people of Baltimore, I would like to express to the Harris family our deep and heartfelt sympathy. Mrs. Harris was an example of what the American dream was all about. The daughter of a railroad porter, she pulled herself up by her own bootstraps, pursuing an academic career, and then obtaining a law degree from Howard University to go on and be the dean of law at Howard University, and also to become an ambassador and then as Secretary of not one, but two, Cabinet posts.

In the process of self-help and self-reliance, she wanted to institutionalize those concepts, and we in Baltimore thank her for the kind of administration she provided, whether through the tools that she developed that enabled a great city like Baltimore to renew itself and revitalize ourselves.

We thank Mrs. Harris for her contribution which will be long lasting.

THE COMFORTS OF INDOOR PLUMBING

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

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, I grew up on the Montana prairie and freeze branded vividly into my mind and elsewhere is the early morning 100 yard dash to a place of repose called an outhouse, so I appreciate first hand the comforts of indoor plumbing.

But all comforts aside, I read with amazement and mortification a story in this morning's paper which indicated the Government is not only considering building Indian housing with no indoor bathrooms, but that these bathrooms cost about $24,000 per home.

Who's building these things? General Dynamics?

Without question these homes should contain indoor plumbing, but without question it should cost far under $24,000 to do so.

What's going on here? The Indian Health Service, Health and Human Services Department, and Bureau of Indian Affairs may suffer from the "Pentagonese" procurement syndrome, which may merit a checkup by the GAO.

Something smells here; and the odor is worse than the privy out back.

THE MEDICARE TRUST FUND

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

Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I read in this morning's Washington Post that the Medicare trust fund, which has been in a severe nose dive, is now recovered and is flying high. I wonder why this has taken place because I have been told for the past several years that if something was not done, this trust fund, in the most pessimistic views, would be out of money by 1988, and most optimistically, by 1992.

Is this trust fund suddenly pulled out because it is accumulating so much money at the expense of some 30 million senior citizens in this country and those who are disabled by increasing their copayments and their deductible? Or is it because we now have prospective reimbursement? Or is it because we have a freeze on physician fees? Or is it because it is being done at the expense of the private sector now?

It really looks good to have this trust fund have so much money. What kind of economic assumptions are being used to say that this is actually what is going to be taking place?

I recall in 1977 that we were told after increasing the Social Security tax that that system would be solvent until the year 2030. Mr. Speaker, I really question and will look forward to seeing what the trustees are going to tell us about this when we receive their report, which I believe will be some time in the month of April.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Senate Budget Committee approved a budget that requires senior citizens to share in the task of reducing the Federal deficit by forgoing next year's cost-of-living adjustment. Such an action would save about $5 billion in the first year and more in succeeding years, however, we would be losing far more in terms of sacrificing the security and health of the majority of our seniors.

The Social Security COLA was enacted in 1972 to protect the purchasing power of benefits. It is the only means that retirees have to compen-

sate for the rising medical and general living expenses that eat away more and more of their income every year. With these expenses as well as high utility and heating bills, senior citizens in my district are at times barely able to maintain a decent standard of living; denying them next year's COLA will push many into poverty.

The American Association of Retired Persons provides some staggering statistics on the economic status of older Americans which merit close attention and further prove my point. For example, the median elderly household income is only half that of the nonelderly and over 2 million older persons or 8 percent of the elderly population are in the near poverty category, placing them in an extremely precarious financial situation.

Mr. Speaker, if the deficit is to be reduced, those factors which are actually causing the deficit must be addressed and Social Security is not one of those factors. My constituents have suffered enough through previous budget cuts—why intensify their hardship by unfairly forcing them to solve the deficit?

STUDENT AID CUTS MUST BE REJECTED

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the administration's proposals to gut our Federal student aid programs takes a direct hit at educational opportunity for hundreds of thousands of students.

To demonstrate the real life impact of these proposals upon students and the schools they attend—consider what happens at just one school—Mercy College in New York:

The proposal to eliminate loans for those with incomes above $32,500 would deny loans to 720 students, 24 percent of enrollment, totaling $1.2 million;

The proposed $4,000 megacap on all aid would affect 200 students, 4 percent of total enrollment, totaling $150,000;

Zero funding of campus-based programs would hit 100 students, 2 percent of enrollment, for a total of $125,000;

Denying Pell grants, NDSL's and college work-study to those above $25,000 affects 1,600 students—with a loss of $1.6 million; and

Failure to pay the full amount authorized for Pell grants by Congress last year hits 5,000 students, 66 percent of enrollment, for a total loss of $1 million.

The budget resolution adopted by the House should reject these proposals—the impact on one campus would be intolerable—the impact on all schools would spell the death knoll for educational opportunity.

51-059 O-86-24 (Pt. 5)

MEDICARE AREA WAGE INDEX

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

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the House, I have served in this body going on 11 years and during that time I have had my share of disagreements and confrontations with the Federal bureaucracy. But I do not remember when a department has so flagrantly demonstrated its arrogance and disregard for congressional intent than what we have witnessed in past months over the Department of Health and Human Services' refusal to correct inequities in the Medicare prospective payment formula.

The inequities in the formula—specifically the indexes used to adjust for differences in area wages—have resulted in rural hospitals being shorted millions of dollars in Medicare reimbursements. The situation threatens to close the doors of many rural hospitals, leaving rural Medicare beneficiaries without access to community-based hospital services and endangering the overall availability of quality health care in rural America.

We have lots of serious problems out in farm and ranch country right now, and there is no excuse for letting one problem go uncorrected when the means is there to set it right—and when Congress has mandated that it be set right!

In the Deficit Reduction Act enacted last July, Congress recognized the serious flaws in the wages indexes and directed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop revised indexes, and we mandated she report back to use within 30 days. Well, that deadline came and went months ago, and since then we have had nothing more than lame excuses, broken promises, and missed deadlines.

HHS has put the blame on Congress, on the hospitals, on unreliable data. We've listened to excuse after excuse about the need to verify data. Well, that data has been checked, double-checked, and checked again. Now we are supposed to buy the argument that separate rulemaking to implement the revised indexes as soon as possible is unreasonable and would compromise the public's right to offer informed comment on the revised indexes. HHS says sorry, you'll have to wait until October 1, 1985.

I say enough is enough. We in Congress have been patient, we have been accommodating, and we have been cooperative. It is time for HHS to produce the goods. I ask for the support of my colleagues in demanding HHS immediately issue the revised wage index report and put in progress the rulemaking process that will result in rural hospitals being reimbursed fairly from Medicare.

Thank you.

□ 1220

FREEDOM DOES NOT COME FREE

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, the President won a tough vote on the MX yesterday. It passed because our chief arms negotiator reminded us of the realities of dealing with the Soviet Union. Do not deal from weakness, he said. Do not give up something without getting something in return, he said.

These arguments were good enough to win, but barely. Frankly, a problem facing and hurting defense support is the hypocrisy in the administration's position that while we need a strong, expensive national defense, we do not have to pay for it.

Let me say to the President again that he cannot keep offering the Pentagon a blank check. A $300 billion defense bill demands better management, demands multibid contracts, demands a unified chain of command, demands weapons built on time at a price and performance advertised, demands consideration of a peacetime draft, demands a sense of priorities, demands the full support of our allies.

As we cut back on all Federal spending, the best we ought to do for the Pentagon is a freeze. If the President wants to spend more, he should ask the American people to pay for it.

Mr. President, if there is no such thing as a free lunch, then surely there is no such thing as a free army. Freedom does not come free. Let us stop pretending that it does.

WORLD AWAITS GORBACHEV REACTION TO KILLING OF AMERICAN SOLDIER

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

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, a new, younger generation has taken over in the Soviet Union now that Mikhail Gorbachev is the head of the Communist Party.

The whole world is watching now to see if it will mean a change in Soviet goals, attitudes, philosophy, and behavior.

A few days ago, an American soldier, Maj. Arthur Nicholson, was murdered in cold blood by the Soviets in East Germany.

He was left to bleed to death from his gunshot wounds, and the Soviets prevented another American from administering first aid to the dying officer.

What is Gorbachev's reaction?

What does the new generation of Soviet leadership have to say about this crime?

The whole world is watching to see whether Mr. Gorbachev will call this action a crime, or whether he believes it was just.

To date, all the talk about the new generation of Soviet leadership has been speculation. There is no evidence that Gorbachev favors free speech, that he opposes invasion of Afghanistan, or that he protested when KAL 007 was shot down.

The world awaits his reaction to this atrocity. So far, he has done nothing to distinguish himself from his Stalinist predecessors, and there is regrettably no evidence that he has any plans to do so in the near future.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED STATES AS DEBTOR NATION

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, there will be another anniversary this year, a first anniversary, the first anniversary of the year when the United States becomes a debtor nation.

The United States trade deficit has tripled in the last 3 years and is forecast to be, at the end of the current year, $135 billion—$135 billion which hangs over America like a poisonous cloud of noxious fumes that many are unable to see, a cloud that affects our economy, that puts farmers out of business, that closes down shoe factories and textile mills. While it is invisible to some people, there is an inextricable connection between our trade deficits and our economic depression, especially in the farm community.

Today, in response to the trade crisis and the mounting crisis, the gentleman from Washington, DON BONKER, will be leading a series of special orders on the subject of the coming trade crisis in America. I invite all Members to join in those special orders beginning today.

POLL CLOSING LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that the time difference between the coasts has prejudiced voting in the West.

The networks' agreement of last year is a valuable first step, but we cannot stop there.

A number of my colleagues have introduced legislation to set a national poll closing time, and I commend them for their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed these proposals, and today I am introducing legislation, with my colleagues, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. MARTINEZ, which is comprised of the best elements of all of them. Our bill simply requires all polls in the continental United States to close at 10:30 p.m. eastern standard time.

This allows the States the flexibility to set their own opening time.

This provides the networks with postelection prime time coverage in all regions.

This provides hours that will maximize voter turnout.

And this treats all regions of the country equally.

I urge my colleagues to join in the bipartisan approach to fair and flexible election reform.

□ 1230

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

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

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee today in introducing the National Infrastructure Act. This important legislation is an innovative, practical, long-term investment in the future of our country. For years, we have pursued a policy of ignoring the maintenance of our highways, bridges, sewage, and water supply systems. Only the periodic crises—bridge or tunnel collapses, overloaded sewer systems which cause raw sewage to run directly into rivers, water supply systems which collapse due to age and excessive demand—make headlines. The continuing crises, the leaking pipes which cause the loss of 15 percent of the water supply in St. Louis and 25 percent in Boston, receive little public notice. Similarly, renovation and extension of sewer facilities is often ignored until a locality discovers that it can no longer attract new industry or build new homes because of outdated facilities which are at or above capacity.

Recently, I received a letter from a constituent which stated the situation very well. She said:

> I would suggest that some national program for repairing the infrastructure is long overdue. You and all other national legislative representatives and the administration need to be doing some long-range planning as well as immediate short-term planning which too often turns out to be a Band-Aid/tinkering approach that does not recognize and treat the interrelatedness of persons and institutions in our country. It would give me great pleasure to see the congressional Representatives from Missouri take the lead in such long range national planning.

Mr. Speaker, I could not put the challenge better than Ms. Hudzinski did. I am proud to represent constituents who are concerned about our future and express that concern so eloquently. And I am particularly pleased to fulfill her request by joining Chairman HOWARD today in the introduction of the National Infrastructure Act.

WISDOM IS KEY TO TOMORROW'S MX VOTE

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the vote coming up tomorrow on releasing the funding for the production of the 21 MX missiles presents the perfect opportunity for this House to extricate the President from the trap he has dug for himself and the American negotiators in Geneva.

Mr. Kempelman has now gone back to Geneva with the demonstration of resolve he sought from the Congress. There is no need to appropriate or spend the money. Let us keep it fenced in. In that way, having demonstrated resolve, we can now demonstrate wisdom.

All of humanity may ultimately be grateful for such an action. Having survived 40 years in the nuclear era, we have no guarantee that we will continue to be as lucky.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues who voted to authorize MX funding yesterday to vote against releasing the MX funds in the vote we take tomorrow.

YESTERDAY'S VOTE WAS ON GENEVA, TOMORROW'S ON MX

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

Mr. MARKEY. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we voted to authorize 21 additional MX missiles. We voted to give Max Kempelman $1.5 billion to put on the table at Geneva to serve as a bargaining chip with the Soviet Union. We have authorized the money for him. We have to decide now whether we are going to actually appropriate the money and produce the missiles after we have given him the bargaining chip of money on the table.

We have given the President the bargaining chip. Let us not fuel the arms race now by producing the MX missiles. We have got another vote tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we voted on Geneva. Tomorrow we vote on the MX.

AMERICA NEEDS PROGRAMS FOR BOTH UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND JOB TRAINING

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as the Members know so well, over 300,000 American workers are threatened with the loss of unemployment benefits just next week, and last week the President expressed his opposition to extending FSC benefits because, as he said, the place now for people who are having problems is our job training program.

What the President did not say last week is that he has proposed cutting in half that program, one-half for this year and one-half for next year.

Mr. Speaker, we need both a decent unemployment compensation program and an effective job training program, and the sad fact is that under the President's approach we will have neither.

WHO PAYS THE BILL FOR NEWLY AUTHORIZED MX MISSILES?

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the President now has his MX missiles authorized. I guess the question I would like to ask the President is: "How are you going to pay for them?"

We have a country in which, when you buy something, you are normally expected to pay the bill. My guess is that the President will once again say, "Well, we'll charge this. We'll charge it to our kids or our grandkids."

Mr. Speaker, I would say this to the President: "Mr. President, you have added about $600 billion to the Federal debt with your proposals. The Congress hasn't had the courage to resist your proposals for deficits, but at some point somebody has to pay the bill. You ask for a missile we don't need and you want us to spend money we don't have. You weaken the American economy with these kinds of proposals, Mr. President. We ask you to rethink your policies that ask us to spend money we don't have on something we don't need."

UNEMPLOYED AMERICANS MAY BE VICTIMS OF CRUEL APRIL FOOLS' DAY JOKE

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

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, next Monday is April 1, April Fools' Day. We will be playing a cruel joke next April 1 on 340,000 unemployed Americans who are currently collecting Federal supplemental compensation and who will be cut off immediately. They will wake up and find they are entirely without benefits.

These are people who are not unemployed by choice. These are people who have had jobs for many years, often for 20 or 30 years for the same employer. These are people who desperately want jobs but must seek them in communities where the unemployment rate is 8, 10, 12, or 14 percent.

Mr. Speaker, we must not break faith with these people. There is a last-minute effort being made in the Unemployment Compensation Subcommittee to mark up a bill and have it ready for us so that we can continue the eligibility of these unemployed workers. I ask my colleagues to join us in that effort.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 181) to approve the obligation and availability of prior year unobligated balances made available for fiscal year 1985 for the procurement of additional operational MX missiles, and that I may be permitted to include certain tables and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MX MISSILE

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Public Law 98-473, 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 joint resolution (H.J. Res. 181) to approve the obligation and availability of prior year unobligated balances made available for fiscal year 1985 for the procurement of additional operational MX missiles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1237

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 joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 181, with Mr. KILDEE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the joint resolution is dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to section 101(h), Public Law 98-473, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] will be recognized for 5 hours and the gentleman ffrom Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] will be recognized for 5 hours.

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues may wonder why we have to continue to debate a matter we have debated for the last 2 days concerning the MX missile. Today's measure is completely different from what we have debated during these last 2 days.

□ 1240

Yesterday we voted on the question of authorizing the release of the fencing of funds for the procurement of 21 MX missiles at a cost of $1.5 billion.

The question of the MX being a bargaining chip and the question of its effect on the Geneva talks was fully debated, so yesterday by a close margin of 219 yeas to 213 nays we voted to release the authorization of that $1.5 billion for the 21 missiles.

Today and tomorrow we will be debating the question whether it is absolutely necessary to appropriate the money at this time to commence the procurement of those missiles. As I pointed out yesterday and I will again go into it in greater detail, the actual expenditure of that $1.5 billion at this time is not necessary, because it cannot be spent and it will not be spent and missiles funded in fiscal year 1984 will be delivered out through May 1987 so the production line will remain open.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to House Joint Resolution 181, which is the actual funding of the 21 MX missiles in unobligated balances of $1.5 billion.

I am sure everyone in this distinguished body is in favor of a strong national defense, but I believe there are many different opinions as to what constitutes a strong national defense.

The preamble to the Constitution of the United States reads as follows:

> We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity * * *

Et cetera.

The preamble states that we should "provide for the common defense" and "promote the general welfare." Our forefathers felt it was equally important to maintain a needed defense and to adequately support the needs of the people of this great Nation. If our

people are not properly educated, our farmers not assisted in producing needed commodities, our financial matters not properly balanced, and our senior citizens not properly taken care of, we will have no strong national defense. The people and the economy of our Nation provide as much for our national defense as do more tanks, guns, and missiles. I personally believe that spending $25 billion for vulnerable MX missiles does not contribute to our national defense. This money could be better used to further the needs of our youths, farmers, senior citizens, and the American people in general.

Let me point out to my colleagues that 2 years ago when we were considering the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1983 on the floor of this same House of Representatives, we, the Congress, overwhelmingly rejected funds for the initial procurement of the first five MX missiles. The administration had requested $1.5 billion for the procurement of nine MX missiles; however Congress only authorized $988 million for the procurement of five missiles. When the Defense appropriations bill was on the floor, I offered an amendment to delete all the funds for the procurement of MX missiles, and it was approved by a record vote of 245 yeas to 176 nays. The basic reason for this denial of procurement funds for the MX was that a basing mode had not been approved. The arguments at that time were that placing the MX in Minuteman silos was a nonoption because of their vulnerability. That has not changed. That is the exact situation today. No appropriate basing mode has been selected, and we should again reject the release of procurement funds overwhelmingly.

Last year we were told we had to build the MX because the Russians had broken off the talks in Geneva. Now we are told we must build the MX because the Russians have come back to Geneva.

Previously we were told that we had to build the MX because Minuteman silos were vulnerable. Now we are told we must build the MX to put it in Minuteman silos.

Previously we were told that we had to build the MX because there was a "window of vulnerability." Now we are told we must build the MX even though that "window" never existed.

Previously we were told that we had to build the MX because it could be used as a bargaining chip. Now we are told we must build it because it is not a bargaining chip.

The President has submitted a report which repeats the same old arguments, but which fails to answer the same old questions, and therefore fails to make the case that we need these procurement funds for the MX missile at this time.

How does buying more MX missiles and putting them in Minuteman silos solve the old vulnerability problem? The answer is that it does not. The President says so in his report when he admits that MX vulnerability, and I quote, "will be roughly equivalent to the Minuteman."

The reason for starting the MX in the first place, the claimed vulnerability of Minuteman silos, remains unaddressed. Buying more MX missiles changes nothing.

How does buying more MX missiles solve the old "attractive target" problem? The answer is that it does not. The President fails to address this question in his report. He fails to note that a 10-warhead MX in a vulnerable silo is a far more attractive target than a three warhead Minuteman in the same silo. He fails to do so even though General Scowcroft has admitted this in testimony before the Appropriations Committee.

How does buying more MX missiles solve the old problem of making the world safe? The answer is that it does not. The President believes that peace will be strengthened by adding 1,000 more nuclear warheads to our stockpile. Well, we already have 9,000 strategic nuclear warheads. Adding to a stockpile already beyond reason makes the world less, not more, safe from the threat of annihilation.

How does buying MX missiles address the old question of overall balance of forces? Again the answer is that it does not. The President says that he wants more MX missiles because "the asymmetry in ICBM's between the United States and Soviet strategic forces remains very much in their favor." The President is silent on SLBM's, sea launched ballistic missiles, because the asymmetry there is very much in our favor. The fact remains that there is approximate parity overall in strategic nuclear forces.

Mr. Chairman, the basic and overriding concern remains arms control and the reduction of nuclear weapons. Building more MX missiles takes us in the opposite direction. It keeps us locked in the same old trap of move and countermove, of build and build even more. It is the same discredited strategy that has brought us to the sorry state that we are in today.

The President says that building and deploying 100 MX missiles is consistent with U.S. arms control policy; but what is that policy? How can we say we are controlling arms by building more of them? In this Member's opinion, the way to control arms is to control them and the first step in reducing nuclear weapons is to stop building more of them.

The President says that we need to build and deploy 100 MX missiles to induce the Soviets to negotiate. There is nothing sacred about the number 100. The Scowcroft Commission spoke of deploying "on the order of 100 MX missiles," implying thereby that the number was not fixed.

I would point out that it was not too long ago that the Pentagon was telling us how vital it was to deploy 200 MX missiles. Mr. Chairman, we have already funded 21 missiles which are on contract and are to be delivered between May 1986 and May 1987. In other words, we already have 21 bargaining chips—bargaining chips which are not actually in our inventory until between 1 and 2 years from now. We need no more. If 21 MX missiles do not induce the Soviets to negotiate, by what logic will 42 MX missiles make them do so?

Also, keep in mind that during the last 3 or 4 years, Congress has provided research and development funding which has allowed the procurement of 20 research MX missiles. Seven of these missiles have been expended, but 13 of those missiles remain which could be used for deployment. In fact, in the conference report accompanying the fiscal year 1983 defense appropriation bill, the following language was included:

> The conferees note that the MX research and development program includes the acquisition of missiles. When both the House and Senate have approved a permanent basing mode, missiles which have been acquired under the research and development program may be deployed in the approved permanent basing mode. The conferees intend by this action to emphasize their firm commitment to modernization of our strategic nuclear forces.

□ 1250

My colleagues, I would like to call your attention to this chart. In 1983 and other years, as I have stated before, we appropriated funds for 20 research and development missiles, of which 13 missiles remain to be delivered in the next 3 years. In calendar 1985, we will only receive four of those R&D missiles.

We will receive in calendar year 1986, six more missiles. The balance of those missiles, three will not be delivered until May 1987. That is the missiles which we have funded back in 1983 and other years.

In fiscal year 1984, we appropriated $2.1 billion for 21 missiles. None of them, none of them are going to be produced in calendar year 1985.

In calendar 1986, we get the first one in May, and we get a total of 12 missiles for the entire year. We do not get the balance of the fiscal year 1984 funded missiles until May 1987.

So how can we say if we do not free this $1.5 billion we are cancelling the MX? The funds are there. The line is open until May 1987. At any given time in view of the fact that we have authorized the release of the funds yesterday, we can appropriate the

funds for these missiles. We do not have to appropriate the funds at this point in time.

There has been a question as to whether we are committed to the modernization of our strategic forces, and there can be no doubt that sufficient bargaining chips are already funded to convince the Soviet Union that the United States means business. To further this commitment, the Congress is supporting, and has funded, as I have just pointed out, the MX missile, the Midgetman missile, the air-launched cruise missile, the sea-launched cruise missile, the ground-launched cruise missile, the Poseidon, the Trident I and Trident II missiles, the Pershing II missile, the B-1 bomber, the advanced technology bomber, the Trident submarine, warhead and nuclear devices for the various systems, and modernization of the Minuteman missile force.

Congress has supported the President in most of his strategic programs and the Soviet Union is aware of this increased and continuing support.

The President says that each Member of Congress should join him in a bipartisan, united effort to approve funds for additional MX missile procurement, but this is the same President who says his budget deficits are entirely the fault of the Congress. This is the same President who says it is up to the Congress to cut irresponsible spending. He is the same President who demands that Congress "rein in the budget monster."

Mr. Chairman, we have already spent far too much of our Treasury on a vulnerable weapon of questionable military value. Do we have an extra $25 billion lying around to finance this complete missile system when the deficit will exceed $200 billion this current fiscal year and will continue to mount in the years to come?

We have already funded enough MX missiles to induce the Soviets to negotiate. And we were told last year when this House passed the fencing amendment that if the Russians come back to negotiate we do not have to unfence the money, but those same people now are saying that we have to make the funds available.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, on yesterday the House voted to allow the authorization of $1.5 billion to fund the procurement of 21 additional operational MX missiles. Today and tomorrow the House will be considering House Joint Resolution 181 which actually makes available the $1.5 billion in unobligated balances for the procurement of these missiles.

I contend these funds should not be released at this time. The House has shown its resolve in supporting the President on this issue by approving the authorization yesterday. The actual funds to carry the additional MX procurement forward should be held up as we watch the progress of the arms negotiations in Geneva.

If there is no progress made, these funds could be made available later because these funds will not be spent. They cannot be spent until 1986 or 1987.

The unobligated balances are fenced and cannot be used for any other purpose except for these 21 missiles. Why not wait to see what results from the Geneva negotiations before committing the American taxpayers to the expenditure of additional billions of dollars for a missile of questionable value when there are so many unquestionable needs in our society?

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 14 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say at the outset that I believe the House yesterday conducted a debate that was in the highest traditions of this body. Members on both sides of the aisle, with deeply felt emotions and feelings, addressed the merits of unfencing the money for the MX missile. And the House worked its will in the finest tradition after a long, lengthy discussion.

It is my own view that we do not need 10 hours once again to replow that ground. I hope that as we work through the day that perhaps some agreement can be made and Members can be given previous advice about what might happen in order that we do not redo the entire area that was done yesterday.

Let me take a moment to pay my compliments to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], who I thought spoke eloquently yesterday in this House, and very movingly, and who was a cosponsor of this resolution with me that is before us today. I am very grateful to him.

I want to address myself to one question, and that is this argument which seems to be surfacing from some place that since we authorized the money yesterday we do not need to approve it today. Well, I think I can point out initially that the people making that argument to you today are the very same people who yesterday said we do not need to authorize the MX missile, period. The very same faces that are aligned to try to prevent the appropriation were aligned to prevent the authorization.

Do not undo the good and hard effort that was made yesterday to make sure that our colleagues at the negotiating table understand where this Congress is. We started to send a message yesterday. Today we deliver the goods. This is when we appropriate the dollars.

May I say to my friends, this is the day when we follow the will of the House as expressed yesterday when it authorized money for this purpose.

So I want to urge my colleagues not to be dissuaded by that, to see who is making the argument, to recognize that they are the same people who would like to stop the MX period.

I need to address myself as well to some comments that were made by my distinguished chairman, my good friend from New York, Mr. ADDABBO, who conducts this subcommittee with great skill, and that is the chart that he put up and the argument that he made that we had funded a series of MX missiles through a given calendar year and, therefore, we did not need to appropriate money in this bill.

My friends, nothing could be further from the facts. The facts are that while it is accurate to say that there will be delivery of MX's into the future, as indeed there ought to be, it takes 3 years to build an MX. If you do not appropriate the money today, the front end of the production line for the MX is dead next month.

□ 1300

The brains of the MX missile is the guidance system. Any missile without a guidance system is not a missile, it is nothing.

If you fail to appropriate the money today the contractor who makes the guidance system is out of business next month. Let me say to you once again it is an effort and a skillful one by those who are opposed to the missile to undo what you did yesterday. Yesterday you voted to produce 21 additional MX missiles. If you stop the production line, you do not end up with an additional 21 missiles, you end up back with 21 and some R&D missiles. It is a little bit technical but, my colleagues, you need to know that if you stop this line of production you have stopped what you voted to do yesterday and you are back to square one with an uninterrupted line, with contractors and vendors and people working all over this country contributing their best efforts to build an MX missile which results in delivery 3 years subsequent to the date of order to the people who are ordering, in this case the Department of Defense.

So I would ask you please to focus on that issue and to recognize the importance of appropriating this money to carry out what you did yesterday and to keep the production of the MX at 21 additional for our negotiators in Geneva.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, when he concludes? Would the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I only wanted to respond, once the gentleman had concluded his remarks, but I appreciate the gentleman yielding at this time. I only want to comment with respect to his earlier remarks with respect to the lack of ne-

cessity for going forward with 10 hours of debate on the appropriations process. I would not challenge the gentleman's assertion that on the last 2 days this body debated in the finest tradition of this House. But I do believe that we were not in a position, given the 10 hours' time constraint when Members are asking for an allocation of 2 minutes, 3 minutes, 4 minutes, 5 minutes. It does not lend itself to an open and honest and free exchange of debate. What it does is create a procession of speeches. It may be a pro speech and a con speech, a Republican speech and a Democratic speech, but nevertheless certainly this gentleman found himself in the incredible position of not being able to yield to one of my distinguished colleagues on his side of the aisle who serves on the Armed Services Committee with me. We do not tend to agree politically but we have always yielded to each other in the hope that we could achieve a level of intellectual honesty.

Mr. McDADE. Let me say to my friend that I was not aware of individuals who were denied time yesterday or could not get time under the 10-hour rule. Let me say that we would be glad to cooperate and facilitate their appearance on the floor today to debate. It is my feeling that a full 10-hour rerun, so to speak, of all the issues involving the MX were laid out in front of the body by Members on both sides; I am not aware of many issues or any issues, this Member is not aware of any issues that were not discussed.

If individual Members want to express themselves, I think perhaps we can work something out to try to make sure that happens today. If the gentleman will let me know who did not get time, we will try to see that they get time.

My point is, may I say to my colleague, that the issues were addressed, the body made an informed judgment and it is now time to move on. I do not think we need to go back to all of those same issues.

Mr. DELLUMS. Would the gentleman yield again?

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

But this gentleman is making a little different point. It is not that the issues were not presented but that we did not have the possibility, given the structure of the discussion, to allow each other to challenge the assertions that we made. We were able to present our argument but we did not have time to expose our argument to critical analysis and critical debate and free exchange.

This, as the gentleman points out, is an incredibly important marketplace of ideas and when we cannot challenge each other in the marketplace of ideas and it is simply a procession of points of view that never get a chance to be debated, where critical analysis can be applied, then I am not sure it is a debate. Maybe it is more speech making than it is a debate.

This gentleman likes the intellectual and political challenge of debate. I am saying that perhaps these 2 days gives us an opportunity to actually exchange with each other.

For example, I would like to debate LES ASPIN on the MX missile. I did not have an opportunity to do that, because he spoke, we spoke, someone else spoke. So that is the problem.

Mr. McDADE. Let me say to my colleague that I am sure he and his chairman have had a lot of debates in their committee and here on the floor. I encourage them to have as many as they wish.

I believe that the body performed in a way that is consistent with what it is supposed to do; that is, namely, address the issues, put forward those issues as strongly as we can, and then work our will. That is I believe what we did.

Mr. DELLUMS. The gentleman has been very generous and very kind and I appreciate and respect my colleague.

Mr. McDADE. I am delighted to at any time yield to my colleague—almost any time.

Mr. Chairman, the need for the MX militarily has been documented, in my judgment, for some time. It has been documented because the Soviets have seen fit to deploy over 600 MX class missiles which have prompt hard target kill capability. We do not. That means that our entire LCBM force, a critical part of our triad, is put at a risk which we do not present to the Soviet Union.

That, my friends, is a term that some people call a symetrical, it is a term that people call destabilizing. What it means to me is that it puts at risk a triad which has kept the peace, a system that thoughtful people have worried over for almost half a century and that has kept peace in the world. And the stakes are that if we lose any one of those legs of that triad to an advantage on the Soviets' behalf, then we risk the kind of destabilizing conditions that will lead to nuclear war, because the premise of deterrence is parity or equality. Neither side, if deterrence is to be effective, can have an overwhelming advantage over the other. And today our land-based missiles are at risk, our command and control is at risk; theirs is not.

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

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HYDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully to words of the very distinguished subcommittee chairman from New York and he said something that struck me as very important. He said the way to control nuclear weaponry is to stop building them; the way to reduce nuclear missiles is to stop building them.

That had a great plausible ring to it. It really clutched my innermost soul.

But then I thought that yesterday I heard some other speaker say that the Soviet Union has 308 intercontinental ballistic missiles called SS-18. Somebody said they are twice the size of the MX. They have a range of 6,000 nautical miles. They are MIRV'd warheads. Then they have got another array called the SS-17. Then they have got one so-called SS-19.

Then I read a little bit more and I found that they have two new missiles they are testing, the SS-X-24 and the SS-X-25.

I could not help but wonder about the logic that says the way to get reduction of missiles is to stop building them.

Now, a great effort is being made on the part of some Members of this body to get us to stop building missiles. I wonder what leverage we are going to have with our adversaries who have continued to build and build and build and build.

Harold Brown, Secretary of Defense under the previous administration, said "When we build, they build; and when we stop building, they build."

Now, how do we persuade them to stop building, to get in line with the marvelous thought that the gentleman from New York had?

I am going to wait and I am going to listen to every minute of the debate today and maybe I will get a hint of how we can stop them from building, especially if we stop building and modernizing our antique intercontinental ballistic missile system.

□ 1310

Mr. DICKS. Will the gentleman yield on that very point?

Mr. McDADE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the major points made by the Scowcroft Commission. I do not think there is any doubt that in their analysis of our strategic posture, they were troubled about some of the issues surrounding MX and the difficulty of finding a survivable basing mode.

But one thing they said very clearly:

It has been, 12 years since we last deployed a new land based ICBM. We have been struggling with this issue since then.

During that same timeframe, the Soviets have deployed seven new ICBM's, 648 heavy ICBM's, SS-18's and SS-19's, which have an aggregate of 5,000 MX-quality warheads aimed at this

country, at our ICBM's, our command and control, and our leadership.

Now at some point we have to demonstrate national resolve that a program that we have started and debated, can finally be completed. I will just tell the gentleman in the well. He knows this very well. The very people who were saying we do not need this because we will be for Midgetman, we will be for improving our submarine leg, we will be for new bombers; they are going to turn around the moment this progrm is dead and lead the fight against these systems. They will say "Well, we didn't know Midgetman was going to be quite that expensive." And, "Oh, no, we didn't really want those accurate missiles on submarines, either." And "We can't afford the B-1."

So at some point I think those of us in this Congress who are concerned about defense and national security have to stand up and level with the American people. It is not good policy to keep spending $10 billion of their money without putting something of significance into the field.

In my view, getting this 21 missiles for a total of 42 will give us what I consider a very substantial and significant military force to deploy. I happen to think that 21 missiles—that is all we have in the procurement stage now, represents a token force.

Now the administration in 1981 talked about 40 missiles, to be deployed in existing silos.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McDADE. I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKS. The administration talked about a program of about 40 missiles to be deployed in existing silos in 1981, and that we should examine how to get increased survivability for additional missiles.

Yesterday I heard all my friends here who talk about survivability saying, "We don't want this missile because it's vulnerable in existing silos." I disagree with this assertion because of synergism—there is no one foolish enough that he is going to attack our land-based ICBM's when we have 50 percent of our retaliatory force in submarines and 25 percent in bombers; no Soviet would be so foolish to launch a first strike.

My friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], I consider the father of synergism, talked about this in 1979. He and my colleague, TOM DOWNEY said it would be outrageous for a Soviet war planner to think about trying to strike our ICBM's.

Yesterday we heard it again, "But wait a minute now. If you are talking seriously about survivability and you want to spend $20 billion for the hardening of those silos, we're not for that."

So on the one hand they say we want survivability and this missile is flawed because of a lack of it, and then when we propose a way to make it survivable they say, no, that is too expensive and it is outrageous; we do not need it.

Now, I do not think you can have it both ways. I think if you want survivability, you are going to have to pay for it and we can do it. I happen to believe that about 3 years from now, we will have the technology in place to increase by about tenfold the hardening of these silos, and we can produce about a 50-percent rate of survivability. When ICBM's are viewed in isolation.

We are going to have to make a judgment at that point, whether we are prepared to invest that kind of resources. We may say that there are other priorities within the strategic budget; the Stealth bomber, the D-5, cruise missiles and advanced cruise missiles, that may have a higher priority, because we are all faced with the reality that the defense budget is going to be cut.

But since we have spent $10 billion, let us at least get a force in the field that has military significance. I happen to believe that once these 21 missiles are paid for—this is fiscal year 1985 money—once it is released, then we will have reached the threshold of a significant force.

I went to Geneva as an observer. I sat there for a week, I watched our negotiators, and I must tell you I am convinced that these people are serious about getting an arms control agreement. When we are only weeks into these negotiations—how can we pull the rug out from underneath the negotiators, out from underneath the President of the United States, out from underneath our NATO allies? We are facing the most unbelievable pressure from the Soviet Union in Europe and adverse public opinion about the NATO INF deployments.

How can we pull the rug out from under the entire alliance? I just happen to think it would be a serious mistake. I happen to believe that these missiles in existing silos, through perhaps not the best approach, is the only one that is viable. I think the best part of the Scowcroft conclusions, in my judgment, was that they threw out this notion of a window of vulnerability. They agreed with Mr. DELLUMS, they agreed with Mr. DOWNEY; they said "That's preposterous."

And it was a blow to the President and the Committee of the Present Danger who had talked about this before. And so, I think they put us on an intelligent, rational course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman had expired.

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman would yield me just a couple more minutes.

Mr. McDADE. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman for yielding additional time to me.

Mr. Chairman, what has worried me about this whole issue from the start is, how do we make some progress? How do we move from a position of not having an arms control agreement ratified in the last 10 years?

I happen to believe the only way we are going to get there is through bipartisanship, where sensible people work together for the national interest.

I must tell you when this President came to office, I was concerned about his track record on arms control. I was concerned about some of the people that he had in high official positions in this administration and their record on arms control. That is why I thought the recommendations in the Scowcroft report gave us the basis to move ahead and make some progress in this, the most important area of activity.

Mr. McDADE. I want to just interrupt my friend to tell him that that word, "bipartisanship" is a word that is important to all of us, and I want to offer my compliments to him because he has conducted himself through this entire matter in a very expert way; he is an expert member of the Defense Subcommittee; and in a thoroughly bipartisan way.

He has advanced the peace process that is taking place in Geneva, and may I say to my friend and colleague were he not a Member of this body, that may not be the case.

So I just want to compliment you for what you have done, and commend you on your statement.

Mr. DICKS. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and his continuing to yield to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say I still believe that the President, when he made the agreement to go along with the Scowcroft recommendations, he had to eat a little crow, because they did debunk the "window of vulnerability."

He said he would do two things: That he would pursue arms control vigorously and he would develop the small, single-warhead missile because the experts believe that is a more stable system down the road.

He said to us, and we have some reluctance about this—"Would you support the strategic modernization, the MX"—and we agreed to a certain extent to go along with some deploy-

ment of those MX missiles. We thought that was a good bargain, and give us the chance, hopefully, to make some progress.

I was not convinced in the first 2 years of this administration about their seriousness in arms control. I am convinced that the team they have in Geneva today wants to get an agreement, will fight for an agreement. I am convinced that the President is serious about arms control and wants to get an agreement; I think he can get an agreement through the Senate.

So in a sense we are faced with the same historic opportunity that was had during the Nixon administration, when we got most of the major arms control agreements enacted. Then we had a conservative President who had the faith of the American people in terms of his commitment to defense and national security. He presented agreements to the Senate that were ratified and are the basis for our whole arms control program today.

I believe the President has delivered on his part of Scowcroft. I think it is the responsibility, of those of us who believe in national defense, to help him at the start of these negotiations by going ahead with these 21 missiles.

I recognize that it is a very difficult choice for some because priorities are an issue, and the budget problems are serious. The deficit is a question that troubles many Members.

I just believe that supporting his position, hanging tough, is the way to get the arms control agreement that every American wants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McDADE. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

the CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McDADE. I thank my colleague for the contribution that he had made, and I want to reference back, in concluding my statement to my colleague from Illinois who indicated that there had been such tremendous growth in the Soviet ICBM force and the question of how we get some kind of handle on what they are doing in putting the world at risk.

The answer to that is the second major reason that I believe that we need to vote to appropriate this money today, and that is to advance the peace process which is taking place in Geneva.

Everyone in the Scowcroft Commission, representing many Secretaries of Defense, Secretaries of State, Directors of the CIA, were unanimous in their comment that there was no way to get a arms agreement with the Russians unless we built this missile; that there was no other candidate missile available in this decade to try to achieve arms control in Geneva except for the MX. Therefore without it, they said it was illusory—that is their word—to believe that we could ever achieve any kind of progress with the Soviets at Geneva.

They are right. I share that concern. I attended the meeting at the White House, as many of you did, when we heard our chief negotiator say, we have got to go ahead, or we are going to see ourselves delayed in Geneva; we are going to give something unilaterally to the Soviet Union which they will misinterpret as a lack of resolve, and we will see the peace process delayed, at the very least.

□ 1320

So I say to my colleague that the way for us to advance that process is to show our resolution, appropriate this money, and let our negotiators in Geneva know that as part of their bargaining process, right in the middle of it is this weapon that the U.S. Congress stands behind, appropriating the money for, putting on the table in Geneva, and noticing the Soviets that they will no longer posses a hard-target kill monopoly, that the United States of America is going to redress that imbalance.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes, just to clarify a couple of points.

Number one, the ICBM, the land-based missile, as presently configured, especially in the Minuteman silo, will never be our firstline defense. It may be our first-strike weapon because it is so vulnerable, but we know that land-based missiles are vulnerable, and that is why we have funded the Midgetman, the air-launched cruise missiles, the sea-launched cruise missiles, the ground-launched missiles, the Poseidon missiles, the Trident I missiles, the Trident II missiles, the Pershing missiles, the B-1 bombers, and others. We know that the ICBM, the land-based missile, is the weakest link and it cannot be made strong by putting a 10-warhead missile in existing silos.

We have heard about the "antique" Minuteman III. Let me tell my colleagues and the gentleman from Illinois, how antique our Minuteman III's are. We are today funding and have funded for the last several years and will continue to fund very expensive programs at the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars to keep the Minuteman III current. Those programs include replacing the motor propellants, modernization of the guidance system, and upgrading the command and control system. The result is a more accurate and reliable system. It is so reliable that even the Air Force has admitted we will have a system life past the year 2000.

So I do not believe our Minuteman III is antique. It has the strike capability and it is a viable weapon which the Russians must contend with.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the House voted 219 to 213 to authorize the release of $1.5 billion to procure 21 more MX missiles. I was on the losing side of that vote. But I acknowledge the fact that the majority of the Members of this House evidently felt it was important, in view of the start of the Geneva talks, not to deauthorize those funds.

The purpose of my remarks today is to suggest to those who are in the majority that it is entirely consistent for them and entirely prudent for them now to vote no on this vote with respect to the appropriation of those funds.

The fact of the matter is that those funds are now on the bargaining table at Geneva, for whatever that is worth. Those 21 missiles are there at Geneva. But it makes no sense at all, from an appropriations point of view, from the point of view of the testing and the production of this missile, now to obligate the funds to purchase missiles Nos. 22 to 42.

We should understand that those missiles are not due to go into production until 1987 and 1988. They can readily be appropriated in this year's fiscal year 1986 defense appropriation bill or next year's fiscal year 1987 appropriations bill as needed. And if those of you who are in the majority are right that this is an effective bargaining chip, and if indeed we are able to bargain the MX for a Soviet concession of equal worth, then by not appropriating the funds at this time we will have saved ourselves the enormous termination costs which we would otherwise incur if these funds are appropriated and obligated, as the administration will surely obligate them if we appropriate them.

I would also suggest to you that, from the point of view of prudence, the testing status of the MX does not justify entering into procurement contracts for these missiles at this time. My information on the testing comes from testimony in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the other body by the General Accounting Office. Their testimony informs us that only 7 of the 20 tests, only 35 percent of the tests, have been completed. They further testify that major changes in the system will occur prior to flights 9 through 11, including the stage 4 propellant storage assembly tank, the ground and flight software, the warhead fuse, an item that is particularly important on the accuracy issue, the reentry vehicle substructure, and indeed that fully operational configuration guidance and control system will not be flown until flight test No. 14 in the third quarter of 1986.

GAO further testified that—

Retention of the current range capability is dependent upon successful repair of the stage 3 extendable nozzle exit cone which failed in the third and seventh test flight.

In other words, it has failed two of seven times, 29 percent of the time, and that includes the most recent test.

So I would simply say to those of my colleagues who voted yes yesterday that you have now accomplished what you set out to accomplish by that vote, you have seen to it that these missiles will remain authorized, that the President and his negotiators can brandish them at Geneva and extract for them whatever concession they can get, and that authorization will remain on the books and we will make it available for us to appropriate these funds if needed in the future.

But I would suggest to you it makes no sense, it does not undercut the President's position not to appropriate these funds today. The state of the testing of the missile does not justify it. The time when this procurement must actually occur does not justify it. If you are successful in what you set out to accomplish by voting yes yesterday, you will simply saddle our Government with unnecessary termination costs if you vote yes instead of no today.

So I strongly urge my colleagues who voted yes yesterday to vote no today or tomorrow when this vote occurs, in order to keep the bargaining chip but to save us some money while doing so.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, nobody believes that the MX missile will by itself force the Soviet Union to bargain seriously in Geneva, and nobody believes or asserts that the MX missile will by itself deter the Soviet Union should it decide to launch some new aggression.

The MX missile works no miracles. No submarine, no rifle, no artillery shell, no fighter plane will by itself deter aggression, and none of them by themselves will force the Soviet Union to sign an agreement to reduce the number of weapons in the world.

But the MX missile is an absolutely essential part of the combined force which both keeps the peace and enhances the prospects for a new arms reduction agreement.

Destroy the effectiveness of the triad, let our missiles grow both old and absolete—and they do grow both old and obsolete, no matter how many times we try to do a quick overhaul of them—take away from our negotiating team the systems that the Soviets most want to limit and most fear, and we encourage Soviet intransigence at the bargaining table and we increase the possibility of war.

In yesterday's debate, the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] said correctly that this investment in weapons to protect us against the Soviet Union has gone on now for 40 years. It has. And 40 years ago the general wisdom, the accepted knowledge was that the United States and the Soviet Union would be at war with each other in less than a decade.

□ 1330

American strength, the American deterrence has prevented that war. We do live in a perpetual fear of war. But living in fear of war is better than dying in the reality of war. It is the triad that keeps nuclear war a horrible prospect rather than a fatal reality. It is American strength that can lead the Soviet Union to an agreement that can ultimately remove the fear of nuclear war.

We have an obligation to preserve both peace and liberty. If we are weak, we may or may not preserve the peace; we will almost certainly lose our liberties. Only if we are strong can we preserve both peace and liberty. If we build the MX unnecessarily, then we spend unnecessarily an amount equal to a small part of what we spend each year on foreign aid. But if we do not build the MX, and if that decision is wrong, then we may leave our children a legacy not of higher taxes and bigger deficits, but of nuclear war, and that is too great a risk to take.

I urge my colleagues to vote today to appropriate the funds to build this system. I very strongly disagree with my colleague from New York [Mr. GREEN]. Fail to appropriate the funds, and you take the MX off the bargaining table. The Soviets are not stupid, and if they see that we have not appropriated the funds, they will understand that they have no incentive and no need to negotiate seriously.

Yesterday, we voted to strengthen not only our national deterrence capability, but to strengthen the hands of Max Kampelman and our negotiators. Today, by appropriating the funds, we can keep the commitment we made yesterday so Mr. Kampelman can try to force the Soviet Union to understand that it is in the best interests of the Russians, as well as the Americans, to remove nuclear weapons from our arsenals.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made a very interesting comment. He said, "Living in the fear of war is better than dying in the reality of it."

It is a very interesting phrase; I would like to go beyond it for a moment, and with all due respect to my colleague. Every single study that this gentleman has seen indicates that when you ask children in this country whether they will live to be adults, the overwhelming majority of them believe that they will not achieve adulthood because they believe sincerely, in their tiny, little hearts, that they will be killed in thermonuclear war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] has expired.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the phrase, "Living in the fear of death," also means dying, because I believe that when you kill children's hopes and dreams and futures, you are indeed destroying those children; you are indeed killing those children.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. If I may respond to the gentleman, 30 years ago I was a teenager, and 30 years ago I was afraid of war. Thirty years ago I knew that there was a danger of war with the Soviet Union and I knew there was a possibility that my friends and myself might die in that war. But the people who were teenagers 30 years ago and were afraid of war and were afraid they would never live to be adults, have lived to be adults. They have lived to be adults because we remained strong.

I would tell the gentleman it is not as bad for a teenager to be afraid that something might happen and there might be a war, that is not as bad as the teenagers who died in World War II. It is not as bad as the teenagers who have lived in war.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Teachers and psychologists and scientists today have observed a behavior pattern that they have never seen in the history of this country. It is called "futurelessness." This is where our young people are beginning to act out in behavior patterns that we have never seen before, with a sense that they will not achieve adulthood. They are starting to act this out, many of them in adverse and negative ways.

The point this gentleman is making is that living with the fear of war is not something that this gentleman can feel comfortable with. It seems to me the way we remove it is to go to the table and negotiate hard; not come to the floor of Congress building new weapons systems whose only objective is ultimately to destroy human life on

this planet. That is the argument that this gentleman is making.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I would say to the gentleman that the reason that some of those young people are alive today is because their parents were not killled in war because we maintained a deterrent capability. It is a better to be a youngster in this country, aware that there is a prospect of war, than it is to be a youngster in Afghanistan dying because of it.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. What we are talking about in this debate with MX missiles, which are strategic nuclear weapons, if we talk about war, we are not talking about war as World War II or war as war took place in Vietnam; we are talking about war with the potential of destroying all life on this planet. That is a very different concept.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] has again expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman in response that if the gentleman wishes to stand here on the House floor and say that it is not better to fear war than to die in the reality of war, then I think I am beginning to understand the basic argument that his side is making.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. This gentleman would never fire that kind of a shot at the gentleman because I respect the gentleman. I know the gentleman realizes that that is not the assertion that I am making.

What I am saying here is that we have a responsibility not only to remove the reality of war, but I am saying to remove the symptoms of the fear of war as well, because the fear of war is also killing our children. That is the point the gentleman makes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman that I agree with that, and that is why it is necessary to be strong enough to force the Soviets to bargain because they respect strength.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think what is being missed here is that there is a real difference between a gun in the hand of an officer of the law, and a gun in the hand of a known criminal. I think that is really what we are talking about in arms negotiations with the Soviets.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

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

Mr. Chairman, two issues preying on the minds of the American people are the massive deficits plaguing our economy, and the needs of our national defense.

It is essential that this Congress act to provide a strong defense. A defense capable of deterring Soviet aggression in areas vital to U.S. security, and more importantly capable of protecting our Nation and in the event of war, winning.

However, with $200 billion deficits in the administration's projections for the foreseeable future it is also essential that we ensure that we are providing a strong defense without wasting our resources.

Throughout my career in this body I have continually supported defense requests that truly increased our national security. Increased funding for our conventional forces, which will be called upon to prevent Soviet incursions into areas vital to our security; increased funding for air- and sea-launched missiles which have been determined to be highly accurate, but difficult for the Soviets to locate; and other weapons designed for situations expected in modern warfare.

The MX missile does not increase our security. The President has stated that MX is necessary for agreement at the arms talks in Geneva. However, the Soviets came back to the bargaining table after Congress had delayed funding for the MX, and they have never shown much interest in discussing MX at previous talks. They would greatly prefer to discuss items such as the Trident and B-1, which they consider true threats to their own security.

Almost all of the Nation's defense experts have agreed that the Minuteman missiles are extremely vulnerable to attack. However, following the recommendations of the Scowcroft Commission this administration is recommending placing the MX in those same Minuteman silos which they insist are vulnerable. Their rationale is that by hardening the silos the missiles will no longer be vulnerable. A Soviet missile that can destroy a city however, would be expected to destroy a missile silo regardless of what steps were taken to harden the silo. And missiles destroyed while sitting in the silos are of no deterrent value to the United States.

It is important that the United States use the money and resources available to it to provide for the best defense of our Nation and our interests. That requires that we evaluate our needs, what systems contribute to our defense, and how we will react to events that may arise.

The United States and the Soviet Union each possess the ability to destroy the world, to end life as we know. This capability has fortunately made each reluctant to engage the other in serious conflict. Hopefully, this will continue to be the case. However, if it is necessary to use our nuclear arsenal it is imperative that we be able to rely on an arsenal that will be effective. Again, missiles which cannot get out of their silos, regardless of how accurate they may be are of no use to our defense.

At a time when Congress has been asked to make very real and difficult choices on where to spend and where not to spend Federal money the President has asked for a weapons system that could cost over $40 billion, not counting ever-present cost overruns. That is $40 billion for a system of highly questionable value. Not only is the MX an expensive weapons system, it is also a flawed weapons system.

This administration has never presented a comprehensive defense plan to Congress. They have never fully defined what the needs and purpose are of not only MX, but of many of the other systems they have asked us to allocate billions of dollars on.

I will oppose the MX because it will not strengthen our strategic readiness nor enhance our national security. It is nothing but another means of wasting precious Federal resources on a vulnerable and ill-conceived desire of the Department of Defense.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

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

Mr. Chairman, yesterday and the day before, because of the nature of the process, we all had to make our speeches. It seems to me today we now have an opportunity to go beyond our speeches and begin to explore the intellectual credibility of the assertions that each of us make on the floor of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of my remarks, I wish to challenge one of my colleagues on our side of the aisle with respect to the need for the MX missile. But since the gentleman has walked off for a moment, let me make this initial point.

On yesterday, I tried to respond to the argument that the MX missile is terribly important to the negotiations in Geneva. This gentleman would assert that that is an incredible overstatement of the reality and the significance of the MX missile. I tried to assert yesterday that on the public record this President of the United States has said, "The objective is deep

reduction in our nuclear arsenal." The Soviet Union has also publicly responded by saying, "It is equally our objective to engage in deep reductions in our nuclear arsenal."

Now, we have in our present arsenal over 10,000 strategic nuclear weapons, over 15,000 tactical nuclear weapons; some of them more powerful than the bombs we dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. So at this very moment, as this debate goes forward, let the record show that we have in excess of 25,000 nuclear weapons in our arsenal. The Soviet Union has similar numbers.

Now, if the leaders of both nations have stated that it is their objective to engage in deep reductions in our nuclear arsenals to move us back from the brink of thermonuclear war, then clearly there is great incentive to stay in Geneva and stay at the table.

□ 1340

I would assert that to make the argument that the MX missile is the factor upon which this conference will turn is at best an absurd argument.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington on that point.

Mr. DICKS. I would say to the gentleman that I think it is easy for each of us to put ourselves in the position of deciding this, as if we were in fact the Commander in Chief and the President of the United States. But the fact is that Ronald Reagan is the President of the United States and Ronald Reagan named a very distinguished commission called the Scowcroft Commission to evaluate how we coordinate arms control efforts and strategic modernization at the same time.

In my judgment, when you are looking at a situation like this, you have to look at what is possible, what can be achieved in the political world.

The President of the United States came to office convinced that our strategic forces had not been modernized and that there needed to be an improvement in those strategic forces before he could get the Soviets to agree to the kind of reductions that are necessary to reduce the threat and enhance stability. This goal was to get down to 5,000 ballistic missile warheads, on each side as a first step. I am sure the gentleman from California and I could agree this would be a good objective, assuming it is done in a stabilizing way.

It is the President who, by adopting all the recommendations of Scowcroft, committed himself to arms control if we in the Congress in turn would support his modernization program. So for those of us, the so-called group of moderates, this was a difficult choice. Not all of us were thrilled about the MX missile. But we were interested in getting Ronald Reagan, the Commander in Chief, the President, who now has been reelected, onto an arms control path and off of what we saw as a very dangerous confrontational path with the Soviet Union that might lead to war.

We only have one President at a time. We have to do what is possible with the individual who is the Commander in Chief, and we felt, although it was a difficult choice, that the responsible effort was to get the President committed to arms control, and I believe he is now committed to arms control, and I believe Mr. Kampelman is a serious negotiator.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, let me respond to that, and then the gentleman and I will go on to our discussion of synergism.

Let me respond to the gentleman by saying that the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, was indeed elected President of the United States. He was not coronated King. We have a triumvirate form of government. The gentleman and I were also elected to exercise our intellectual prerogatives to engage in making our own independent, political judgment. The founding persons of this country decided to engage in a careful check and balance, and so for us, as Members of the Congress of the United States, to walk in lock step with the President as if we have no capacity to exercise judgment in these matters, are in my estimation derelict in our responsibilities and not assuming our duties. The President is not the King.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman and I led the fight against dense pack, of 200 missiles closely spaced, because we thought that basing mode was not going to work. It was very expensive, and we together fought and voted against that. So we did exercise judgment. And then the President put together a group of distinguished former Secretaries of Defense, Secretaries of State, the best minds available, and they came up with a course for modernization which appeared to be plausible.

The most important point in that whole exercise was when Ronald Reagan said that he would get personally serious about arms control. The gentleman from California knows, I think, because of his chairmanship on military construction and his travels around the world in meeting with foreign leaders, that there was a great doubt around the world whether this President would ever be serious about arms control. I happen to believe that getting him committed to that was worth going ahead with some deployments of these missiles which, in fact, do give us some additional military capability.

In the late 1970's, I even think before that, there was discussion whether we had to have a mobile system. I supported that system as a prudent approach to the question of survivability. But the gentleman from California and the gentleman from New York stood up here and explained to the House at that time a very fundamental point still relevant today. This was all before Scowcroft. They argued that there was a synergistic relationship between the submarines, the bombers, and the land-based leg; that you could not view these missiles in isolation, you could not attack them in isolation, and no fool would because you would be devastated, it would wreak havoc on the Soviet Union and totally destroy it.

What I would argue with the gentleman from California is that that synergism still exists today and no rational nation is going to attack, so why are these missiles now vulnerable? All I hear is this vulnerable, vulnerable, vulnerable, but they are not vulnerable when viewed in the context of the triad. The gentleman was right.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, If I may reclaim my time, let us set up the argument.

In April of 1977, to be more precise, this gentleman offered an amendment on the floor to strike the MX missile, castigated very strongly, this is some way-out, fringe argument. What we tried to do in 1977 was to explode the absurd notion of the window of vulnerability.

Let us set up the argument. The way the argument flowed was as follows: One leg of our nuclear triad; namely, our fixed-based missiles, would be in the mid-1980's vulnerable to a nuclear attack from the Soviet Union. This gentleman, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY], argued the synergistic argument. What we said was, it is absurd to assume that the Soviet planner, looking at one leg of our nuclear triad, would attack that knowing that we have two additional legs of our triad that could inflict unacceptable damage upon the Soviet Union.

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman will yield, there was 75 percent of our warheads and our capability in those 2 remaining legs.

Mr. DELLUMS. Exactly. Therefore, we said, "Look, this notion of the window of vulnerability at worst is a fraudulent argument and at best an argument that lacks intellectual competence."

All right. But we were considered the radical extreme people on the floor in 1977. We argued that we were trying to solve a problem that does not exist. All right? But they did not buy that argument in 1977.

A fantastic thing happened a couple years ago when the President of the

United States commissioned Scowcroft. Scowcroft then came forward and said, "Let us put 100 MX missiles in the same Minuteman-III silos." That is why we are here today. Some people stood up and said, "Wait a minute. Are you placing MX missiles in the same hole that you considered vulnerable a few years ago, that you argued against the Dellums-Downey assertion a few years ago?"

The Scowcroft Commission came back and said, "But these holes are not vulnerable. The Soviet planners would have to look at the entire aggregate of our nuclear triad and realize that we were not indeed vulnerable."

Here is my point that I do not think the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] is really fully dealing with: Once Scowcroft accepted the efficacy of our argument with respect to synergism, they not only closed the window vulnerability, it vanished, and with it the need for the MX missile. That is the point this gentleman is not dealing with.

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman will yield further, this is where we get down to it. This is where I think the major argument exists that we have to focus on.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Let me argue with this gentleman, and then you and I can have at it. I love it.

Mr. DICKS. We will yield in a minute.

Mr. Chairman, what the Scowcroft Commission said was this: That one, after 12 years of arguing about this, there was a question of our national resolve and commitment to be able to finish a program that we had started, and a question of whether the Soviets would view it as weakness if we did not proceed.

Second, there is the military utility argument that everybody has been trying to get to. Scowcroft said this program provides important leverage in the arms control talks, but most importantly, important leverage in getting the Soviets to recognize that their land-based missiles are vulnerable as well, and that they would be well served to move away from their heavy ICBM's toward mobile missiles which are more survivable. Survivability on their side is important because we do not want to have a destabilizing situation.

At the same time they argued that we should only deploy 100 of these, not 200, as Mr. Carter had recommended, and Mr. Ford, but 100, and they said we should start the development of a single warhead missile which would be probably mobile in order to give us a more survivable system and an increased stability on both sides.

□ 1350

So the key point is leveraging them out of their vulnerable silos so they are not subject to a first strike, just as we move toward Midgetman, and on both sides have enhanced ability. Hans Mark, former Secretary of the Air Force, said once that the best thing we could have is 500 single-warhead missiles on each side; then there would be no incentive by either side to strike first, and on both sides you would have survivability and that would be the most stabilizing, because in a crisis we would not put ourselves into a hair-trigger situation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time now, we have wafted this far, and what the gentleman has asserted was that the window of vulnerability was a fraudulent argument and——

Mr. DICKS. I did not use that language.

Mr. DELLUMS. All right, you did not use that language. Let us say it was a flawed argument.

Mr. DICKS. Yes, I agree with that.

Mr. DELLUMS. It was at best a flawed argument. And this gentleman is saying that once Scowcroft accepted the efficacy of that assertion, then not only did the window of vulnerability disappear but the need for the equipment disappeared.

Now, you argue in response to that, but there was need to finish the program and there was need to develop important leverage in negotiating with the Soviet Union. Let us start with your first point.

Mr. DICKS. And leveraging them out of their vulnerable silos toward a more survivable mode.

Mr. DELLUMS. All right. Let us start with the first argument, to finish the program.

Here is what the gentleman is saying. The program was started on the basis of a flawed argument at best. What this gentleman was asserting all along was that they knew there was no window of vulnerability, and what we really did want was a first-strike nuclear weapon.

Mr. DICKS. No, that is wrong. That is not correct.

Mr. DELLUMS. They wanted a hard-target, time-urgent silo-killer. That is exactly what it was.

Mr. DICKS. That was for window-of-vulnerability reasons, not for first-strike reasons. The gentleman knows very well that we do not have a first-strike policy. It is not our intention to strike first.

What this does in a crisis, in a sense, is it would give us some capability against their silos, their command and control, and their leadership that we presently do not have that the Soviets have to take into account in deciding whether they would attack us. They have a sanctuary now, and they get enormous political benefit from that. What we want to have is some of that similar capability, but not enough to constitute a destabilizing first strike.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I have let the gentleman finish his argument. You said, "Let's finish the program." What I am saying to my colleagues and the American taxpayers is that that is the game that got run on them.

The MX missile was a game at first, and then we said, "Let's finish the program" when there was never any need for the program, and that is the very basis of the argument that we make. Once there was no vulnerability, there was no need for it. If there was no need, why are we going forward with the MX missile? To build a time-urgent, hard-target silo-killer weapon, which takes us beyond the principle of nuclear deterrence, which takes us into a very destabilizing and dangerous situation.

Mr. DICKS. I would argue with the gentleman that if we do not develop so much that it presents a first-strike potential against all 1,300 of the Soviet missiles—and this does not; this level of deployment we are talking about does not—it does not present a first-strike threat and, therefore, is not destabilizing. But it also gives us some military capability against the weapons systems that the Soviets hold closest and dearest to their hearts.

I think in that respect, by getting more equality in that one area that we do not have, hard-target capability, that it strengthens deterrence. It does not weaken deterrence. It makes the Soviets less likely to strike first, and that is what we are attempting to achieve with this system.

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask, how can we maintain a commitment to the concept of deterrence which means we would not strike first, that we would only respond? Why do we need a hard-target silo-killer if we are not talking about striking first? Because if we are talking about striking second, those silos are empty. Why do we need a hard-target capability when the silos are empty?

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, not all of them may be empty. As I said to the gentleman, if the Soviets recognize that we have some of that capability, they are going to move out of their silos to

mobile forces which are more secure and, therefore, more survivable, as well as less accurate. And that is what you want.

Not everything is done in an arms control agreement, by the way. Some things can be achieved indirectly, and in my view this is one area where, by deploying some MX, it will convince the Soviets to move toward a more stable force structure.

Mr. DELLUMS. All right. And your second argument is——

Mr. DICKS. Hopefully they will agree to make deep cuts in those large offensive weapons, recognizing that they are in a sense vulnerable, too. And their force structure is different than ours. Seventy percent of theirs is land-based missiles.

Mr. DELLUMS. Exactly.

Mr. DICKS. So they will move toward a more synergistic relationship in their triad, which will make them have a more secure deterrent, as we will do the same thing. That winds up making it a more stable situation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Let us accept that. But you assert that under this second argument, to provide important leverage. Now, you have not suggested that the MX missile is not a weapon capable of first strike. What you argue then is the numbers you have to put forward to do it.

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman will yield——

Mr. DELLUMS. Let me finish. The President, as per the Scowcroft Commission, is asking us to deploy 100 missiles. Now, there are some Democrats in the other body and, I think, this gentleman as well who does not want the 100. You want to cap it at 50.

Now, if I ask you, "Why do you want to cap it at 50?" you will say very honestly, because the gentleman is a man of integrity, that you do not want to go forward developing a force that appears to threaten the Soviet Union with first strike. That was the argument this gentleman made yesterday.

Once you accept that 100 missiles are not sacrosanct and you are willing to talk about the 50, then this gentleman is saying that you already have 21 and you cannot argue competently that 50 missiles at the negotiating table is going to do something magically that what we already have is not going to do. That is the bottom line.

Mr. DICKS. Let us assume the gentleman's hypothetical situation of 50 missiles.

Mr. DELLUMS. All right.

Mr. DICKS. I think, No. 1, those who recognize political reality know that the defense budget is going to be cut, and I happen to have other areas in the strategic budget that are more important—the stealth bomber, cruise missiles, and things of that nature. We have to prioritize within defense. I would favor that over going further in expenditures on this.

But, most importantly, I believe a force of 21 would not be taken seriously. A force of 40 to 50 of these missiles once was recommended by the Air Force in 1981 as an interim program until they came up with a more survivable basing mode, which they have not yet been able to do, and in my judgement a limit along those lines gives us a chance to look at progress in the arms control talks and it gives us a chance to look at hardening, to see if we want to go back and harden those first 40 or 50 missiles.

Plus it gives us the leverage at this important point when we are starting into these negotiations, and it keeps the production line warm. So I think there is a rational basis for making a judgment on 40 to 50 missiles.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, if I may reclaim my time, and if I have enough time, I will yield back to the gentleman, let me respond to the two arguments the gentleman makes.

You said the 21 missiles they presently have may not be taken as seriously as the 40 or 50 you would be willing to cap. I think the gentleman would agree that is at best a judgment call. That is the gentleman's judgment.

Mr. DICKS. Certainly.

Mr. DELLUMS. There are some of us who do not agree that the difference between 21 and 40 is that big or that the difference between 21 and 50 is that big a thing, except it means spending billions of taxpayers' dollars.

Let me make the final argument. The final point you made is that we must accept the political realities. Once you make that assertion, then we get away from this high-falutin' military strategy and we get away from this high-falutin' tactical strategy. We come down to the "political realities," and again political realities are judgment calls.

This gentleman is perfectly correct in asserting a political reality in opposition to the gentleman and is not un-American as a result of it.

Mr. DICKS. No, no one is suggesting that. I have the greatest confidence in the chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee of the House on authorizations.

I just want to say one thing. There is one thing we are agreed on. The President has said we will not develop a first-strike capability against the Soviet Union. What we have to make sure of, as we look at MX, D-5, and Midgetman, is that we do not develop so much prompt hard-target capability that it poses that threat. I think that is where the gentleman and I will be in agreement as we go down the road looking at these modernization programs, making sure that we cap each one of them so in the aggregate we do not develop that capability. And there is a report coming in on April 15 where the President is going to have to tell us how he is going to avoid developing a first-strike capability.

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for this time. The gentleman has been very generous with allowing me more time. My distinguished colleague and I have appreciated the opportunity to have some exchange, even within the confines of the limitations we find ourselves in. This gentleman has been willing to expose his arguments, and the other gentleman has been willing to expose his. Hopefully, people out there listening to this debate will make up their minds one way or the other.

I would just like to close with this comment: I think what this exchange has demonstrated to this gentleman and, I hope, to others is that what we are really down to is judgment calls here—40 or 50 missiles against 21 missiles. And so banging the table about resolve and strategic capability, those things fly out the window. The Soviet Union is not about to attack the United States. They know what our capability is. I think the hope for the future of this country, for the future of the world, for the future of our children, and for the future of humankind does not rest on building more and more MX missiles and spending bigger and bigger dollars on larger and larger military budgets, but it is in sitting down at the negotiating table and developing a negotiating strategy that backs us significantly away from the brink of nuclear war.

In conclusion, as I said yesterday, nuclear weapons cannot be viewed as military weapons because, I say to my brother, they can never be used. Once you start down that road, exploding nuclear weapons, we will destroy all life on this planet.

We are not now talking about war in World War II terms; we are talking about war that will annihilate the entire planet, and this gentleman is not arrogant enough or presumptuous enough to believe that it is within my right and my privilege and my prerogative to destroy all life on this planet.

□ 1400

When you start talking about moving in that direction, then we ought to be understanding what the American people and the world want and they do not want nuclear war and I do not believe they want the MX missile.

Mr. DICKS. What both of us agree on is that we are trying to achieve deterrence, to avoid war, to maintain the

peace. I will just argue that I believe the approach that we are on is the way to achieve that.

Mr. DELLUMS. I respect the gentleman and I thank the gentleman very much for the opportunity for this exchange.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. FRANK] having assumed the chair, Mr. KILDEE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 181) to approve the obligation and availability of prior year unobligated balance made available for fiscal year 1985 for the procurement of additional operational MX missiles, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING SCHEDULE OF TIME FOR FURTHER DEBATE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 181

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on House Joint Resolution 181 be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] and myself; 2 hours of such debate to be consumed today and 1 hour to be consumed tomorrow.

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

Mr. McDADE. Reserving the right to object and, Mr. Speaker, I shall not, of course, object. I do think that it would be useful for the Members of the House to know that it is the intention to come in tomorrow at 11 o'clock, as the House has been set to come in, not have 1 minutes, have the half hour on either side then in vogue at noon. I think the Members of the House would be convenienced, all of us, knowing that we are looking at a vote certain at 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, this is my understanding from the leadership.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman and I withdraw my objection.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MX MISSILE

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 181) to approve the obligation and availability of prior year unobligated balances made available for fiscal year 1985 for the procurement of additional operational MX missiles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1402

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 181, with Mr. KILDEE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to section 101(h) of Public Law 98-473 and the unanimous-consent agreement agreed to earlier today, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] will be recognized for 1 hour today and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] will be recognized for 1 hour today.

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding to me. I want to express my admiration for the job he has done.

Mr. Chairman, the MX question is a very complex one, not so much because of the missile itself, but because of the maneuvering that accompanies it. I would like to touch on a couple points in the debate. One has to do with survivability.

There has been a lot of argument about survivability. I want to concede that the MX has had a survivability capacity that far exceeds anything that I have seen in what is becoming an increasingly political life. The MX missile has survived a 180-degree change in its justification. We originally needed a new missile because the existing missile was fixed in place and we needed a mobile one, so the MX missile then survived 35 changes in where to put it.

Then the Scowcroft Commission decided that we really could not do anything about the fact that it was immobile, except to proclaim that was not as bad as we said it was, but that it was an important test of our resolve to have it, so we switched the justification. It survived all those changes in basing mode and then we decided we would have it.

Then last year we were told by several people, including the gentleman who now chairs the Armed Services Committee, that we needed the MX missile because we were not having talks with the Russians; so a majority voted for the MX missile because we were not having talks with the Russians.

Then we were told if we were having talks with the Russians, then we would not need it; so we began to have talks with the Russians.

Once again the MX showed that incredible capacity for survival, because having been put forward as something we needed because we were not having talks with the Russians, it then became something we needed because we are having talks with the Russians.

I will make one prediction, Mr. Chairman. You can be wrong about things here. I agree with what one of the gentlemen said yesterday, we should not have such certainty. I will certainly admit that I have been wrong in this. I was wrong when I voted for the chairman of the Armed Services Committee in January. I will admit the fallibility, but I can make a prediction right now very confidently that we were told last year we needed this because we were not having any talks with the Russians and we need it this year because we are having talks with the Russians and if the talks break down, we will be told next year that we need the MX missile because we used to be having talks with the Russians.

The MX missile survives. There are Members in this body who have an attachment to it that defies any specific set of reasons and there is no want of ingenuity in this body. There is no change in circumstances, no feat of engineering, no fact of physics, no question of international strategy so stark that people cannot weave it into a justification for the MX missile, so it will continue to survive.

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

Mr. FRANK. I will be glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

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

You know, in listening to our negotiators and in looking at the background of the MX missile, I think there are some compelling reasons to have it and I tThink you have gone over the fact that the Russians are back at the table and implied that somehow that is because of the MX missile. Of course, I think the consensus is that it is probably because of the SDI.

Mr. FRANK. Well, I will take back my time. No, I did not imply for a minute that the Russians are back at the table because of the MX missile. That is the people on the gentleman's side, their argument. I do not think the Russians care much about the MX missile. I see no signs that is one of the things they worry about. They worry about the SDI. They worry

about Pershing. I do not think they worry about the MX missile; so I would never suggest that it has anything to do with their being back at the table.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield back for my question?

Mr. FRANK. Yes, in a minute. We have got a lot of time to kill. The gentleman does not have to worry. We are just eating up the time here because we do not want to vote until tomorrow, so there will be no problem. We all know that. The gentleman from New York will give me some more time. In fact, if the gentleman from Oregon takes over, he will give me 15 or 20 minutes, so do not worry about it. Let us get to these things one at a time.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. FRANK. Yes. I just want to finish.

The point is the MX missile has nothing to do, in my judgment, with whether or not we come back. My point was there were people, mostly on our side—the gentleman has been for the MX missile. He was for it a long time ago. It is an old missile. I am not sure who is older, the gentleman or the missile, but I am sure that since that time they both have existed simultaneously and will continue to be and I respect that consistency.

What I was talking about here were the people on my side who have to keep thinking of new reasons why they are for it. Last year their reason was that we were not having talks and if we were to have talks, we would not need it any more. Now that we are having talks, they threw that out, so I was referring to only two people there.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Let me just make a statement, or read a statement, that was made by Soviet physicist and Nobel Peace Prize winner, Andrei Sakharov, and ask my friend if he agrees with the basic thrust of this argument. He says:

> It seems very important to me to strive for the abolition of powerful silo based missiles at the talks on nuclear disarmament. While the USSR is the leader in this field, there is very little chance of its easily relinquishing that lead. If it is necessary to spend a few dollars on MX missiles to alter this situation, then perhaps this is what the West must do.

So I would ask the gentleman, does he not agree there is an argument beyond simply saying that we are at the table and we are always going to be at the table for the next couple years.

Mr. Sakharov says basically that you cannot negotiate with the Soviets. You should not negotiate with the Soviets for reductions in their heavy missiles if you do not have something else to counterbalance that and to give the full faith and credit of the U.S. Congress behind that position if necessary.

Mr. FRANK. I would say to my friend, he said will I not admit there is an argument. As long as there is an MX missile, there will be an argument. I do not know what the argument will be. It may be a direct contradiction of the last argument.

Mr. HUNTER. Does the gentleman agree with Mr. Sakharov, is my point.

Mr. FRANK. I will take back my time. It is my turn and then it will be the gentleman's turn. I will give him plenty of time. His side has some time, too, so we will not run out of time.

The point is this. There will always be an argument. I do not agree with Mr. Sakharov on this particular point and I do not think the gentleman from California does, either, because as he read that statement, Mr. Sakharov said that we should be negotiating for the abolition, as I understood it, of silo based missiles. I do not know that anyone thinks that it is realistic to expect the Soviet Union to agree to give up all its silo based missiles. I am afraid that Mr. Sakharov, a distinguished physicist, a martyr, a victim of terrible and brutal Soviet persecution, greatly to be condemned, his family has been victimized, denied medical treatment, all those things are savage facts that confront the Soviets and are an eternal shame to them; but on this particular point, I think he is wrong and I do not think the gentleman from California thinks, Ronald Reagan does not think, Max Kampelman does not think, no one thinks that abolishing the silo based missile is a goal for negotiation.

□ 1410

So Mr. Sakarov simply makes a mistake on that. That is not what we are trying to do. It is not achievable. No one thinks it can be done and therefore I have to disagree with him.

I just want to get to this point: The gentleman said the good faith and credit of the Congress, because there is this thing that disturbs me. My friend from Washington—I do not see him here and I hope that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS], who has been a very valiant advocate here will return because I had some questions for him—but one of the things several people said is we have one President. We have one President and therefore we must do what he thinks.

I agree we have one President. I had hoped that we would also have at least one Congress. I do not think the question about whether or not we have one President is at issue. The question is will we have no Congress because the one President, whom we undeniably have, has his responsibility. But I had thought that the one Congress, to which people were at a minimum entitled, had an independent function.

The question is not whether we have a President. We stipulate to that. He is the President. He appoints negotiators. He brings them on planes so that they can fly back here.

Why, one of the greatest surprises of this past week, apparently, was that the man that Ronald Reagan appointed to be this chief negotiator happened to agree with him on this particular issue. You know, maybe because of the problems they have had with Mr. Nitze and General Rowney they are unused to having this kind of an agreement among themselves, and it was a cause for celebration that Mr. Kampelman agreed with his boss, and it was worth bringing him back here to tell us that he thought his boss was right.

I worry about people who say we only have one President. In the first place, the fact that we have one President, it seems to me, is substantially irrelevant to what the Congress should do. The Congress has an independent function.

What people are saying is this, and they have said it in so many words, that once the President has made a proposal the Congress has to accept it. That I think is nonsense. It is bad constitutional law. It is terrible political theory.

Then we are told that the President was elected. Well, nobody appointed is sitting in here. Everybody here also got elected.

The fact is that Congress has that responsibility.

And I have to ask my friend from Washington, because one of the things we have heard is that we are going to vote—one of the things we get with the MX missile, I hear people talk about the MX missile and they sound like I used to do and my friend from California before we must have resolved to diet, and I congratulate my friend from California because he and I and some others have dieted. But we remember the old days when we had the "gonnas" and we were "gonna" diet the next day.

Mr. HUNTER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend for not having the before and after pictures as exhibits.

Mr. FRANK. I think that they would have been not in order, and we would not want to have our pictures taken down.

The issue is that the people have the "gonnas." They are "gonna" do that, they are "gonna" stop eating, they are "gonna" do this. Well, people with the "gonnas," they are "gonna" stop voting for MX's and one of the things, of a variety of things, is first you have some Members of the other party in the other body—I got that right under

the parliamentary rules, I got all of the others—it is the Republican Senators, I will say once, but I will go back to say other Members of the other body of the other party. And it is very, very interesting what happens. Some of them now are against the MX missiles. And there are some people who are not, and they never met a weapon that they did not like, and that is okay. They are entitled, and that is an honest argument to make, that we think it is a tough world and we need to do everything we can.

Go right ahead. But there are other people who will tell you that it is not a good weapon and we do not really need it; we cannot afford it. And they are not going to vote for any more next time. But they vote for it each time it comes up, then they read in the paper that the President says that he is not going to campaign, on them and they say they do not care that he won't campaign. We have people on the other side that say "I am not going to be intimidated by the President who says he is not going to campaign for me, and I am not going to be intimidated." Then everyone who has announced that he is not going to be intimidated gave up, so one thing that I would note as a symbol, any time you hear a Member of the other party announce he cannot be intimidated by the President, look for a cave in.

Now we have the people who say, "Well, I am going to vote for these 21, but I am not going to vote for the next 48." I have to ask them—I do not think the 21 makes sense. We are told by many people privately and publicly on both sides from both parties that "I will vote for the next 21, but no more."

Now, the gentleman from Washington, my good friend, says we have to do this now because we are in negotiations and we have only one President. If he has to vote for the 21 now because we only have one President, does he not then have to vote for 48? I have to ask those who say they are going to vote for 21 but not for the next 48, and they have said it, you heard them, "We only have one President," a simple, fact. Question: How many Presidents will we have in June? Will we have four Presidents, seven Presidents? If the fact that we only have one President now means they are going to vote with him, why does the fact we will still only have one President in June mean that they will not have to vote with him?

Is Max Kampelman going to be the President? Is John Tower also going to be the President? I do not understand this.

So what we are getting again, I think, is another round of "gonnas." They cannot justify voting for the MX.

I think it is extraordinary that they justify voting for this weapon not because it is a needed weapon but because the President told them to, and they are not going to vote for it the next time, and that is justification for all of this.

Mr. HUNTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. If the gentleman would get more time, and he can do it, because I am running out of time and your side has some time, too.

The point I think we have is this: If we need to spend for our national security so that it will not be begrudged—the gentleman from New York read a very impressive list of weapons, some of which I support, a few of which I do not, most of which I support, nuclear submarines all over the globe, air-launched cruise missiles, the Stealth bomber which I support and I hope we will get. No one is talking about being vulnerable to the Soviets. No one thinks we are vulnerable to the Soviets.

I will tell you the decision that we are making today. Are we serious about the deficit? We are told by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, "Do not worry about it," that that is $1.5 billion in this year's deficit. Tell that to the people who are about to lose their supplemental unemployment compensation. We have several hundred thousand Americans who are now unemployed through no fault of their own because of imports, and a high dollar and other problems. They are about to be thrown off the unemployment compensation, thrown on to the rocks of fiscal disaster, personally for themselves and their children because we are told we cannot afford $1.5 billion for the rest of this fiscal year. But we can afford it because some people think if we only have one President and national security, we have to do everything he says.

This would have its comic aspects to me if we were not talking about $1.5 billion now, and a lot more later.

I would at this point insert in the RECORD an editorial by JOHN GLENN as support material in which he points out that it is going to cost us a great deal more than this. And he says that superhardening this, all that cement, is going to cost another $180 million per silo, three times as much as it already costs. So we are talking about vast expenditures to which you are committing people.

The article referred to follows:

INSTEAD OF THE MX

(By John Glenn)

We've had far too much jumbled rhetoric, conflicting testimony and macho political posturing on the MX. But administration lobbying efforts notwithstanding, the only way to truly increase deterrence is to modernize our strategic systems so that we can ensure an effective retaliatory capability in the event of a Soviet first strike. These new systems will include the Trident submarine with the D5 missile, the B1B bomber and a replacement for our aging Minuteman ICBM force. But in my judgment—and despite the outcome of the Senate's first vote on this issue yesterday—the Minuteman replacement should not be the MX.

The administration has bullied Congress, implying that opposition to the MX is unpatriotic and that failure to fund the missile would "knock the legs out from under the bargaining table" in Geneva. But Soviet planners are less interested in rhetoric than they are in reality. And the reality is that placing MXs in the same old silos that the Soviets have had targeted for more than 20 years would simply perpetuate the existing vulnerability of our ICBMs.

The only effective way to reduce that vulnerability is to make our missiles mobile, so that Soviet planners will not know where to shoot. Mobility, of course, is the key concept behind our submarine-based missiles, which make up over 50 percent of our nuclear forces. Not surprisingly, the Soviets fully recognize this principle and are now starting to deploy their own mobile ICBMs, the new SS24s and 25s.

The time has come to make America's ICBM force mobile as well. The mobile missile—already well on the road to development by the U.S. Air Force—would be a much less attractive target than the MIRVed MX and, more important, would be nearly impossible to locate for a preemptive strike. Nor would accuracy be a problem, since the mobile missile could equal the MX's accuracy.

Cost, of course, is another important factor, and a small mobile system might actually be cheaper than the MX. The administration wants us to believe otherwise, but its cost figures deal only with the price of the missiles themselves, ignoring the additional basing expenses. In congressional testimony two weeks ago, for instance, the administration put the cost of each MX missile at $74 million. But that is far less than what they would actually cost. The reason is that sticking MX missiles into the same old vulnerable Minuteman silos makes sense only if we "super-harden" those silos, so they could withstand a Soviet attack. The only alternatives would be a "launch-on-warning" or a "launch-under-attack" strategy, both of which are unacceptably dangerous.

But here's the kicker: super-hardening would cost at least $180 million per silo, bringing the actual cost of each MX missile to at least $254 million—and that doesn't even include the additional costs of research and development or program support. And let me add that I'm not making those figures up; they were given to the Senate Armed Service Committee last week by the U.S. Air Force. Furthermore, silo hardening won't work if Soviet missiles become more accurate, as they assuredly will.

Finally, we should consider the effects of the MX on the Geneva arms talks. I don't deny that we should proceed with building new strategic systems that will bolster deterrence and stabilize the nuclear balance. But we must show the Soviets that we are willing to negotiate seriously in the area of arms control.

Lately, administration supporters have been touting the MX as a "bargaining chip." Indeed, Secretary of Defense Weinberger wrote to me on March 14 explicitly stating that "every aspect of our modernization program, *including MX*, is on the bargaining table, [emphasis added]. Yet as Gerard Smith, Clark Clifford and Paul Warnke

pointed out in a recent letter to The Post [Free for All, March 16], "the MX, if approved, will be a weapon with tens of billions spent, entrenched constituencies pressing for its continuation, if not expansion, and a bargaining chip that will have lost its ability to bargain." Exactly so. In the area of weaponry, there is a long history of supposed "bargaining chips" suddenly becoming nonnegotiable once they are approved. There is no reason to think the MX will be different.

In sum, the small mobile ICBM is superior to the MX by almost every measure; it is less vulnerable and costly; more stabilizing and amenable to arms control. For all these reasons, I will oppose MX missile appropriations and support the small, mobile alternative. It would give us a deterrent that is stronger, not weaker, than the one proposed by the Reagan administration.

Mr. FRANK. Tell the old people that they have to pay more when they get sick, and throw them off unemployment, and vote for this, and you make a mockery of deficit concerns.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my good friend from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], an able member of our subcommittee.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the debate that I have listened to today indicates to me that there are no further arguments from the opponents, and they have resorted to humor, which is fine because I enjoyed it as well, and fast talking that was so fast that I could not quite keep up with some of it. But I think it indicates that the debate has run long enough. We have listened to this debate for hours, weeks, months, and years.

And throughout the debate I would like to compliment the leader of my committee, the gentleman from New York, Chairman ADDABBO, and the Republican leader, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE], and those who have taken part in the debate, because while there have been obvious disagreements, Members have conducted themselves with distinction.

Mr. FRANK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FRANK. I apologize. I was slightly distracted and I did not hear the point that the gentleman said that he had trouble following. If he will get me more time from his side I will say it again slower.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I did hear the gentleman's remark where he indicated that all he was doing was using up time anyway. So, I do not think that that will be necessary, because I plan to use up some time now, and it will balance out.

What I was saying was that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE], and those who have played a major role in this debate for days and weeks and months have conducted themselves with distinction and with honor. The differences have been strong but they have been very genuine.

I do not detect on the part of a proponent or an opponent a desire to weaken the United States. To the contrary, I detect a strong desire that the United States be a strong Nation.

But I also detect some inconsistencies. I was interested in the comments of my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO], when he said that what we ought to do is take the additional 13 missiles that we have scheduled for the testing program and go ahead and deploy them.

□ 1420

And I assume he suggests that we do that because the testing program is going so well that we can afford to take the 13 test missiles and deploy them. But one of those who supports his same position, our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN], was complaining because we had only tested seven missiles. So I am not sure whether the opponents want to test more missiles or do not want to test any more missiles.

I think it is important that we find where the consistent line here is.

The debate has suggested that we are being asked to appropriate $1.5 billion for these 21 MX missiles. If anybody would pay attention to what the debate actually is about, today it is House Joint Resolution 181, and House Joint Resolution 181 says that the Congress approves the obligation and availability of prior-year unobligated balances made available for fiscal year 1985. It is not a new appropriation. We are not asking for any additional money.

What we are doing is asking to release the funds that have already been appropriated by this Congress for those 21 additional MX missiles.

It has been suggested that the arms talks in Geneva have been a show and that President Reagan led us to that negotiating table strictly so that he could get the MX missile. It has been indicated that President Reagan is not sincere.

One of my colleagues in debate yesterday said that President Reagan came to the White House opposed to arms control and will leave the White House opposed to arms control. I say nothing could be further from the truth. Anyone who will take a lesson from history as our friend from Pennsylvania suggested yesterday should recognize the fact that from November 1981 to August 1984 the United States under President Reagan made 11 separate formal negotiating proposals dealing with arms control. Four of these were START proposals. Arms reduction, not limitation, but actually reduction. Four were INF proposals. There were one each in the areas of conventional land forces, chemical weapons, and confidence-building measures.

Also during this same period the U.S. administration under the leadership of Ronald Reagan has called for arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union on at least 21 separate occasions for the purposes of reducing or limiting nuclear weapons; on three separate occasions with regard to space weapons and on three separate occasions with regard to nuclear test limitations.

Mr. Chairman, while the House was in the House I asked unanimous consent to insert additional material, and at this point I would like to have that material inserted into the RECORD, because this outlines by date the specific proposal that President, Ronald Reagan, has sincerely made in an attempt to free the world from the threat of nuclear confrontation.

A CHRONOLOGY OF REAGAN ADMINISTRATION ARMS CONTROL PROPOSALS AND SUBSTANTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, NOVEMBER 1981-AUGUST 1984

From November 1981 to August 1984 the United States made eleven separate formal negotiating proposals in various arms control fora. Four of these were START proposals, four were INF proposals, and there were one each in the areas of conventional land forces, chemical weapons, and confidence building measures.

Also, during this same period, the U.S. Administration has called for arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union on at least twenty-one separate occasions for the purposes of reducing or limiting nuclear weapons; on three separate occasions with regard to space weapons; and on three separate occasions with regard to nuclear test limitations.

A summary of these proposals and communications follows:

START

1. November 18, 1981

President Reagan announced at the National Press Club that he has proposed to President Brezhnev to open negotiation on strategic arms as soon as possible next year.

2. May 9, 1982

President Reagan announced in a speech at Eureka College the US START proposal. It called for: reductions in deployed ballistic missile warheads to a level of 5000 for each side, of which no more than 2500 would have been on ICBMs; a limit of 850 deployed ballistic missiles, roughly one-half the current US inventory; sub-limits of 210 medium-sized missiles, of which no more than 110 would have been heavy missiles; and equal levels of heavy bombers, including the Soviet Backfire bomber. In a second phase, the US sought equal ceilings on other elements of US and Soviet strategic forces including equal limits on ballistic missile throw-weight at less than current US levels. Significant progress towards throw-weight equality was to be accomplished in phase one.

3. May 31, 1982

The US and the USSR jointly announced agreement to begin formal negotiations on the limitation and reduction of strategic

arms on June 29, 1982 in Geneva, Switzerland.

4. June 8, 1983

At Round IV of START, the US proposed:

A relaxing of the proposal to limit the total number of ballistic missiles on each side to 850;

A shift from an approach which envisioned two phases of negotiation, with the initial emphasis on ballistic missiles, to an approach embodied in a single phase agreement, with everything on the table;

The proposal of limits on the number of bombers on each side and limits on the number of cruise missiles permitted to be carried on each bomber which are below SALT II levels;

An offer to explore alternative approaches to limiting the destructive capability of ballistic missiles.

5. October 4, 1983

At Round V of START the US tabled the build-down proposal:

A provision which links reductions to modernization using variable ratios which identify how many existing nuclear warheads must be withdrawn as new warheads of various types are deployed;

A provision calling for a guaranteed annual percentage build-down (an approximately 5% mandatory build-down per year);

A provision that ensures that the reductions would be paced by whichever above rule produces the greatest reductions.

In addition, the US delegation proposed:

A concurrent build-down of bombers;

To discuss additional limitations on the air-launched cruise missiles (ALCMs) carried by US bombers;

To negotiate trade-offs, taking into account Soviet advantages in missiles and US advantages in bombers, in ways that provide each side maximum flexibility consistent with movement towards a more stable balance of forces; and,

The establishment of a working group in START to discuss the US build-down initiative in Round V.

6. December 8, 1983

US START Delegation proposed resuming negotiation at Round VI beginning on February 1, 1984.

INF

1. US Proposal, November 1981

The US INF Delegation, headed by Ambassador Paul Nitze, opened negotiations with the Soviets in Geneva in November 1981, shortly after the main elements of the US negotiating approach were set forth by President Reagan in his speech of November 18. The President made a far-reaching proposal for the mutual elimination and renunciation of longer-range land-based INF missile systems on a worldwide basis. Specifically, the US offered to cancel deployment of Pershing II and GLCM in exchange for the elimination of all Soviet SS-20s, SS-4s, and SS-5s—the zero/zero proposal. Although the US subsequently proposed an interim solution as described below, the zero/zero proposal represents the most desirable outcome. By eliminating the Soviet threat, it would make the NATO response to it superfluous.

2. The "Walk-in-the-Woods"

In July 1982, during the so-called "walk in the woods," Ambassador Nitze and his Soviet counterpart discussed ideas for an agreement on an informal, exploratory basis. As developed by the negotiations for consideration in their respective capitals, the formula contained the following main elements: The US and USSR would each be limited to 75 LRINF missile launchers in Europe. The USSR could deploy only ballistic missile launchers, containing no more than one missile each with three warheads. The US could deploy only GLCM launchers carrying four missiles with one warhead apiece. In addition, the Soviet Union would be limited to 90 LRINF missile launchers in the eastern USSR. Specified US and Soviet nuclear capable aircraft would be limited to equal levels in Europe, and their shorter-range INF missiles would be limited to existing levels. Finally, verification measures were to be negotiated within three months.

Although the US had several problems with the proposal as it stood, we were interested in keeping this informal channel open. The Soviet reaction, on the other hand, was completely negative, both as regards the proposal itself and further use of this informal channel.

3. The US Interim Proposal, March 1983

In an effort to break the stalemate and after intense consultations with our Allies, the President on March 30, 1983 presented an interim proposal under which the US would agree to substantial reductions in the number of warheads on planned deployments of longer-range INF missiles, provided the Soviet Union reduced the number of warheads on its longer-range INF missiles to an equal number on a global basis. He instructed Ambassador Nitze to indicate to the Soviet side that while our zero/zero proposal remained on the table as our ultimate goal, we would consider any number between zero and 572 the Soviets might propose which would result in an agreement at substantially reduced equal global levels.

4. The New U.S. Initiative, September 1983

Determined to achieve a sound, equitable and verifiable agreement, the US made a third major effort designed to move the talks forward. President Reagan announced in his September 26, 1983 speech to the UN a US initiative in Geneva which authorized Ambassador Nitze to put forward a package of steps designed to advance the negotiations as rapidly as possible. These initiatives built on the interim proposal and addressed concerns that the Soviets have raised:

First, the United States proposed a new initiative on equal global limits. If the Soviet Union agrees to reductions and limits on a global basis, the United States will consider a commitment not to offset the entire Soviet global missile deployment through US deployments in Europe. We would, of course, retain the right to deploy missiles elsewhere.

Second, the United States would be prepared to consider mutually acceptable ways to address the Soviet desire that an agreement should limit aircraft as well as missiles.

Third, the United States would address the mix of missiles that would result from reductions. In the context of reductions to equal levels, we would be prepared to apportion the reductions in deployments appropriately between Pershing II ballistic missiles and ground-launched cruise missiles.

5. 420 Warhead Proposal, November 1983

After consultation with its Allies, the US decided to elaborate on the September initiatives by indicating that we would be prepared to accept an interim equal global ceiling of 420 warheads on LRINF missiles. This would equate to the global limit of 140 Soviet SS-20 missile systems, a number the Soviets proposed in October for SS-20 levels in Europe. This proposal was made in an attempt to be responsive to the Soviets and to show continued flexibility in reaching an agreement.

6. November 23, 1983

At the end of Round VI, Ambassador Nitze made the following statement (excerpts): "The US profoundly regrets the unilateral decision of the Soviet Union to discontinue the present round of the INF negotiations without setting a date for resumption. This decision is as unjustified as it is unfortunate. . . . The US remains committed to reaching a negotiated solution which meets the legitimate security needs of all concerned. The US Delegation has sought, both formally and informally, to explore all opportunities for reconciling the differences between the two sides. The US proposals are flexible and designed to meet expressed Soviet concerns.

The United States stands ready to halt or reverse its deployments if an equitable agreement to reduce and limit or eliminate US and Soviet INF missiles can be achieved.

For its part, the US remains prepared to continue the INF negotiations until an agreement has been reached and our two countries have thus fulfilled their responsibility to contribute to the cause of Peace."

During the press conference held on the same day, Ambassador Nitze stated "As far as this delegation is concerned, part of our delegation is permanently stationed here in Geneva. Some of the rest of us may go back to Washington for consultation. But the entire delegation is prepared to return here to Geneva at any time that the Soviets are prepared to continue or resume the discussions with us." In response to the question "Do you think they'll come back?", the Ambassador said "All I can say is I hope they come back. We're ready for them to come back; they should come back."

COMMUNICATIONS WITH SOVIET UNION ON START AND INF

1. November 29, 1983: North Atlantic Council Press Release (excerpt) stated "Ambassador Nitze reported on the latest session of the current round of negotiations, and on the unilateral Soviet decision to discontinue this round without setting a date for resumption . . . The Council discussed and deplored the Soviet decision and confirmed its belief that there is no justification for this decision. The Allies hope that the suspension will be temporary."

2. December, 1983: President Reagan reportedly sent a letter to Andropov suggesting that the U.S. was ready to move forward in START by discussing frameworks and possible tradeoffs, and a possible summit meeting on those issues.

3. January 16, 1984: In a major public address, President Reagan stated "our negotiators are ready to work toward agreements in INF, START, and on MBFR. We will negotiate in good faith. Whenever the Soviet Union is ready to do likewise, we will meet them halfway."

4. February 14, 1984: Vice President Bush stated the following during a press conference in Moscow following the meeting with the new General Secretary Chernenko. "I delivered a letter from President Reagan to the General Secretary . . . It conveyed the President's determination to move forward in all areas of our relationship with the Soviets, and our readiness for concrete, productive discussions in every one of them . . . I (Vice President Bush) stressed the particular importance of real results in reducing nuclear weapons . . . Let me direct a few parting words to the Soviet people and the

Soviet leadership . . . we are dedicated to arms reduction . . ."

5. February 29, 1984: In an interview, Secretary of State Shultz said the U.S. is engaged in "private diplomatic efforts" or "quiet diplomacy" to explore areas of agreement on arms control and other issues. Contacts included his regular meetings with Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin and meetings between U.S. Ambassador Hartman and Soviet officials.

6. March 8, 1984: Ambassador Rowny stated the following in a speech before the Los Angeles World Affairs Council: "The United States is prepared to return to the START negotiations immediately, with no preconditions or reservations. I would therefore challenge the Soviets to respond positively to this proposal and indicate their readiness to return to the START talks in Geneva.

7. March 16, 1984: President Reagan, in a statement on the resumption of MBFR, stated "I also urge the Soviet Union to return to the INF and START negotiations, where very important work in the cause of building a more secure and peaceful world has been suspended by them. . . . It is in the interest of all mankind that these vital efforts be resumed now."

8. March 27, 1984: NATO Special Consultative Group Chairman's Press Statement—"We wish to reiterate our own readiness to return to Geneva at any time. The Soviet Union should match this spirit."

9. April 5, 1984: Presidential News Conference on US draft CW Treaty and announcement of Vice President's trip to the CD: "The US and many other countries have urged repeatedly that the Soviets return to these talks (START and INF) . . . I hope that the Soviet leadership will respond to our new initiative, not only by negotiating seriously on chemical weapons but also by joining us in the urgent task of achieving real reduction in nuclear arms."

10. April 18, 1984: In a speech at the CD in Geneva, Vice President Bush stated: "Here today, I again invite the Soviet Union to return to the two nuclear arms negotiations it suspended five months ago and to resume with us the crucial task of reducing nuclear arms. The US remains ready to explore all ideas, without preconditions, at a time the Soviet Union chooses, to renew the dialogue."

11. April 26, 1984: Ambassador Rowny stated in a speech in Dallas, ". . . the United States has made it clear to the Soviets, both in public statements and through diplomatic channels, that we remain ready to return to the negotiations at any time, without preconditions . . . President Reagan raised this issue yet again in his most recent press conference when he said the Soviets 'have ignored the will of the world' by refusing to resume negotiations. He once again called for the Soviet Union to 'join us in the urgent task of achieving real reductions in nuclear arms.' "

12. May 2, 1984: ACDA Director Adelman stated in a public address "We remain prepared to return to the negotiating table without preconditions at the earliest possible time."

13. May 5, 1984: President Reagan stated the following on the occasion of the resumption of the Conference on Disarmament in Europe: "The opportunity for meaningful progress in arms control exists. The Soviet leaders should take advantage of it. Our representatives are ready to return to the two negotiating tables on nuclear arms, and we will negotiate in good faith. As I have said before, whenever the Soviet Union is ready to do likewise, we will meet them halfway."

14. June 1, 1984: In an address before the Foreign Policy Association in New York, Ambassador Nitze stated "We are ready to return to the negotiating table on 24-hour's notice. Part of our INF delegation is in Geneva at the present time. The rest of us are prepared to return on a moment's notice."

15. June 13, 1984: In an address to the Leningrad UN Conference on World Disarmament Campaign, ACDA Deputy Director said "We remain prepared to renew the talks at anytime."

16. June 29, 1984: White House Statement regarding the Soviet proposal for talks in Vienna on outer space: ". . . the United States Government has informed the Government of the Soviet Union that it is prepared to meet with the Soviet Union in September, . . . to discuss and define mutually agreeable arrangements under which negotiations on the reduction of strategic and intermediate-range nuclear weapons can be resumed."

17. July 27, 1984: White House Statement regarding the Vienna talks on outer space: ". . . we simply point out that we wish to restore exchanges on the subject of offensive nuclear arms."

CHEMICAL WEAPONS

On April 18, 1984 Vice President Bush presented to the 40-Nation Conference on Disarmament (CD) a U.S. draft treaty for a comprehensive, worldwide ban on chemical weapons. The treaty would prohibit development, production, possession, transfer and use of chemical weapons.

Verification measures include a system of regular international on-site inspection for checking declarations, monitoring stocks and facilities prior to destruction, confirming destruction, and monitoring permitted activities such as commercial production of specified chemicals which pose a particular risk. A special mechanism, involving challenge on-site inspection any time, anywhere, for military and government-owned or controlled facilities would be established to deal with suspected violations.

When the Vice President presented the U.S. draft CW treaty, he indicated that the U.S. looked forward to serious negotiations and steady progress. Obviously multilateral progress is dependent upon U.S.—USSR progress toward agreement. The Soviet Union is a member of the CD. To this end, we have indicated to the Soviets our willingness to meet bilaterally with a view to facilitating the multilateral treaty negotiations. Although the Soviets have been openly critical of the U.S. draft treaty, they have indicated their willingness to conduct such consultations in Geneva.

THRESHOLD TEST BAN TREATY

The Administration has been examining steps it might take in its efforts to strengthen significantly the verification provisions in the signed but not ratified Threshold Test Ban and Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaties, to which the United States and the Soviet Union are parties.

We have approached the Soviets on the three occasions since early 1983 to discuss our concerns, but so far they have refused to meet with us on this issue.

ADDITIONAL PROPOSALS AND COMMUNICATIONS

CSCE (COMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE)

In February 1981, in one of his first major foreign policy decisions, President Reagan endorsed the proposal that a European Conference on Disarmament (CDE) be organized to discuss first confidence building measures and later general disarmament issues. Meeting in Madrid, the 35 CSCE states finally agreed on a CSCE conference document which contained a mandate for the CDE as well as new human rights proposals. The meeting closed in September, 1983.

MBFR (MUTUAL BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS)

The U.S. developed a new approach to the Vienna talks based on President Reagan's stated arms control criteria: substantial, verifiable, and militarily-significant reductions to equal ceilings. Concluding that the establishment of military manpower parity in Central Europe would enhance stability and security in the region, the U.S. introduced this approach in NATO in May 1982 in the form of a draft treaty; after intensive Allied consultations, it was tabled in Vienna on July 8, 1982.

Following a thorough U.S. review of MBFR policy and of extensive consultation within the NATO alliance, in an effort to move the stalled talks a new Western proposal was tabled in Vienna on April 19, 1984. This proposal amended the West's 1982 draft treaty by showing greater flexibility and reducing our previous demands. This proposal calls for limiting initial data exchange to combat and combat support forces, which are the most easily identifiable.

CDE (CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE)

The United States, together with its NATO allies, tabled a proposed package of confidence and security-building measures at the Stockholm CDE on January 24, 1984. This was the first day of regular business for this new conference. The Western package calls for information exchange on ground and air forces in the CDE zone; forecasts and notifications of military activities in the zone; mandatory invitations to observers at these activities; verification provisons including inspections; and provisons for impoved communication between participants.

On June 4, 1984, in an effort to advance the CDE negotiations, President Reagan, in a speech in Dublin, offered to enter into discussions on Soviet non-use of force proposal if the Soviets would negotiate on measures to give concrete meaning to that principle.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION ON OUTER SPACE

1. June 29, 1984

The US informed the USSR that it was prepared to meet with the Soviet Union in September at any location agreeable to the Soviet Union, to discuss and seek agreement on feasible negotiating approaches which could lead to verifiable and effective limitations on ASAT weapons, and to discuss and define mutually agreeable arrangements under which negotiations on the reduction of strategic and intermediate-range nuclear weapons could be resumed.

2. August 1, 1984

The White House issued a public statement that the United States has made clear to the Soviet Government in a series of high-level messages that it accepts the Soviet Union's June 29 proposal, and is pre-

pared for serious talks in Vienna on outer space, including anti-satellite weapons. We have expressed our view that the problem of weapons in space cannot be considered in isolation from the overall strategic relationship, but that we have no preconditions on the Vienna agenda.

In response to the Soviet proposal of a mutual moratorium on anti-satellite tests from the outset of the talks, the United States expressed a readiness to have our negotiators consider what mutual restraints would be appropriate during the course of the negotiations. However, any joint Soviet-American statement on the content and objective of the Vienna talks should not prejudge the outcome of the negotiations.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION ON DEFENSIVE TECHNOLOGIES

1. May 14, 1984: Secretary of State Schultz stated the following in an address before the League of Women Voters. "Shortly after the President announced the initiative (SDI) last year, the Soviets proposed that scientists from the two countries meet to discuss the implications of these new technologies. We proposed, in turn, that experts of our two governments—including scientific experts—meeting in the context of appropriate arms control forums would be a more appropriate and effective vehicle for such discussion. We have recently renewed our offer, and it still stands."

Mr. Chairman, opponents have also suggested throughout this debate, that if we build the MX missile or build too many MX missiles, we are creating a first-strike capability. That is not so. We are building a deterrence. We are improving the deterrent capability that has kept us out of a nuclear war or a world war since the nuclear weapon was first created.

We want to make sure that there are no more Pearl Harbors, we want to make sure that no other nation ever again believes that the United States is so weak that they can attack, wipe us out, or eliminate our ability to respond.

We want to make sure that never happens again.

And as was so aptly pointed out in an earlier debate, times are different now than they were at the time of Pearl Harbor. We would not have months to rebuild, or prepare our defense as we did in 1941. In the missile age we would have only minutes.

Should the Soviets begin an activity that convinced us that they were leading up to a nuclear strike, we would not have time to start to produce our weapons then. It is too late.

We have also heard the argument that to build the MX missile is destabilizing and it is always the U.S. missile, the Peacekeeper, the MX, call it whatever you like, that is the destabilizing weapon. The Soviets have built the SS-18, the Soviets have built the SS-19, why does not somebody say that they are destabilizing? They are building SS-24's and SS-25's. Why in the world does not somebody stand up here and say that these Soviet weapons are destabilizing?

I do not think we are destabilizing when we upgrade our capability to defend ourselves and to defend freedom.

Look at the history of the United States. Our history is not a first-strike history. Our history is not one of destabilizing the peace of the world. Our history is not one of threatening the peace of the world.

At the end of World War II the United States had the only real credible military force left. The rest of the world had been pretty badly beaten.

At the end of World War II the United States had the only nuclear capability anywhere on the face of the planet.

Despite that, the Soviets have expanded their control of formerly free people far beyond their own borders. The people of the Baltic States no longer have a national identity; Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia no longer exist.

The freedom fighters of Hungary were trampled by the Soviet tanks. So were the people of Poland and Czechoslovakia. We have never done any thing like that. We have not created any surrogate hoodlums to roam the world as the Soviets have done with Cuba in Angola and other parts of Africa or with Vietnam, in Southeast Asia. We have never done that.

Despite that, look where the Soviet control has expanded in the world. Despite the fact that we had the nuclear weapon, and that we had the military force left, what do you think the map of the world would look like today had it been the Soviet Union that had the only military power left after World War II? What would the map of the world look like today if it had been the Soviet Union that had the only nuclear capability in the world?

I would ask you, and listen carefully, pay attention to history, listen to the voices of those freedom fighters from Hungary, listen to the voices of those people from Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia who no longer have a country; listen to the people of Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia; listen to the people of Cuba who came to the United States en masse in the Mariel boatlift to escape the Soviet kind of communism.

Listen to these people and learn what it means to be weak while the Soviet Union is strong. We have a sincere effort under way in Geneva today and I would like to believe that the Soviets are sincere as well. We need to make sure that our negotiators in Geneva who are trying to remove the world from a possible confrontation, nuclear or otherwise, that we give them every opportunity that we can to be successful in limiting or reducing the number of devastating arms that are available in this world.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the Soviet Union has built a destabilizing missile with the SS-18, and shame on them for building it.

The question is whether or not because they have done something stupid we should do something stupid. It is the question of building not what they have built, but building what we need.

Let us deal for a minute if we can with the history of the triad. The United States of America invented the triad. When we put weapons at sea we recognized that, at some point, weapons on land would be vulnerable, and we decided to hide our weapons.

That was a wise decision. I do not think anybody disputes that decision.

I want to deal with another question. How many times do you have to repeat, and I say this with all due sincerity to my Republican friends, over and over again the notion that we were at rest during the period of 1970 to 1980 while the Soviets were building up their forces?

□ 1430

No one is disputing the fact that the Soviets built up their forces; that is a matter of fact. But please, please concede the argument that in 1970 this country had 4,000 warheads aimed at the Soviet Union in 1970 and in 1980 it had 9,200 aimed at the Soviet Union.

That is not a nation at rest; we modernized every single aspect of the triad during the 1970's. The fact that we did not go ahead and build new weapons systems is testimony to the fact that we're not stupid. We did not, every time we wanted a 25-percent increase in accuracy, decide to build a new weapons system; we improved the very fine weapons systems we have.

Now, let me deal with this question of Geneva, because I know my colleagues over here are dying to be little arms negotiators and tell us what we should be doing and what we should not be doing with respect to Geneva.

It is important for us to remember that it is Ambassador Kampelman and not President Reagan who believes that there may be some fiddling at the margin of the talks; the President of the United States believes they will be ended; that they cannot go on.

Let us be honest with the American people and say to them that our responsibility here is to determine what is in the best interests of national security policy. So when we structure our arsenal, let us do so with our security interests in mind.

Mr. HUNTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I think his last statement that we should leave,

we should trust the negotiators in Geneva, we should not try to be 435 would-be Secretaries of State or arms negotiators, is well taken by the President and by the Members who voted for the MX missile yesterday.

Essentially, Mr. Kampelman said this: The message I got was, "I need your trust. I am asking you for something." He did say clearly that he wanted us, if anybody comes away from the White House saying Mr. Kampelman did not really want us to go with the MX missile then they are not being fair.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. I am not suggesting that.

Mr. HUNTER. OK, that is why he came forth, and I would ask the gentleman if that was not the thrust of his statement; he said "trust us," and I am telling you that this is what we need to present, a united foreign policy to the Soviet Union.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Well, let me just say that I do not quarrel that Mr. Kampelman advocated for the MX missile at his White House meeting. He did that. I would not want to mislead anybody into thinking that that was not the certain purpose for his visit back here.

Mr. HUNTER. I agree with that point.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. I think it is instructive that what Ambassador Kampelman did not say was as important as what he did say. He did not say, as President Reagan said, that this would be the end of the arms talks, and the people of the United States spend more time listening to President Reagan than they do to Ambassador Kampelman, because he is the President.

The President and Caspar Weinberger have repeated over and over and over again that this is the end of the road; if this missile is not there, things are finished. That is clearly not the case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADDABBO. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman earlier stated something that I would like to bring the colloquy back to, and that was his statement that this is not a Nation that has been at rest, when it comes to providing needed defenses for this great country.

We have modernized, we have built, we have not been unfunding things, and I think when we hear speeches to the contrary, we ought to put that into context. The context is that that is so much hokum.

I would like to ask the gentleman in the well when it comes to what this Nation has funded, which of the two superpowers funded and built and deployed MIRV'ed ICBM's first?

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. The United States.

Mr. AUCOIN. And, how many years later did the Soviet Union follow?

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Five years, six years. There is some argument as to whether or not they were ready to test right after us, but they certainly deployed multiple, independently retargetable reentry vehicles at least 5 years after we did.

Mr. AUCOIN. That squares with the information I have from the posture statement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I think it is an accurate statement.

That is not a nation at rest when it comes to any stretch of the imagination; when it comes to funding systems. We can disagree with them or agree with them, but to say that we have been at rest, we have been disarming, is absolutely absurd.

What about submarine-launched ballistic missiles?

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Well, we are talking the Soviets at least 7 or 8 years behind us.

I want to deal with an issue that we have not dealt with; at least I have not heard dealt with here in terms of cost, and that is this preposterous notion that you can protect the MX missile in the hardened silos.

Is my understanding correct from the Appropriations Committee that there is no money in this budget to harden the missiles?

Mr. ADDABBO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ADDABBO. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Does that square with the information?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADDABBO. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. There is no money, no money in the budget to harden the silos. Is there money in this budget to do point defense for the Minuteman fields?

Mr. ADDABBO. I believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COURTER. Does the gentleman argue that it is important to do so. If he wants to add the money for hardening or point defense, I would be happy to join him.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Does the gentleman believe that the missiles can be protected with hardened silos?

Mr. COURTER. The missiles can be protected, and are protected now because of the fact that we have other legs of the triad. We have gone through this argument.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Does the gentleman believe that in a race with the other side—I take back my time to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. COURTER. Go ahead.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Does the gentleman believe that in a race between hardening and accuracy that we can harden missile silos faster than the Soviets can improve their accuracy? Can the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. COURTER. I would argue that when you have a triad, something that you are arguing against, you have defenses, you can defend yourself because of the strategic or the synergistic effect of three legs of the triad.

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. I congratulate the gentleman for having read my speeches 5 years ago.

The point that the gentleman has not answered is the fact that you cannot harden silos to protect them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], a member of our subcommittee.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of this resolution, releasing funds for fiscal year 1985 MX procurement.

My reluctance stems from my fervent wish that we could vote today to banish such terrible weapons of mass destruction from the face of the Earth forever.

We do have within sight the prospect of transforming this dream into reality, but we must get there from here. And "here"—the reality with which we are faced—is a massive Soviet advantage in strategic nuclear strike power, an advantage gained despite—perhaps it would be more accurate to say because of—SALT I and SALT II, the arms control agreements that were supposed to give us a nuclear arms freeze.

The Soviets, with their highly accurate, MIRV'd force of SS-18 and SS-19 ICBM's now have the ability to launch a devastating first strike against our land-based missile force. Alone, the more than 300 SS-18's now deployed have the capability of knocking out 80 percent of our ICBM silos. The nearly 400 SS-19's currently deployed have virtually the same ability to destroy hardened targets.

Add to this first-strike threat the Soviets' program of superhardening their ICBM launchers and command and control facilities, their comprehensive civil defense program, designed to bring their industrial infrastructure through all-out nuclear war, their violations of the ABM Treaty, which seem to be part of an effort to "break out" with a nationwide antiballistic missile defense, and their clear intent to deploy the SS-X-24 and 25—two new, highly accurate, hard-target-killing ICBM's—with a large proportion of them mounted on mobile launchers.

Add to this the Soviets' continued and blatant attempts—in violation of SALT—to conceal most of their efforts to gain a decisive strategic advantage with which to cow the United States and our allies into submission.

Add to this the fact that our most accurate ICBM's—our Minuteman III's—have neither the accuracy nor the punch to crack the Soviets' superhardened launchers and command and control centers.

Since SALT I was signed in 1972—while the United States stuck to the terms of the SALT I treaties and even of the unratified SALT II Treaty—the Soviets have deployed 28 new or significantly modified strategic weapons systems. And as we debate whether or not to buy 21 more MX's this year, they have at least 8 more systems—including the SS-X-24 and 25—either poised for deployment or under development. Moreover, there is evidence that indicates they may have deployed the SS-16 ICBM—once again, a violation of SALT.

"Here" is a very frightening and dangerous reality indeed.

The comprehensive arms talks now going forward in Geneva offer the shining hope that we may at last achieve real arms control, as opposed to the cosmetic and dangerous arms control we have known to date. They offer the hope that the generation of strategic weapons which we will deploy in this decade—including MX, the Trident D-5, and the B-1B—will be the last of their kind.

Regrettably, because of the arms and arms-control policies of past administrations, this last generation of offensive nuclear weapons systems must be put in place to restore the strategic balance, give us a basis of strength from which to go forward with arms negotiations, and carry us through the period from now until the day we will be able to implement the sort of real arms control I believe is possible and that I believe President Reagan is pursuing in the Geneva talks and with the strategic defense initiative.

Let me take a moment to share some thoughts about real arms control.

The key ingredients of real arms control are: First, substantial and lasting reductions in strategic nuclear weapons; second, the nonnuclear defensive technologies to ensure that any failure to adhere to arms control accords will not upset the strategic balance; and third, policies that encourage defense over offense.

To be "substantial," reductions in strategic nuclear weapons must reduce stockpiles on both sides below the levels the United States and the Soviet Union believe necessary to achieve "assured retaliation."

The only way it will be possible to begin reducing nuclear arms stockpiles significantly is if the United States and the U.S.S.R. can be reasonably certain they have the means to offset such a reduction with defensive weapons—a "star shield."

This is the promise of President Reagan's strategic defense initiative. This program of intensive research will determine and demonstrate the feasibility of strategic defense technologies. Once these defensive weapons have been proven practical, we will be in a position to begin a step-by-step cutback of nuclear offensive weapons coupled with a symmetrical fielding of nonnuclear defensive weapons—the star shield.

This would introduce a "new look" in strategic arms, a policy new look based on genuine reductions in strategic nuclear weapons backed up by nonnuclear defenses. And reducing stocks of offensive nuclear weapons while putting in place "offsetting" nonnuclear defensive systems maintains the strategic balance—and does so at a less threatening level.

I am convinced that this is an imminently practical approach to achieving real arms control and a safer world. With it, we can change the name of the strategic arms game from offense to defense. With it, we can begin the process of dramatically reducing the danger of nuclear war. With it, we can transform the strategic arms race into a "peace race."

But we cannot get there from here without first going through a difficult and perilous time, a time of negotiations and changing policies and perceptions, a time demanding unity and strength of purpose, a time that will sorely test our courage and creativity and mightily try our patience and resolve.

We now face one such test, my friends and colleagues. I urge you to join me in standing up to it in supporting the resolution now before us and in dedicating yourselves to the support of arms and arms control policies that will make the MX and its terrible sisters the last generation of their kind and give all humankind the precious gift of a world forever free of the threat of nuclear holocaust.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

In the previous colloquy, I was interested in our colleague from Oregon asking our colleague from New York about how long after the U.S. deployed MIRV'd missiles did it take the Soviets? He was not exactly sure; 5 or 6 years.

I am not exactly sure, either, but it depended on how long it took the Soviets to either buy or steal our technology. That is where the timeframe is established.

Mr. KASICH. Will the gentleman yield?

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York did not characterize the President's statement on MX accurate, or the Secretary of Defense's statement on MX.

Secretary Weinberger appeared before the Committee on Armed Services. We have heard numerous briefings from the President and Mr. Weinberger on the need for MX; what the President said was really almost dovetail what Mr. Kampelman said; that if we did not give them the MX it would seriously undermine our negotiating process; he says, as the President said, that if we unilaterally give up the MX, viewing it like an apple that drops off a tree, the Soviets prepared to wait a heck of a long time to see what else we give up unilaterally; that we need strength and resolve and we need strength behind the talk and negotiating position. That is what the President said.

The President did not say that not having an MX means we have no more arms talks; he says in order to have effective arms talks—that is the same thing that Mr. Kampelman says; effective arms talks, we must have something that they want.

So I think it is proper that we clarify what the President's position is on the MX missile.

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

Mr. Chairman, I might say that Mr. Kampelman also said that act of good will are looked upon as absence of will be the Soviets rather than acts of good will; and I think that that dovetails with what the gentleman said.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of continued funded for the MX missile and against the House appropriations resolution disapproving funding for 21 more MX missiles.

□ 1440

In the last few day there is no doubt we have been rehashing arguments we have heard for years. In fact, over the last 10 years the Congress has voted over 200 times on the MX issue in one form or another here or in the other body. I believe it is safe to say that

had we not gone through these endless fire drills and had we gone ahead and approved the MX during the Carter years when perhaps we should have, we might not be here today; we could very probably be much further along the road in vital arms control negotiations, which of course we all want to succeed.

But indeed we are beginning new negotiations. And I am convinced that that is true primarily because the Soviets have agreed to begin again, only because our Nation has shown some resolve in the last few months, by reelecting President and an administration that is committed to keeping the Nation strong; and an administration which the Soviets now believes that peace can be preserved only by preserving our strength.

Most people agree, including critics of the MX and, most importantly, our bipartisan negotiation team in Geneva, that the Soviets only react to strength.

I might quote former Soviet Maj. Gen. Petrol Grigorenko on September 28, 1983, who said:

> The MX program, it is wise. President Reagan understands the world situation better than the liberals in America. He knows the Soviets will not talk until you show them the fist. Pay no attention to what the pacifists say or do.

So this is the time to send a message to Geneva that we are going to be strong. It is not the time to send such a message that we are going to be weak, or that we lack resolve.

As my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. HUCKABY] said just yesterday, timing is everything in politics, whether local, national or world politics.

This is not the time to send a negative message to Geneva. This is not the time to send a negative message to our ally Belgium that has just recently shown resolve by deploying cruise missiles, or to the Netherlands, for that matter, where debate on deployment of cruise missiles is occurring today.

Oddly enough, the debate in the Netherlands on deployment of cruise missiles centers on the number of medium range SS-20's the Soviets plan to deploy in Eastern Europe. This is odd, inasmuch as the critics of the MX missile and of the defense increases in general never seem to concern themselves with Soviet buildups.

But we cannot afford to ignore the Soviet military buildup. In fact, Soviet military strength is much greater than the United States and its NATO allies, as is abundantly illustrated by the comparative trend charts that I have gotten declassified by the Department of Defense. And I show these to my colleagues at this time. A number of these charts have been distributed to the leadership tables on each side of the aisle, and they illustrate that in instance after instance the United States, in a comparative basis to the Soviet Union, is remarkably inferior in one item of warfare after another. In instance after instance the Warsaw pack exceeds the capabilities of the NATO allies. And I would encourage my colleagues to take a look at these. These are declassified material. I have them available for the Members' inspection.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman just for a casual remark. I still have comments to make.

Mr. AUCOIN. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding for a casual remark, and I will make one.

I would like to ask the gentleman how it is that he believes that the construction of a vulnerable weapon is a projection of American strength? If this weapon can be taken out, and it will be taken out because there are no plans to harden silos, and there are no plans for a point defense for these missiles so they will be vulnerable. If it is vulnerable, how is it a projection of American strength? How can a vulnerable weapon be a projection of strength?

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is a question we have answered four or five times on the floor, and I have not yet seen a contradiction to the answer that has been given, and that is simply that we have three parts to the triad. And in fact if you look at a system in an isolated situation, most of our bombers are vulnerable right now. They could be taken out before they could escape. But it is a fact that if the SS-18 is launched on our ICBM's, our bombers would be able to escape. And if their SLBM's should launch on our bomber fields, our ICBM's should escape. So in a sense if the gentleman speaks of vulnerability, the Minuteman is vulnerable and our bombers are vulnerable, and Bill Perry, who is Secretary for R&D, said that he could not guarantee the invulnerability of our submarines past 1990. That is why the triad is important, and that is why the MX adds a deterrent force to our defensive systems, to our strategic systems, because of the Soviet Union should launch, for example, on our bombers, if they should decide to launch with SLBM's, they would see a much larger number of warheads coming back in our ICBM force that would escape. The triad has been explained many times.

Let me say one last thing that the gentleman raised and the gentleman from New York raised. We did stand still largely during the decade of the 1970's. They built 758 ICBM's between 1972 and today, SS-17's, SS-18's, and SS-19's, they built 38 ballistic submarines. We got a total of five Tridents in the water. They built 200 strategic long-range bombers. We built zero long-range bombers.

Now, if that is not standing still, I do not know what is. And your very argument that the MX missile is vulnerable today basically backs that point up. They have made it vulnerable during the 1970's when we stood still.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I appreciate the gentleman's answer. I think he responded to the gentleman's question.

I will be happy to yield to the gentleman for an additional question at the end of my time, if I have any left.

But I would like to just reiterate, in support of the answer of the gentleman from California to the gentleman's eloquent question, that these charts that I have available show the relative strength of the United States versus the Soviet Union, of the NATO allies versus the Warsaw Pact, and show that in such instances as intercontinental supersonic bombers the Soviets are ahead of us by some 4 to 1. In tactical combat aircraft they are ahead of us by 3 to 1.

Mr. AUCOIN. Does the gentleman know that the long-range bomber of the Soviet Union is a propeller driven bomber?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will be happy to answer that and yield to the gentleman later on, although any bomber can drop a nuclear bomb.

These trend charts clearly show for the first time in an easy-to-read fashion that the Soviets currently hold a clear margin of superiority over the United States in 31 of 36 defense categories. These categories include significant Soviet advantages in nuclear stockpiles, ballistic missile submarines, deployed ICBM's and ICBM warheads.

These trend charts are disturbing, but I believe they are very relevant to the MX debate. They clearly reveal true Soviet intentions, not for defense, but for offensive warfare.

We all hope that Soviet intentions are good. We hope that the Soviets react to our good intentions. But can anyone remember when the Soviets have demonstrated good intentions? Ask our military mission in East Germany about Soviet good intentions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has expired.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Ask our military mission in East Germany about Soviet good intentions. Ask the wife of the soldier who was killed a couple of days ago. Ask the families of the thousands of Afghans killed over the last 5 years.

Ask the families of the men, women, and children who died aboard KAL 007.

When we have not modernized our land-based ICBM's in over a decade, and by so doing have unilaterally weakened our strategic triad during the same period, the good intentions of the Soviets have resulted in at least 5 new and modernized land-based ICBM's alone—the SS-17's, SS-18's, SS-19's, and, most recently, the mobile SS-24's and SS-25's.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot escape the fact that we need to modernize our land-based strategic systems. We cannot escape or ignore the number of weapons the Soviets are deploying. Most importantly, we cannot escape the timing and circumstances of the situation we are in.

We must finally show some resolve and must move ahead today to modernize our land-based strategic forces. We cannot rely on the single warhead Midgetman scheduled to be deployed in the next decade as an excuse not to. As the history of this MX program has shown, and the Soviets clearly realize, the resolve of the United States to actually deploy or even significantly modernize a new land-based strategic system is nonexistent, unless we vote to fund these missiles.

Let us listen to our negotiators in Geneva who have sat face to face with the Soviets over the years. They know the Soviet intentions. Let us listen to them and let us vote to fund 21 more MX missiles.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN.]

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding some time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have to confess I wonder how some of the folks in this House sleep at night if they really think this country is that weak and the Soviets are that strong. I get a little tired hearing how this country has let its defenses lag and the Soviets are 25 feet tall.

The fact is, the question has been asked—and all of you would answer the same way—would you trade our nuclear strength for the Soviets? Of course you would answer "no, we would not trade for the Soviets' nuclear strength. Of course we would not trade for the Soviet strength because our nuclear strength, with the triad that we have built in this country, is much, much stronger than the Soviets."

□ 1450

Now, let me say as many others have said, I do not trust the Soviets; we need to be vigilant. We need to invest in what is necessary to protect freedom. But, I ask you: If you live in a country that has invested $1.3 trillion in 5 years in its defenses, are you really able to make the case that we are not a strong country; that we are not able to compete with the Soviets militarily; that we must fund every single weapons system proposed by the generals and the admirals no matter how illogical that weapons system might be?

Let me ask about some realities. All the debate around here is about perception. We are spending real dollars, not perceived dollars. Incidentally, these are real dollars we do not have. But what we are debating is perception. If we do this, the Soviets perceive that; if we do this, we are perceived not to have that chip; if we do not do that, someone else perceives the other thing. The reality is this: For one thing, we have land-based missiles in my State, we have 300 of them underground; I drive by them every weekend; they are sunk there in the prairies; Minuteman III's with three modern Mark XII-A warheads on each one.

Now, in this case, in North Dakota's case, we have 300 of those missiles underground. You say that we ought to replace those Minuteman III's with something new called the MX. I suppose that if we are going to get to reality, we must ask what strength will that give us? What will it give us when we finish putting this MX missile in the old silo? What will it make the Soviets afraid of?

If the President is accurate in spending 2 years telling us those silos are vulnerable to Soviet attack, and he explained it to us only as the great communicator could, if he is accurate, what does it give us to put a big, new missile in a silo that is vulnerable? Isn't that buying a pig in a poke?

Maybe someone will answer that later, I doubt it.

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I said to the gentleman I would be happy to yield to a question when I have completed my address.

Mr. COURTER. You keep posing questions, and I was wondering when you would give us a chance to respond.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I will be glad to give the gentleman an opportunity to answer those questions. In fact, his side has had plenty of time over the last 2 days to address those questions, and unfortunately I have not heard any answers and that is why I am asking them.

Mr. Chairman, what does it give us to put the MX missile in a Minuteman silo that the President says is vulnerable to attack? A greater component of accuracy with the MX missile? Well, maybe that is true. The MX missile does have a greater component of accuracy.

But for what purpose? Well, if the President was wrong, and the Minuteman silo is not vulnerable, ostensibly you could put the MX missile in there and put at risk the Soviet silos. My guess is you would not want to aim at a Soviet silo that is empty, so you would probably want to put at risk a Soviet silo with a Soviet missile in it. That suggests to me that those who want the MX missile want the opportunity, at least the opportunity, to launch a first strike that this President has said this country will never launch.

Let me conclude by asking this question: There are so many stout-hearted men and women in this House who, whenever we have a public spending question, rush to the well of this House and say, "We cannot afford that. Let us evaluate every period, every comma, every word in that bill, because I think it is going to cost somebody some money and we have the biggest deficit in the history of humankind."

Where are those stout hearts when we talk about defense? I want to invest in the right things for defense, but where are those stout-hearted men and women when it comes to a proposition like the MX which spends money we do not have for something we do not need. Where are they? They want to spend the money and charge it, and I say that is more destabilizing, more detrimental, and riskier to this country than most anything else we can do. We will choke on red ink before we will suffer at the hands of the Soviets, because we are taking this country's economy into a position from which it cannot survive unless we begin understanding that what we spend on the floor of this House we must pay for. I ask you: Where do you get the $14 billion to pay for a missile we do not need?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER].

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

Mr. Chairman, a number of questions were posed. I do not want to spend all my time answering them; let me just answer a couple of them right now.

First of all, I regretably conclude, after having been a member of the Armed Services Committee for 6 years in this body, after having listened to the testimony in the full committee and the subcommittee, that indeed, when it comes to strategic arms and strategic capabilities, there is no doubt in my mind that the Soviet Union is superior to us, and that the trend line is going in the wrong direction; not the right direction. That they are increasing their capabilities as we are decreasing our capabilities relative to the Soviet Union, No. 1.

No. 2, the gentleman poses the question: "Where are we getting with the MX missile?" Very simply I am sure

the gentleman was here, had the gentleman had an open mind yesterday, he would have realized we would be achieving a credible deterrent which is something we do not now have.

I am sure the gentleman recognizes that what we want to have is parity with the Soviet Union when it comes to strategic capabilities. They can put our command and control centers, our leadership, our military targets at risk by their land-based leg of their triad. We do not have similar capabilities at all. It will be only the MX that will give us those capabilities which will give us a credible deterrent, and that is in fact what we are buying with the deployment of the MX missile.

The real question I have is what are we doing here today? Everybody knows what we are doing here today. We are doing today precisely what we did yesterday and the day before. The vote tomorrow is going to be the same vote as the vote yesterday; precisely the same.

This debate scenario, which was structured last year, gave simply four cracks at the apple; four cracks at the MX. Four times to kill the project. We attempted in the U.S. Senate, the other body, it failed. There was an attempt, obviously, yesterday, and it failed. We are going to have a redundant vote tomorrow.

As a matter of fact, why are we deferring the vote for tomorrow rather than having it today? With the time limitations on the debate, we could have the vote in the very early evening. We could have the vote before dinner. The reason we are going to defer the vote to tomorrow is to give the opposition additional time to work and twist and use whatever persuasive powers they can to turn around some votes, and everybody knows it.

This is precisely the same vote that we had yesterday; precisely the same vote that the Senate had. It is a redundant vote; it is another crack at the apple, and I think that this body can make better use of its time.

Finally, it has been argued that this vote today is an appropriation vote and therefore it is different than the authorization vote. That is not the case whatsoever. If this appropriations vote failed, the MX procurement would end. The Peacekeeper missile production is a 3-year production. Production is divided basically in three parts. The first phase is the purchasing of raw materials, parts, and manufacturing of small assembly items. There is literally hundreds and hundreds of small subcontractors and contractors that are involved. If this vote is a negative vote today, contrary to the vote yesterday, what will happen in the real world? It is not like a light switch, it is not like baking cookies where you can take them out and put them back in if the guests come later. There are long lead items. There are contractors that will leave. As a matter of fact, all of the testimony before the House Armed Services Committee was the fact that if we do not go ahead and have two affirmative votes in the House of Representatives today, that will kill the production of the MX missile. The only way to bring it back would be at great expense.

It is possible; we did stop B-1, and then we brought it back. But we have to recall that when we did that, we spent $1 billion more than we otherwise would have had to. The testimony that we have is if we vote no today, which is the identical vote of yesterday, we will have to come up with an additional $1.3 billion to put Humpty Dumpty back together again. What is the $1.3 billion going to buy? The old Humpty Dumpty.

We can vote yes today or tomorrow; the $1.5 billion will permit the construction of the 21 missiles which will increase our deterrent capability which will give it credibility or, if we vote no, we can later on, when we find out that we need it, spend an additional $1.3 billion for no missiles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. COURTER] has expired.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. COURTER. I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

We can spend $1.3 billion which will give us no missile whatsoever, which will mean, if we feel that we need to have it in the future, have to come up with the $1.5 billion again.

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

Mr. COURTER. I yield to the gentleman.

□ 1500

Mr. KASICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Would the gentleman just for a second enter into a discussion with me concerning the deployment of MX today, as Scowcroft calls for. Scowcroft Commission says deploy that MX today because that modernizes that leg of the triad today, but would the gentleman not agree that it is critical that when we are talking about MX we recognize that MX is just the link to a more stable system that Scowcroft and the supporters of MX want, and that is the deployment in that Midgetman, that low warhead missile that gives us greater stability.

I wonder if the gentleman would comment on that feature of deploying MX today to breathe modernization into that system today with the link to that Midgetman in the future.

Mr. COURTER. I thank the gentleman. He brings out a very important point.

The credibility of deterrent, and that is what we have today until we go to some sort of defensive system, which I think the gentleman wants, as I do, the research and development, depends basically on a couple of things. It depends basically on the invulnerability of the entire defense capability, not to perceive vulnerability with regard to one silo or one leg of the triad, No. 1; and No. 2, a credible threat to the other side to make sure that they recognize that we could render unto them and make certainly unreasonable any type of attack against the United States.

It requires both those things. Therefore, it is essential that we give credibility to our deterrent today by deploying MX, and at the same time move, and this is extremely important, move toward a mobile system. The Soviet Union is moving toward a mobile system. We had the artist's rendering yesterday that it will be moving toward a mobile system this year, in 1985.

The gentleman points out a very good thing. It is important to shore up the credibility today by deploying MX, and then moving to a Midgetman, a single-warhead, mobile missile that will be invulnerable sometime as soon as we can in the early 1990's.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

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

Mr. Chairman, the debate on continued production of the MX missile has become so polarized that a central point has been lost. It is that intelligent, well-motivated people on both sides of the issue are seeking the same goal: Reduction of nuclear arms.

I am as sincerely dedicated to that goal as I know the hundreds of people are who have called and written on this issue.

I have decided to support continued, limited production of the MX Peacekeeper missile at the present time.

I believe this course provides the best chance to encourage serious arms reduction negotiations in Geneva and to reduce the overall threat of nuclear war. Those are the fundamental principles that have guided me in making this decision involving the defense of our Nation and the free world.

The most important, and often overlooked, word in this debate is "reduction." It is not enough to control arms, because all we are doing is controlling the growth and expansion of nuclear arsenals. It is not enough to freeze nuclear arms, because that preserves a status quo which is an unacceptable balance of terror.

We must think and negotiate beyond the narrow limits of control and freeze, and achieve at Geneva a mutually advantageous agreement to reduce nuclear arms.

My reading of history indicates that the Soviets will join us in that effort only if they clearly see it is the best alternative open to them. That is why I've supported the consensus of the bipartisan Scowcroft Commission, which made the critical link between a careful, measured modernization of U.S. forces—including limited production of the MX—and arms reduction negotiations.

Congress endorsed this critical link last year by passing legislation which I supported, embracing the idea that if the Soviet Union returned to the negotiating table and thereafter sought real reductions in strategic nuclear arms, the United States would not have to build any more MX missiles. That the Soviets have come back to the table is a good sign. In the course of negotiations we shall now learn if they are willing to seek real reductions—similar to those we suggested in our build-down proposal offered in Geneva during the previous negotiations before the Soviets walked out.

We have been successful in generating a resumption of negotiations. Those talks are in their delicate, early stages, with no clear indication of how they will progress. I believe we should continue to follow the guidelines of the Scowcroft blueprint. I sincerely feel that abandoning the MX now would mean the Soviets would retain their current monopoly on MX type missiles—of which they have over 600. Sensing a lack of U.S. resolve in that we would permit such a destabilizing monopoly to exist, the Soviets would have no incentive to reduce the number of their large, accurate, multiple-warhead missiles, which is one of our primary goals in Geneva.

None of us can see the future. I believe the present course offers mankind's best hope for a real, meaningful step toward mutual arms reduction. However, I will not allow that hope for arms reduction to cloud a realistic view of the Soviets. I sincerely believe that the Soviets are shrewd negotiators who will not agree to mutual arms reductions if they think we will reduce ours unilaterally, without requiring an equitable response by them.

It must also be recognized that the Soviet negotiators returned to the bargaining table only when it became obvious that the United States—and the Western Alliance—would not continue to defer strategic modernization if the Soviet Union continued to refuse to respond in kind.

However, in supporting the MX, I do not agree with the belief that maintenance of an adequate defense should not have to take into account budget concerns. My voting record illustrates that I look at new weapons systems in a careful and independent manner. It should be pointed out that the cost of the entire MX program—over half of which has already been spent— is less than the B-1B bomber program and is almost half that of the F-18 aircraft program, both of which I consistently have opposed.

Let me say, in closing, that as a former Sunday school teacher and military officer, I seek a world at peace. I do not believe that unilateral disarmament will maintain and secure a lasting peace. Bilateral arms reduction is possible at Geneva if both parties are serious.

I will continue to make critical evaluations and independent votes on America's defense needs. I thank the many citizens of the Second District of Michigan who have offered their guidance on both sides of this critical issue for our Nation and the World.

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES].

Mr. MAVROULES. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think this has been a very meaningful debate. I think the last couple days has been excellent. So far today it has gone quite well, and it is my understanding we will finish it off tomorrow.

I might answer my dear friend from New Jersey that no matter what debate we do, it has got to be meaningful and healthy because all nations see us as a legislative body willing to take on the hard issues and to talk about them and finally make a decision. I just want to talk about a couple things here this afternoon that we really should touch upon.

I do not think either nation is trying to become superior to the other. So long as we have that deterrent factor, so long as one nation understands that indeed at the time of an attack the other has the capability of raining total destruction on the other nation, I think we have that today. If we want to be candid and honest with ourselves, we have that today.

The MX missile in my judgment, at least my opinion, to those I have talked to, those who have testified, and from what I have read, is not the weapons system that brought the Soviet Union back to the negotiating table. SDI plays a far greater effective role in what brought the Soviet Union back to the table. Let us not kid ourselves. Let us put all the cards on the table. We are all grown people here. It is the SDI Program they are concerned about, not so much the technical aspect of it, but I think the economic aspect of it, because that one really is going to cost an awful lot of money.

We have to make some decisions here pretty soon. Are we willing to make that commitment as a nation, Republicans, Democrats, and we are going to separate those very shortly.

The thing that has bothered me from day one on this issue is the talk that is prevalent on both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans alike, that feel that they are going to get off very easy on this one, but they are not. Those who feel that, "Well, we are going to give the President 21 more so that he can continue those arms control talks in Geneva because we do not want to cut the legs from under our negotiators," and then in the 1986 budget, and as sure as we are here today it is going to happen, there is going to be a movement from both sides to say to the President, "You have had enough, Mr. President. We are giving you 42 missiles, and maybe 50 if you can find the money for the other 8."

I said yesterday here, and I hope that people do not take it personally, and I do not mean to be disrespectful, but in my judgment that is being intellectually dishonest because either you believe in a program or you do not believe in a program, and this is funny coming from me: To those who truly believe in the MX missile, I am not going to offer any advice, but if you believe in it, give it to the President. Give him 100. Give him the 223 that he is asking for, because that is what we are talking about, 223 missiles. Give it all, because 42 missiles will not do, will not give you the deterrent factor, at least from the point of view of the administration.

So are we wasting our time here today? Have we wasted our time during the last 2 days in this so-called meaningful debate? Are we going to say to the President in about 3 or 4 weeks, or right after the Easter recess, that "You have had enough of your missiles"? What is going to happen to the arms control talks in April should we take that position, perhaps later on in the summer, should we take that position?

Are we being honest with ourselves? That is the question we have to ask. I am not sure we are about ready to answer it. Maybe I am saying that today, and I stated it yesterday, to give those who are thinking in that direction some thought.

I oppose the system. I think it is a waste of money. The MX missile probably would give you more fire power as part of the triad. If you honestly believe that 1,000 warheads on 100 MX missiles is going to take the greatest brunt from the Soviet Union, you are mistaken, because what they are going to do is build more missiles, and they can build them. Let us not kid ourselves. They will build more missiles, and they can aim them right at the MX missiles.

The fact here is this: It is deterrent. Do we have a force? Do they recognize the fact that we can retaliate, and I think they do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES] has expired.

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MAVROULES. I thank the gentleman for yielding this additional time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here to take anybody on. I think we have all expressed our views. For 6 years I have been hearing the statements on this floor about a balanced budget. Let us talk about it, because this plays a hard part in the economy.

Cut the budget. That is all I keep hearing. When we cut out $50 million for a particular program, there are those who say, "Well, you have to cut it out because you are adding to the deficit." Let me say this: that of those who have spoken from both sides of the aisle in the last couple days, I can honestly tell you they are not the same people talking about a balanced budget. I want to hear from those who come and take the floor of the House every single day and say no matter what we do we are going to tie that into the budget deficit so we can reduce the budget deficit.

Where have they been? Where are they today? Why are they not calling for budget reductions today, because this is part of the economy? Those are the questions that I think have to be answered and I think we have to be honest with ourselves.

□ 1510

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take this opportunity to respond, I hope thoughtfully, to some of the things the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has said.

No. 1, on this point of 223 missiles, this, I do not recall, has ever come into a debate before on missile systems, keeping track precisely of all of the surplus missiles that are built to use in the test program. I did a lot of research yesterday because of a thoughtful conversation two of us had on the House floor about this; 150 of the additional 123 missiles will be regularly fired as we have done in the Minuteman or the Titan Program. The Pershing II missile has been averaging 20 test firings a year to ensure the viability of this system, and it had its problems early on, which the peacekeeper MX missile never had. They hold 15 missiles back in reserve generally to take care of that area years from now where a missile system begins to deteriorate, age, or decay.

If we had talked about, say, the Minuteman Program, which had been firing right up until this year an average of seven missiles a year, then in that program of 1,000 missiles, after we had retired the obsolescent Minuteman I missiles, we still would have averaged hundreds of missiles that we have used in that test program.

I have had a lot of constituents call after watching yesterday's debate on C-SPAN, and they were really confused about the number of missiles. I just wanted to clarify that.

Nobody is ever going to get anything by Aviation Week and Space Technology, let alone your excellent committee or the distinguished gentleman from New York, with two jeweler's eyepieces watching every line of the markup of every subcommittee and committee in the appropriations process, or to ever sneak, as the Soviets may have done it to EURATOM, test missiles into strategic combat-ready holes.

Now, at one point the gentleman made a statement, if I heard the line correctly—and please, I will get more time if I did not hear it correctly—he said that neither country, the Soviet nation or the great United States of America, wants to achieve military superiority. If you listen to what Arkady Shevchenko says or probably what we are going to hear from the Soviet diplomat who defected while jogging in India last week, I think a reasonable case can be made, without making your case to be any less intellectually solid or patriotic, that the Soviet Union, after the missile crisis, when some gentleman in the news media coined an historical phrase, "We were eyeball to eyeball, and they, the Soviets, blinked," made a decision among those old men in that Politburo that never again would they find themselves in a position of 5 to 1 superiority on the U.S. side.

I do not believe they drove to a 5-to-5 perfect standoff. Their Communist plan, their doctrine is to drive for and maintain overwhelming military superiority in biochemical warfare, overwhelming 4 to 1 superiority in conventional, which our bishops want us to address, and overwhelming strategic superiority in land, sea, and air. That is my judgment.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AuCOIN].

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, a great many things have been said about this missile, some of them probably accurate and some of them not accurate.

Just recently in the conversation there was this talk about 123 or 223 missiles. I heard the testimony before the Committee on Armed Services, and my impression is that they do not really expect to use all those additional 123 missiles just for testing. It was left a little bit up in the air about what they were going to be used for. My own impression is that it will not be very long after we get 100 missiles in 100 sites that we are going to want to build another 100 missile silos.

In the discussion earlier, late last night, about other things that this money can be used for more profitably, discussion was had about conventional weapons, and I would like to refer to some of those facts that I was not able to give specifically within that time element that we had, and then talk about not only conventional weapons but strategic weapons. This program for the future costs about $32.5 billion, and if we decided to scrap these missiles and go to conventional weapons, which I think is the wise thing to do because of our danger in Europe about having to go to a nuclear war because of not being able to win a conventional war there, we could build, for instance, the following:

Eight hundred and forty M-I Abrams battle tanks for $2.3 billion; 716 M-2 Bradley fighting vehicles for $1.2 billion; 144 Apache attack helicopters, $1.4 billion 44 multiple-launch rocket systems with 72,000 rockets, $0.6 billion; 180 F-16's, $3.7 billion; 48 F-15's, $2.2 billion; 2 DDG-51 guided missile destroyers for $2.4 billion; 3 CG-47 Aegis cruisers for $2.8 billion; 4 SSN-688 attack submarines, $2.8 billion; Army and Marine munitions for 1 year, $6.4 billion; and annual operations costs for 5 Army infantry divisions for $3 billion; 8 squadrons of 24 F-15's for $1 billion; and 6 carrier battle groups for $2.6 billion; for a total of $32.4 billion.

Now, after I said that, from similar statistics before the Congress earlier in the debate, some people said, "Well, we do not think you ought to go to conventional war. That would require a draft or something like that." They say they would not like to do that, but they would like to strengthen the so-called triad.

The interesting thing about the triad is that we really have a triad without the ICBM, because if a triad consists of land-based, air-based, and water-based missiles, we have the nuclear cruise missiles as well, and they can be fired from land, sea, or air as well. So we have a triad even without the ICBM, and it is a very good triad, as a matter of fact.

Now, if you wanted to go to nuclear weapons, here is what you could do. The money saved by canceling the MX, $33 billion, could fund the following nuclear weapon systems:

Twenty Trident submarines at $33 billion, or the following cruise missile triad: 2,000 ground-launched cruise missiles at $12 billion; 4,000 submarine-launched cruise missiles at $11.5 billion; and 3,400 air-launched cruise missiles for use on modified B-52's, $8.4 billion. That is a total of $31.9 billion.

Or you can have a combination of nuclear weapons systems adding up to $33 billion, such as: 1,000 ground-launched cruise missiles, $6 billion; 4,000 submarine-launched cruise missiles, $11.5 billion; 1,700 air-launched cruise missiles for use on modified B-52's, $4.2 billion; and 6 fully equipped Trident submarines, $11.0 billion.

It is my opinion that this particular missile, the MX, should be canceled because it is not a good weapon. Weapons should be used to do harm to the enemy. This particular weapon has as much chance of doing harm to us as it does to the enemy. It is so very vulnerable that it incites an attack. It incites the possibility of the other side fearing that we have a first-strike possibility. It increases the chances of nuclear war. All of these things added together seem to me to make it a very, very faulted weapon.

We can look at the very people who are now testifying for it and see that a year or so ago, with the same silo, they said, "For heaven's sake, don't do it."

It is a waste of money. The money could be put into conventional weapons or could be put into other nuclear weapons, and that is a much worse thing for the enemy than is projected here with this particular MX missile.

I would like to conclude my remarks by saying that there is a reason for having this debate today. This is not an endless or useless debate we are having today because it is focusing on the next thing, and that is the appropriation.

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

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, just to conclude my remarks, I say that this is not a useless debate because the debate yesterday was on authorizing these missiles. They have now been authorized. The money has been fenced, $1.5 billion for the immediate purchase, and the next thing would be the appropriation. If we turn down the appropriation today, that would be just something that would be hanging over. It would be something we could respond to at the Geneva talks on the basis of what is best for us.

So it is just like any other authorization. The authorization would be there. We do not have to make the appropriation today, and I urge those of us who feel, as I do, that it is a bad missile, that we really ought to postpone the appropriation for this missile until such time as we really know that we need it.

□ 1520

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the United States has not deployed a new land based strategic missile for 15 years. During that same period of time the Russians have deployed four generations of new missiles and are developing two additional ones as we speak here today, an unprecedented and relentless nuclear buildup across the way.

While the Soviets have been moving ahead, America has been falling behind. I am convinced that in this country and even in this body there are those who had they been here during the continental congressional years would still be saying there is no need to upgrade the muskets we have. They are absolutely effective against whatever enemy may be out there, or if you want to upgrade those muskets you may intimidate or scare or destabilize the world situation and perhaps cause war. That is an archaic and I think moldy opinion of the world situation. We must upgrade. We must modernize. We must keep up with whatever is the threat against us at the moment; but there are those who say, "Oh, but to upgrade our system and to modernize our muskets would cause a destabilizing situation in the world."

How can you say that? How can you say the United States building 21 missiles would destabilize a world where during the past decade the Soviet Union has deployed over 800 Peacekeeper-type missiles.

They have 308 SS-18's, 360 SS-19's, 150 SS-17's, all of which are larger and more powerful than any of the U.S. missiles.

How can they say that us building 21 missiles of equivalent force would be destabilizing? Is it not destabilizing what the Russians have done over the last 15 years? They have deployed 800. We are talking about 21. Of the 1,400 or so Soviet ICBM's, 308 are SS-18's, the most powerful missle on Earth.

Let me make this point clear. The SS-18 is eight times as large, eight times as powerful, as the newest U.S. ICBM, the Minuteman III; yet I am convinced when we decided to make the MX, we made a mistake. We should have called the MX the Minuteman IV. That way we would not be destabilizing the world. That is what the Russians do. They have the SS-14, SS-16, SS-18, and so they say that is not a new missile, that is only an upgrade of an earlier missile.

I think we should call ours Minuteman VII, because that is how many rockets the Russians have deployed since we deployed the Minuteman III.

To build 21 missiles of less power than the Russians is destabilizing? Come on, give me a break.

The Soviets are testing two new ICBM's. Is that destabilizing? I do not hear an answer on the other side.

The multiple warhead Peacekeeper, SS-X-24, and the single warhead SS-X-25, the latest, are directly in violation of the SALT II Treaty. And we are destabilizing to build 21 MX missiles?

The current U.S. ICBM force which consists of 500 Minuteman III's, 450 Minuteman II's, and about 30 old Titan II's, all these missiles were developed before 1971, not too long after we flew to the Moon. That is how old these missiles are, many of them much older than that. the Titans, in fact, were used to launch some of the first satellites the United States ever launched back in the sixties. We are still depending on that old, unreliable rocket even today.

All these missiles were developed before 1971 and since that time the Russians have put out over 800 rockets of the size and power of the MX. Overall, the Soviet ICBM force is three to five times as powerful as the U.S. force. And for us to add 21 missiles to that is destabilizing?

I maintain that whether it be MX missiles or strategic missiles, whether you put trucks or howitzers or airplanes or whatever——

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

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield my colleague 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Whether you put trucks, missiles, planes, or what have you, you have got to modernize, you have got to have a system that is up to date to take advantage of whatever technology there may be.

Finally, let me say this. We have heard it is the MX missile, the building of this small quantity which will, in fact, destabilize the world's strategic balance. We all know that it is not weapons that destabilize the world balance. We have had weapons ever since we have been a nation that hopefully were among the world's best. We have never used any weapon we have had for a first strike or in an aggressive capacity. We have always been defensive. The Russians know that. The world knows that. The United States will never be the aggressor nation; so you cannot say that the United States is building a weapon for aggression or a destabilizing force, because it has never been in our history to do that; but when the Russians build these huge quantities of missiles, they are not called destabilizing, even though the history of the Soviet Union has been of aggression and taking over defenseless countries and those who could not defend themselves. Somehow when they build these huge quantities of destructive weapons, eight times more powerful than ours, they are not destabilizing the world strategic situation.

I really think we need to reexamine whether or not when you say these weapons, these 21 MX missiles are destabilizing the strategic situation in the world, I really think when you examine the numbers and the history of the Soviet Union, the numbers of missiles involved in their buildup, I really doubt you can make that point stick.

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday some Members in this body felt compelled to give a vote for Max. Max Kampelman had returned from Geneva. We wanted to symbolically strengthen his hand by putting $1.5 billion on the negotiating table that he could use as leverage with the Soviet Union.

Well, yesterday this House cast a vote for Max. We gave him $1.5 billion. It is on the table now sitting across from his Soviet counterpart negotiator. He can now give it away or retain it and say that it will be converted into missiles, if in fact he determines or recommends to the Congress and to the President that the Soviet Union is not negotiating in good faith, the classic definition of a bargaining chip.

Tomorrow's vote is another vote, though. Tomorrow's vote is on whether or not we have to break our pattern of the past year of keeping this money in the form of a bargaining chip to be given away or retained by our negotiators and convert it into actual missiles.

Now, I ask the Members of this House if they believe it is a wise decision to switch their votes from last year to a new position that takes us into an era of production?

Yesterday's vote was a vote for Max. Yesterday's vote was a vote for Geneva.

Tomorrow's vote is a vote on the production of the MX.

Let us make the distinction between giving him a bargaining chip and actually beginning to produce additional nuclear MX missiles.

For the Members that want to in fact be perceived as consistent on this issue, the only logical choice tomorrow which they can make is tc stay with the same position which they have had for the past year, which is to fence this money, give it to the negotiators, but tell them that with great personal reservations, they have done so because they do not want to see this missile go into production unnecessarily because of the economic and strategic questions which they have about it, but they will reserve their right to make that decision pending recommendations which return to this House, to the Senate and to the President, as to the sincerity and good faith of the Soviets in their negotiating positions over the next year in Geneva. But they will reserve their right to make that decision.

□ 1530

That is the responsible position that Members of this House can take. It is in fact the only position that those that wish to give the President a pure bargaining chip can in fact take.

I would hope Members tomorrow would understand that they are not going to be perceived as being inconsistent if they stick with the position which this House has had for the past year but, rather, they will be perceived to be inconsistent if they move it from the bargaining chip of money to the bargaining chip of missiles which this President is requesting.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RUDD].

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Chairman, yesterday we voted 219 to 213 in support of the authorization for the MX Peacekeeper. I hope we will stand firm in our resolve and vote again for our national security and a strong negotiating position at the bargaining table in Geneva by adopting this resolution.

The MX is needed to enhance our bargaining position, but it should by no means be considered a bargaining chip—something to be given away. Any delay in ICBM modernization will threaten the already weakened ability of our land-based forces to perform their triad mission. We have not deployed a modernized land-based ICBM since the early 1970's. Our Titan II force is being retired, and extensive rehabilitation of Minuteman missiles is already required to keep them operational; 75 percent of U.S. strategic weapons are 15 years old or older. By contrast, 50 percent of the Soviet force is less than 5-years old.

Should we fail to approve funding for the MX—the only system immediately available to redress the imbalance in land-based forces which exists—we will be voting to unilaterally disarm through obsolescence.

We must have a modernized land-based force.

For more than 30 years, our triad of strategic defense forces has successfully maintained the peace, but only because it has been of sufficient strength and credibility to provide effective deterrence. Each leg of the triad has contributed unique capabilities not found in the other two components. The land-based force offers prompt response, alert rates near 100 percent, high accuracy, flexible target coverage, responsive command and control, greater throw weight, and sufficient penetration to counter Soviet ABM defenses.

Sea-based forces remain virtually invulnerable to attack, and possess important accuracy and throw weight characteristics. Air-based, bomber forces can be recalled; they can penetrate Soviet air defenses.

Together, the three legs of the triad severely diminish the effectiveness of any Soviet attack. Together, they serve as a credible deterrent.

However, the credibility of the triad is significantly reduced if one of its components is allowed to become obsolete. Obsolescence would sacrifice strategic force diversity, flexibility, and military capability, and would reduce overall force survivability by allowing the Soviets to concentrate on the remaining two components.

If we vote down this resolution—if we demonstrate a lack of resolve in ensuring our national security—what incentive do the Soviets have to bargain in good faith in Geneva?

While we demonstrated unilateral restraint by not deploying new ICBM's since the early 1970's, the Soviets built and built and built.

They deployed at least three new types of systems involving over 800 missiles and are already testing at least two more new types, including the SS-X-24, which should achieve initial operational capability in 1985, and the SS-X-25, which is believed to be designed for mobile deployment.

The Soviets haven't given up any systems prior to coming to the bargaining table, and you can bet they won't give anything up at the bargaining table unless they can get something in return.

Let's not determine the outcome of those talks here in this Chamber. Let's give our negotiators the tools they need to negotiate from a position of strength and achieve mutual deep reductions in nuclear arsenals. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. OLIN].

Mr. OLIN. I am sure that as many people have said today, that just about all has been said here that needs to be said many, many times over. It is very unlikely that anybody who voted yesterday would change his mind or her mind. But there is always the hope that a few will, and that it is well worth speaking out in that maybe unlikely eventuality.

I have followed this debate as everybody has for the last few days, and last year, and the year before. I have listened to all of the intricate arguments about the negotiating strategies and how that ties in with the MX.

It just seems to me that that may be a little bit beside the point and that the real point here is that the MX, if you look at it over a period of time, just has not represented a good value and we all know that it is vulnerable. It never has acquired a basing mode that was worth a darn.

It is a first-strike weapon. We now find that to make use of it at all we

are going to have to harden the silos. I had a general come down and see me 1 week ago and we talked about hardening the silos. And he said we do not even know how to do it. It cannot possiblly be done until 1990, because the technology is so foreign to us. I could hardly believe that, but that is what he said.

We heard the Scowcroft Commission report 2 years ago. They basically said the device is a transitional device. It is not the kind of thing that will really do us much good. He did say to build a few, but he said go ahead all out with the Midgetman because that is a mobile missile that will be equally powerful, equally accurate, and it will do us so much good, and I bought that argument. I think it made sense.

The President said to me face to face, 2 years ago, I said:

How many of these missiles will you need to build, Mr. President?

Then he said:

Very few, just don't worry about it.
Will you ever build 100?
Never. We will bargain them away.

Well, he did not bargain them away and this year he says we have to have the missile because of negotiations. I do not think that anybody really, really believes that the MX has much to do with the negotiations in Geneva. It is just not conceivable that a missile of this nature that has had a 14-year history as spotty as the MX has had that barely got even a majority in the Congress year by year could possibly in any sense be the reason that the Russians came to the bargaining table.

It is inconceivable that a swing of a couple of votes is going to make the difference in the negotiations. It does not make sense.

Ambassador Kampelman said earlier this week to the question of what will happen if we do not get the MX, and he said: "Well, my negotiations might take a little longer."

For $30 billion, $12 billion for the MX's and $18 billion to harden the silos, and we would not get that done until 1990 when we will have the Midgetman, negotiating a little bit longer in Geneva is a very good, very good thing, and a good bargain as compared to $30 billion of money that we do not have.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MILLER], a very able member of the Defense Subcommittee.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to know what additional points or arguments can be made in this debate. In recent weeks, as the other body and now we in the House consider these resolutions, every conceivable aspect of this difficult problem has been examined—not only on the floor of our two Chambers, but also in the media, and in free and open debate among our citizens. But it is not only in recent weeks that we have examined this issue. We in this country have been agonizing about the MX for years.

The President appointed the Bipartisan Scowcroft Commission 2 years ago to examine this issue and make recommendations. We all know what those recommendations were. The Commission recommended deploying 100 MX missiles in silos, proceeding with the development of a small, single-warhead missile, and pursuing arms control negotiations. That, of course, did not put a stop to our national debate. As Nicholas Brady, former Senator from New Jersey and a member of the Scowcroft Commission, wrote in a recent Wall Street Journal article, the Commission's recommendation was 2 years and several million words ago.

We have all been deluged with articles and commentary on both sides of this isue. We have heard from our constituents—again, on both sides of this issue. This is all as it should be. That is our free and democratic process in action. We all love and want to preserve this free and open society. And that is exactly the point I want to make now.

Unfortunately, not all the people of the world have the privilege of living in free societies. Was there a great public debate in the Soviet Union, involving citizens and free media, questioning the production and deployment of over 600 SS-18's and SS-19's, both of which carry multiple warheads? Are Soviet citizens writing to the bosses in the Kremlin to express their views, and are these views being taken into consideration in determining Soviet policy? Of course not. It is a tragedy, but the fact of the matter is that the Soviet Union is ruled by a few powerful men, who oppress their own people, and seek to dominate other nations. That is what we are up against in dealing with the other superpower. And that is what makes our decisions so difficult.

We ourselves are peaceloving, and would much rather see our national resources used for purposes other than military might. But we are up against a regime which, every since seizing power, has been willing to deny the domestic needs in its society in order to increase Soviet military might.

There is no one on the floor of this Chamber who is not concerned about the dangers of nuclear weapons. We are all committed to seeing our Nation pursue policies that will prevent nuclear war and will preserve our Nation's freedom and security. The point at which we differ is in determining whether the addition of 21 MX missiles will contribute to the goals we are all seeking to achieve.

I think it is important to bear in mind that we possess nuclear weapons as a deterrent to aggression and attack. We have not used our nuclear capability to intimidate or blackmail any other nation, even when we had a monopoly on this awesome power. Anyone who thinks that the United States possesses nuclear weapons in order to take an aggressive stance toward other nations does not know this country very well.

The Soviet military buildup, to which I referred earlier, has gone far beyond reasonable defensive needs, and has destabilized the strategic relations between our two nations. The MX is designed to restore the balance between the two superpowers, to give us once again a credible deterrent capability. Deterrence is all we seek, and deterrence helps keep the peace. We will not be promoting the deterrence-based peace if we do not upgrade our strategic missile capability in the face of the Soviet advances in this area.

But another aspect of this equation—and it is a complex equation—is that we are earnestly seeking a mutual, balanced, and verifiable arms reduction agreement with the Soviet Union. And that is why our negotiators are at Geneva. It makes absolutely no sense for us to negotiate with ourselves, and deny ourselves an improved strategic missile capability, without getting anything from the Soviets in return. As I pointed out earlier, if we unilaterally disarm ourselves, there will not be free editorials, and peace marches, and sit-ins in the Kremlin, urging the Soviet bosses to follow the American lead. Anyone in the U.S.S.R. who tries that gets a one-way ticket to Siberia.

So if we want to see a genuine two-sided arms reduction agreement, we simply must not cut the ground out from under our negotiators in Geneva. They have to bargain from a position of strength if they are to obtain reciprocal reductions with the Soviet Union.

Like everyone else, I wish we did not have to spend the $1.5 billion on the MX. I doubt there is a Member of this Chamber who is more reluctant to spend the taxpayers' dollars than I. But we can't fall into the trap of thinking that when we spend money for national defense, we are not getting anything for this expenditure. We are buying peace and freedom, which is to the benefit of each and every American. I ask my colleagues: isn't peace worth $1.5 billion? Isn't the freedom of our Nation worth $1.5 billion? Isn't improving the chances for a genuine arms reduction agreement worth $1.5 billion?

I have weighed the issues carefully in my own mind, and have come to the conclusion that the additional 21 MX missiles will, in fact, contribute to these goals, which we all seek. I urge my colleagues to vote to release the funds for the MX.

□ 1540

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

Mr. MOODY. I thank the chairman.

I have two quick points which need to be stressed.

First of all, if the 21 missiles are a bargaining chip, or a leverage for Geneva, there is no reason why that bargaining chip has to be played now. A tough bargainer, and we should always be tough bargainers with the Soviets, a tough bargainer would play his bargaining chip at the right moment, not at the beginning of the game. He would put it in his back pocket and he would play it when the right time comes. Why give it away now? Why not hold it and see how the Russians in fact do behave in Geneva and then play it if that is appropriate?

Second, the vote on Thursday is not necessarily slamming the door on those 21 missiles. If that vote goes against the MX on Thursday they can always be brought back later. However, if you vote yes on Thursday you will never de-deploy them.

Finally, on costs, it is not $1.5 billion as some people say, we are talking about a $5.3 billion program because of the hardening cost that will greatly increase the amount of money that must be spent. So we are not just talking about $1.5 billion.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say initially that I think the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] made some very good points in the debate when he talks about the deployment of SS-17's, SS-18's, and SS-19's. Now we are off the drawing board on the SS-24's and SS-25's. I am told that we could see deployment of the mobile 24 or 25 any day. When we take a look at the fact that the Soviets have deployed over 600 MX-type missiles and what we are looking at in this country essentially is 42, an additional 21, but 42, when you see that the Soviets have deployed over 600 of these same MX-type missiles, and the fact that people say "Why do we need this MX when you put it in a vulnerable silo?" We have already heard the arguments about the synergy. We understand the fact that the MX, if we read the Scowcroft Commission report, understand that the MX really is an effort to modernize our forces today, that to not have this leg as a viable leg of our triad is in itself destabilizing; that the Scowcroft Commission says that for the Soviets to be able to place at risk a variety of our targets were thus being unable to place at risk the same number of targets in their nation, that that situation is destabilizing and that the movement to put MX and to deploy MX today and to modernize that leg of the triad is in fact stabilizing.

Now, let us move on from that because we must all understand that MX is linked to Midgetman. Midgetman, viewed as an effort to try to remove the importance of each individual platform, to try to have more platforms, thus making each target less important. What we hope is by moving toward Midgetman that we encourage the Soviet Union away from the heavy missile dependency and move them in the direction of more mobility, less emphasis on every single platform.

Let it be further pointed out that Scowcroft also said that we do need to continue to modernize our submarine force by moving toward the D-5, by building smaller subs which again is more stabilizing, because then we de-emphasize the importance of each platform and at the same time they advocate the continued development of cruises and B-1.

All this is designed to maintain, to have a modern triad, a deterrent that has kept the peace in the nuclear age.

We also heard from Mr. Kampelman who said: "Please let me go to Geneva," and in fact he was here the day before he went to Geneva and sat down to eyeball the Russians and said:

> Let me have it, don't undercut my negotiating position, don't hurt my negotiating posture, don't send me to Geneva and pull the rug from under me. Let me use this as a bargaining chip.

To me I think it will be great if it is a good bargaining chip, if we could not deploy the MX and get the Soviets to reduce some of their 18's and their 19's and their 17's. That would be fantastic but that argument about the bargaining chip goes by the wayside because if we won in Geneva we would still recognize the need to renew America's insurance policy and breathe modernization into this land-based system.

Let me though for a second dwell on one issue that we have been hearing about and I will tell you people on this side of the aisle, and the conservatives are concerned about this is any issue in America, and that is the issue of deficit and of cost.

I want to make it clear that Mr. COURTER of New Jersey and I have been working on programs designed to figure out how we can stop momentum that can be built into a defense budget, how we can start to look at deficit reduction and have defense play a part; what we can do to look at what the President requests and what we think we can do without in terms of modernization or what we can delay or what system may not be needed or try to figure out what we can do to try to slow the deficits and slow the growth in the defense budget.

Now, you must recognize that when you look at strategic programs in the defense budget, when you talk—and this is very interesting—when you talk about the B-1 bomber, the maintenance and general operations of the B-52, the Trident, the MX, the anti-satellite program, the Midgetman development, the Pershing II, the cruise missile, the Stealth bomber technology, the shuttle cost, the development in command control and communications, add it all up, Trident, MX, B-1 ASAT's, CQ, add them all together and what does it come out to? You add it all together and it comes out to about 10 percent of the entire military budget.

Now, mind you, let me tell you no one is more concerned about nickels and dimes, not even talking billion but nickels and dimes and hammers and wrenches and screws; I have my own legislation to control spare parts, excess property, waste in the military, and not producing systems that do not work. We are going to hear more about all of that. But when you are looking at deficit reduction and a way to stop the momentum that is built into this defense budget you cannot pick on a section of this and claim this is a panacea when it represents about 10 percent of the total defense budget. If you really want to take a look at where the big costs lie, you have got to look at conventional systems, you have to look at munitions, where we are going to go from $12 to $20 billion in 3 years or support a command and control which goes from $23 to $46 billion, or RDT&E, research, development and testing which increased 100 percent over the last 4 years. There is a variety of areas where we are talking big areas, big possibilities of categories that affect momentums built into the defense budget. We all know that what you authorize today you end up spending tomorrow.

So while we must look at it all, let us not mislead the American public into letting them think that the strategic programs comprise a vast majority of the DOD budget, because it just simply is not true, ladies and gentlemen. In fact it is about 10 percent and at times less.

Now former President John F. Kennedy invested about 50 percent of the budget resources that he had at his command in defense. This President is investing about 26 percent of the resources at his command in defense. I think it is very interesting to look, that when you have a President like John F. Kennedy recognizing the threat that existed to the world and investing 50 percent of the resources and this President recognizing the threat, and the bipartisan commitment, stressing it to the tune of about 26 percent of the budget, I think we must recognize that while defense must play a vital role in deficit reduction, let us not build a house of cards, let us not build a straw man and let us

not mislead the American public into understanding the difficulty of our task and recognizing how each component ought to play, or what its role is in deficit reduction.

Strategic programs, 10 percent of the overall military budget; let us not just look at strategic, let us look at everything and let us recognize the need for modernization.

□ 1550

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I was listening patiently to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio a minute ago, who made a statement that we should not mislead the American people on cost of our military defense, nor should we mislead the American people on the cost of any parts of that defense.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations' Subcommittee on Military Construction, I suggest that some of the representations made to Members of Congress in the last 48 hours on the cost of the MX missile do not square on figures that I have heard over the last several years.

So I called a man whom I judge to be the Nation's most influential and credible authority on the question of defense, and that is the Senator from Ohio, Mr. GLENN. And Mr. GLENN came over to the House side today and talked with several of us about the MX program. And here is what he had to say:

He said first of all that the cost of the MX program is far beyond the figures that are being represented by the White House. Instead of the $74 million per missile, the real cost is about $254 million. The White House has not told Members of Congress that the cost of hardening the silos and modernizing the silos to receive the new missile will run up to $180 million per silo.

So instead of a $10 billion program, we have about a $40 billion program.

Another thing that the Senator from Ohio, Mr. GLENN, stated was that the MX missile actually weakens our Nation rather than strengthening our Nation because it uses up funds unnecessarily to deploy a vulnerable weapon which then crowds out the use of those funds for a Minuteman missile—a mobile and defendable missile and which protects America far better than the MX we authorized yesterday.

I was very impressed with the remarks of Senator GLENN not only because he is a patriotic American but because he is recognized, not only in our great nation, but around the world as an authority on missile defense.

So if there is any one of us who wants to ask a question where he may be in doubt, I say call upon the person who knows the most about the program, and that is Senator JOHN GLENN.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN] who was in the meeting with Senator GLENN and I when we discussed these matters.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman whether it is his understanding that each MX missile is to cost approximately $74 million. That is just for the missile alone; is that your understanding?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is for the missile itself; that is for the bullet.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. OK.

From the meeting this morning, from what I understood, that the Air Force had testified to in the other body, was that the hardening of the silos if in fact we are going to place these in hardened silos, would cost in excess of—let us use the number of $180 million per silo.

Is that your understanding?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GLENN] said.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. So the total cost for one MX missile comes to approximately $254 million?

Mr. ALEXANDER. $254 million per missile, deployed in each silo.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. In other words, your statement was, I believe, that we will receive only four missiles for every $1 billion that is spent?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is correct. For each $1 billion the American people receive four MX missiles deployed in the silo.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. I would only like to comment, if the gentleman from Arkansas will continue to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ADDABBO. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. The comment, I think, that was the most telling of all of that discussion that came from Democrats who were at that meeting, was that there was a total unified statement, the Democrats wanted a stronger defense, not one that was weaker, and the feeling at least voiced by this particular Member, was that the MX was effectually creating us a problem in terms of building and buying the modernization we need for all of the other systems; the D-5, Tridents, the Midgetman and all the rest.

Is that what you gained from that meeting?

Mr. ALEXANDER. My understanding is that because of this enormous cost of the MX missile of the overall effect will be to weaken our defenses. We simply will not be able to buy the kind of defenses that we need in the future to make our Nation strong and to defend us against the Soviet threat.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Does the gentleman understand that nobody has yet told us how we are going to even pay for the $1.5 billion much less than the four per billion?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair will announce that there remains 9 minutes on each side.

Mr. ADDABBO. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, in response to the question of the gentleman from Texas, I raised that question yesterday with the President when he called me; the President asked me about my position on the program and I told him that I have supported his defense modernization program and in fact Members of Congress from the South have a tradition of voting for defense programs, and I have carried out that tradition.

I told him that his modernization program, I believe, was defective because there was no plan for payment, and that I felt that the cost of this program which created these enormous deficits was linked to the depression in the farm community, and the closing down of our textile mills, and so on.

We engaged in a conversation of that type, and it went on to the question of the deficit. I said, "By the way, Mr. President, I have heard your speeches about a balanced budget." I said, "There has been a question that I've wanted to ask you now for the 4 years that you have been President." I said, "If you want a balanced budget, Mr. President, why don't you submit one?"

And there was this silence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADDABBO. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. There was a silence on the other end of the line; the President obviously had not thought that he would be questioned about his plans for a balanced budget, and he said, "You know, that is the most hypocritical question I've ever heard."

I said, "Mr. President, that is the most reasonable question that could be asked at a time when you are pursuing a credit card defense policy which, by your own definition and figures will leave the American people with an $185 billion deficit when you leave Washington and return to California."

Defense policy is inextricably linked to deficits and those deficits are

having a devastating impact upon our economy, especially in the farm sector, in the textile mills that are closing down, and in the shoe factories that cannot compete with these foreign products that are subsidized because of the economic policy of the President.

Mr. AuCOIN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AuCOIN. The gentleman has made an excellent contribution in pointing out how much higher the cost if we have to add hardness to the cost of the system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADDABBO. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made an excellent contribution by indicating how much more expensive this program will be if we have to factor in the cost of hardness in order to try to make these silos that we are placing these missiles in, if we approve them less vulnerable to attack.

Mr question to the gentleman is, however, how much more expensive would it be, beyond the numbers he has already developed, if the Soviets merely increase their accuracy? Does not it follow that the cost of additional hardness, on top of what he has described, will run the cost up even further.

Would the gentleman agree?

□ 1600

Mr. ALEXANDER. I will agree with the gentleman. And, further, the MX is a vulnerable weapon, no matter how much concrete we put on top of its deployment.

Mr. AuCOIN. Would the gentleman yield for just one further question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AuCOIN. That gets to another point that I should like to make, and that is that there is nothing in the administration's arms control proposal in Geneva that would in any way limit Soviet accuracy.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any doubt that a defeat for MX today would be cause for partying in the Soviet Union tomorrow and that the vodka glasses would not be lifted high, toasting the victors.

Yes, it would have an impact on the talks at Geneva. I do not think anybody doubts that. But what about beyond Geneva? What is the impact of a defeat for MX on the other parts of the Soviet foreign policy-defense policy continuum? What is the impact of a defeat for MX on Afghanistan, on the war that they back in Southeast Asia, on the war in Ethiopia, on the war in Angola, on the wars in Central America?

The Soviets view defense and foreign policy, the strategic, the tactical, the wars of national liberation together as a continuum.

The defeat of MX in Washington is a victory for the Soviets in Moscow. And I do not think anyone would argue that the Soviets are not unalterably opposed to our production and deployment of MX.

Will this defeat, if it came to pass, embolden the Soviets to put more painful pressure on the people of Afghanistan? Would it embolden them to be more forceful in the conduct of their war in Southeast Asia and their wars in Africa and their wars in Latin America? Would it encourage greater repression against Soviet Jews and nationalities inside the U.S.S.R.? Of course it would. Why? Because they view competition with the West as a whole, where the different parts come together and because one victory is cause for persevering in, and seeking, others.

On behalf of those seeking freedom from Soviet domination, we should deny the Soviets a victory on the MX.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to add some additional comments of mine.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give my children a world in which the threat of nuclear war is reduced. I do not want them to face the threat we face today.

Last year Congress voted to go slow on MX procurement. I supported the Aspin compromise to put a moratorium on these 21 MX's for 6 months. This gave the Soviets time to reconsider their ultimatum when they walked out of last year's arms control talks. The Soviets had time to realize that we would not be bullied into submission.

Since then, Mr. Reagan has been reelected, showing the Soviets that they must deal with him if they want to deal, and the Soviets have decided to return to the table to talk. Now it's up to us to show them that we're very serious about mutually beneficial arms control.

Some of my colleagues are making it sound as if the entire question today is "the MX or not the MX." Fortunately for us, that is not the choice. What we need to remember is that we are voting to release funding for only 21 MX missiles, less than one quarter of the total requested for deployment. House Members in doubt will have another vote later in the year on the remainder of the administration's MX missile request, well after the talks in Geneva are underway.

I say to my colleagues: now that we and the Soviets have shown that we want to talk, let's give them something to talk about rather than deciding now to do away with one of our most advanced weapons systems. Many Americans find the technicalities of arms control, such as throw weight, hard-target accuracy, MIRV's, MARV's, and so forth, difficult to swallow. However, we are all familiar with labor negotiations and there is a parallel here. How many union members would support a labor negotiator who, as bargaining talks were getting organized, would promise management that labor would not use one of its more powerful weapons, the right to strike, without similar concessions from management? That may be a reasonable concession later on, after tough, head-to-head negotiations, but certainly not up front.

Mr. Chairman, I support releasing money for 21 MX missiles now, so that both the administration and the Soviets know that we will go ahead, slowly, with putting this weapon into our arsenal, until we can come to a mutually acceptable agreement to reduce them and the over 600 Soviet MX missiles already deployed. Let's go ahead with MX until we can mutually agree to reduce.

I agree with the Scowcroft Commission: The MX is not the best weapon we might have. It's more vulnerable than we would like, but integrated into our total strategic forces, it's the best we have under difficult circumstances. Let's make sure, as we give the President the MX, which he has stated is crucial to his success at Geneva, that we can look with some hope for success at Geneva. The President has promised to do his best in Geneva. We hope for a similar strong commitment from the Soviets in return for our commitment to support mutually acceptable and significant arms reductions. The Soviets should know that we would prefer not to have to build the MX. Their actions at Geneva could make that preference possible.

I say to Mr. Reagan: Mr. President, we will increase these 21 MX's, but we implore you to be creative, be innovative, keep an open mind, and most importantly, press the Soviets for a workable arms reduction package, and bring it back as soon as possible.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. I think we should give a victory to the American taxpayers by saving this $1.5 billion, and I think the $300 billion that we are spending on defense should be enough message to the Soviets that we are sincere in our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, yesterday we voted to authorize the release of $1.5 billion for 21 MX missiles. Tomorrow we will vote on the resolution to appropriate the $1.5 billion. We now have a few hours to consider more carefully some of the arguments that have been presented in the course of this debate, and to stress again why opposing the missile is so important.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that all the Members of this House are now supporters of arms control, and that is a development that I applaud. But I think that we are fooling ourselves if we think that this $1.5 billion and these 21 missiles will buy arms control. The President suggests that the expansion of our arsenal of nuclear weapons will cause the Soviets to agree to reduce their arsenal. But common sense and history suggest that the expansion of our arsenal will cause the Soviets to expand their arsenals in turn. And then, Mr. Chairman, we're off the arms race.

Building these missiles is a gamble, if what we are really trying to do is gain an arms control agreement. It is a gamble where losing will have very high costs. If we buy the 100 MX missiles, and get no arms control, we will be $41 billion poorer, $41 billion that we need to provide for our security at home if we don't get security from Geneva. Buying the MX to get arms control is a gamble at very long odds with the American taxpayers' money.

If we build 100 MX missiles and get no arms control, then, Mr. Chairman, we will be stuck with the missiles. Even many of the supporters of the MX missile have said that they do not like it as a weapon, that they do not like it as an investment, that it is a dangerous and destabilizing anachronism. But they have to face up to the fact that if this body votes to appropriate the $1.5 billion, and the next $3 billion, and so on, America will probably have 100 dangerous missiles and no arms control.

There is one more point I would like to make. In news reports this morning we have read that some Members on this side of the aisle, some Members who reportedly voted against the MX resolution, were secretly happy that the MX was funded. Supposedly, these Members were concerned that by voting this missile system down, we Democrats would appear soft on defense. Let me tell those Members, if in fact that is their belief, that they are wrong, and that they are worried about the Democrats' image at the expense of our country.

We were not, and are not, soft on defense. We were being, and will be tomorrow, hard-nosed about spending money on bad defense. And it is ironic that those who now criticize us for refusing to waste money on this bad investment are the same people who criticize Democrats for being big spenders and trying to solve problems only by throwing money at them.

If we want to avoid looking soft on defense, voting for this missile system is not the answer. What we may save in image, we lose in serving the national security interests of the American people. And if we think we can fool the American people, or the Soviets, by buying this pig in a poke of a missile system, guess again. In a Washington Post-ABC national poll published this morning it is reported that the public is opposed to our Government building the MX. The only ones we are fooling are ourselves, and the only ones who benefit are those who receive the $1.5 billion dollars of taxpayers money. America will be less rich, less strong and less safe.

Arms control cannot be bought by spending $1.5 billion for 21 more missiles. The idea that anyone will be safer if we spend this money for 21 more MX missiles defies all reason. I urge my colleagues to vote against the resolution and against releasing the $1.5 billion.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time to make a few remarks in response to my friends on the other side of the aisle, and a few on this side of the aisle, who have raised a question, I think a common question, throughout this debate, and that is: How can a missile help arms control? And I think that was the question that was manifested in the statements earlier today of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS]. I think surely the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN], my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY], and several others. I think the best answer to that question was given in the letter that was written on the danger of thermonuclear war by Soviet physicist Andrei Sakharov, the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, and he said this:

> It seems very important to me to strive for the abolition of powerful silo-based missiles at the talks on nuclear disarmament. While the United States is the leader in this field, there is very little chance of its easily relinquishing that lead. If it is necessary to spend a few billion dollars on MX missiles to alter this situation, then perhaps this is what the West must do.

And that is what Max Kampelman was talking about at the White House the other day. And my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], said,

> Well, I think, with all due respect to this great physicist and this peace prize winner, that he is wrong, because we cannot expect the Soviets to give up their SS-18 missiles, their 308 SS-18 missiles.

That may be so. That is very clearly the centerpiece of their strategic force. But we cannot expect reductions in that force, maybe not complete abolition, but we cannot expect reductions in that force unless we have something that is very similar in throw weight and accuracy. That is the message that Andrei Sakharov gave.

Let me just say that my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], said the MX is a gamble. If it is a gamble, it is a gamble that is recommended by America's arms negotiator Max Kampelman. And he said, in response perhaps to some [illegible] ations—and I will be happy to yie[illegible] my friend in a minute—that he should not be, as a Democrat, leading this charge for the Reagan administration with regard to arms control, and he said—and I think my friend from Massachusetts talked about his statement—"I go on the philosophy that we only have one President at a time," and he thinks that if we give up this MX unilaterally the Soviets will, in his estimation, delay the arms talks. That should be of great interest to everybody who, No. 1, trusts Mr. Kampelman and, No. 2, is interested for these arms talks to go ahead.

Let me just conclude by saying that Paul Nitze said that if we unilaterally cut MX, then the Soviets will escalate their demands.

Now, if these gentlemen have bad judgment, maybe we should fire them from their jobs upon which the very existence of our country depends. If they do not have bad judgment and we do trust them, then we should trust them in this case and we should let American foreign policy this one time go from these shores with a single voice.

I very much agree with my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], who says it is Congress' right to fight with the President. Absolutely. But not every time.

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

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

□ 1610

Mr. FRANK. I had yielded to the gentleman in similar circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say, I want to quote what the gentleman said about Mr. Sakarov. Of course I want to see missiles reduced. He asked me a specific question. He quoted Mr. Sakharov, I happen to have the transcript here: "It seems very important to me, Mr. Sakharov, to strive for the abolition of missiles."

My point to the gentleman from California is that no one is striving in these negotiations, as a realistic goal, for their abolition, and therefore, I disagree.

Mr. HUNTER. I take back my time to say but they are striving for the reduction of those missiles, and if the MX will allow us to get reductions, that is just as good as abolition.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK. Let me also say, again, if he meant reduction, I would have talked reduction. I was only talking abolition.

Second, I have to profoundly disagree with the notion that we should speak on foreign policy with one voice.

Mr. HUNTER. I take back my time to say that I agree that we should not always speak with one voice, but in this particular instance, when we have our negotiators telling us we need it, we should go with the President, we should not fight with the President. We should let foreign policy go from the shores with one voice under these circumstances.

Mr. FRANK. I would just ask the gentleman to yield so I can express my disappointment that he would not show me the consideration and yield that I showed to him earlier.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would announce that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO] has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AuCOIN].

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

Mr. Chairman, I was impressed with the statement of the gentleman from California, who quoted the words of Andrei Sakharov, because I am sure the gentleman understands and remembers that Sakharov also had supported ratification of SALT II, and if his position today is that we should follow the advice of Mr. Sakharov, then I am sure the gentleman also supports the SALT II agreement, although I have not heard him say that he supports SALT II. But I hope that he does.

Mr. Chairman, we really return to the point that is that this is a vulnerable missile. It is vulnerable; some of my colleagues, the gentleman from California and the gentleman from New Jersey, said that this great concept of synergism in the triad is somehow going to protect the MX missile in vulnerable, fixed-base silos.

The only trouble with that is that the Scowcroft report said that synergism is going to die. To whatever extent that it exists today, it is going to ultimately die. The reason the report said that was that with the accuracy of Soviet SLBM's, ultimately that synergistic relationship that provides theoretical protection for these silos will no longer be there.

If you want to keep this synergistic relationship that you say provides us protection, then only the freeze will do so. Not the START proposal that our negotiators are putting on the table in Geneva; not the build-down proposal or any combination thereof, but only a freeze on a mutual basis, a verifiable basis on production, deployment and testing of nuclear weapons. If you do not do that, then we are left with what we have said from the beginning. We have a vulnerable weapon; a vulnerable weapon does not deter; a vulnerable weapon invites the other side to hit us in our glass jaw.

Our glass jaw in our missile fleet is the MX missile. One point five billion dollars this year in a totally indefensible weapons system. At a time when we are seeing the vetos of farm credit legislation, that is a dismal bargain militarily and for the taxpayer. I hope my colleagues will vote against the MX.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself first to the notion that some people have floated on the floor that this is somehow a vastly different vote from the vote that the House expressed itself on the other day. That it is an appropriation vote that does not matter.

That could not be more erroneous. If you want to undo the good that was done in the vote yesterday, then you have got to continue and appropriate the money that will deliver the production of those 21 missiles. To fail to do so will be to negate, in an even more meaningful way, our efforts to be supportive of our negotiators in Geneva.

Let me say that it was the Scowcroft Commission that recommended that we do this. Now, the gentleman who just preceded me somehow seems to think that the Commission is not in favor of the MX, or at least he purports to put that proposition to the House, and that is not the case.

The case is that they recommended that we produce a limited number of MX's and then move to a Midgetman missile in order to preserve the triad concept which has maintained peace in the world. They do this by recommending that in the 1990's we transition to the Midgetman and we are spending R&D money for that missile now. It is a missile in concept, on a drawing board, in a computer. It is not extant anywhere.

There is only one missile that we have for the rest of this decade that we can negotiate with the Soviets about, and that is the missile, that not just the Scowcroft Commission but, indeed, four Presidents of the United States, dating back to 1972, recommended that we build because the Soviets had deployed over 600 hard target capable weapons and disturbed the equality and the symmetry that existed between our ICBM's.

They have the capacity today to destroy our ICBM's. It is essential that tomorrow we carry the vote for the appropriation and continue on with our negotiations for peace in Geneva.

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my strong opposition to funding the MX missile.

First, let's look at the military merits of this missile. The MX does exactly the opposite of what a weapons system is supposed to do—deter. In order to deter a nuclear strike, a weapon has got to be able to survive that strike and fire back. The MX, in, its fixed silos, cannot do this.

That would be a serious problem for any missile. But it is especially serious for the MX, because this missile has 10 warheads on it. These warheads make the MX more attractive than any other missile as the target of a first strike. The Soviets or any other adversary would know they could get "10 for 1"—they could knock out 10 of our missiles with only 1 of theirs. So from the standpoint of deterrence, MX is not only useless, it is counterproductive, it is actually an invitation to attack.

Second, let's look at the budgetary merits. We are in a year of terrible budget sacrifices. As the debates now going on in the House and Senate Budget Committees make clear, we are going to have to make terribly painful choices of domestic programs to cut this year. I cannot justify voting for billions for a weapons system that would add nothing to our security, while the same sums would fully fund many of the programs that will be frozen or cut.

Finally, let's look at the argument that we need MX for the arms talks in Geneva. You would think from those who make such arguments that MX is the only weapon in our arsenal, the only thing the Soviets would want us to give up. In fact, the Soviets are looking at accurate new warheads on our Minuteman III missiles; first-strike missiles coming from our Trident II nuclear subs; Pershing II missiles in Europe with pinpoint accuracy and 8-minute flight time to Moscow; a new generation of cruise missiles; and Stealth, radar-evading bombers—not to mention the prospect of an elaborate space-based missile defense in the future.

Mr. Chairman, for these three reasons I believe the MX is dangerous and unnecessary and I urge my colleagues to vote against funds for it. Thank you.●

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, the current debate over whether or not to release the $1.5 billion in fiscal year 1985 funds for the production of a second increment of 21 MX missiles focuses primarily on three considerations: The military merit of the MX, its political value at the Geneva arms negotiations, and the overall cost of the program. Under each consider-

ation, the MX fails to be a worthwhile investment.

There is no military rationale for pushing ahead with the production of the MX. The missile was originally designed to replace the Minuteman ICBM's because these missiles were assessed to be vulnerable in fixed silos. If the silos are responsible for the vulnerability of our land-based forces, then placing the MX in the same silos clearly does nothing to address the vulnerability issue. The threat of the MX to Soviet ICBM silos, moreover, is highly destabilizing; we should not be taking a posture that encourages rash decisions on the part of the Soviets such as a launch-on-warning policy (Subject to computer error and heightening the risk of accidental war) or a decision in a time of crisis to launch a preemptive first strike.

The administration has all but abandoned efforts to justify the MX on military grounds. Instead, it has focused on the political rationale, claiming that it is needed for negotiating purposes. Both President Reagan and Secretary Weinberger have stated explicitly that the MX is not a bargaining chip, but credit the MX with bringing the Soviets back to the negotiating table. This argument makes no sense. Congress approved production of the first 21 missiles in November 1983; 1 month later the Soviets walked out of the Geneva START talks. Congress suspended production of the MX in October 1984; 3 months later the Soviets agreed to resume negotiations. If a correlation is to be drawn between MX production and progress on arms control, the conclusion must be that suspending MX production improves the atmosphere for talks.

Finally, and perhaps most important in these difficult economic times, the MX is a prohibitively expensive weapon. The General Accounting Office has estimated that the total program will cost $29 billion. A decision to continue production of the MX will be a blatant misuse of our financial resources, especially in light of its negligible military worth and considering the sacrifices we are asking our constituents to make in other areas.

Mr. Chairman, the MX is not fiscally, militarily or politically sound, and I believe strongly that it does not and cannot serve the interests of this country. In subcommittees, committees and on the floor, Members of this body have voted nearly one thousand times on the continuation of this program. I sincerely hope my colleagues will join me in making this vote the last.●

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I was very disappointed in the results of the vote on the MX missile yesterday. I can only hope that my colleagues will reconsider before the final vote is taken.

There were good, sound reasons why the Appropriations Committee voted down the MX. The bottom line is that the American people are being asked to pay for a weapons system that is expected to cost more than $40 billion when it is finally completed. $40 billion! And what will we be getting for our $40 billion that can justify that kind of expenditure? A good defense? Hardly. The MX will be almost as vulnerable as the Minuteman it is supposed to upgrade. An effective retaliatory weapon? Not likely. CBO estimates less than 5 percent of MX missiles would survive a Soviet attack after 1996. A deterrent force? Absolutely not. A system with no other conceivable use than as a first strike weapon can hardly be said to deter. With all our other defense options, with all the more credible weapons systems that have been proposed, with all our pressing operations, maintenance and personnel needs, the MX missile is, to say the least, not a wise use of our defense dollars.

How did our priorities get that twisted? How can we even consider spending that kind of money on a useless weapons system and at the same time ask the American people to absorb large cuts in domestic spending for programs which serve millions but which the President deems wasteful? Let's look at what we could buy for the $4.7 billion—$1.5 billion now and $3.2 billion later—we are being asked to approve for the MX this year.

For starters, we could restore all $2.3 billion the President wants to cut from student financial assistance. Then we could take the remaining $2.4 billion and use it to make up for some of the after-inflation cut of 22 percent sustained by the elementary and secondary education budget between 1980 and 1984. A wise investment in the future of our Nation.

Or we could devote some of those funds to health care. We could restore the $1.1 billion the President wants to cut from Medicaid next year. We could also restore some of the funds we cut when we consolidated 20 health programs into four block grants back in fiscal year 1982. The President is proposing less money for these block grants now than we spent in 1981, in spite of the way health costs have risen. For just what we're being asked to approve this year alone on the MX we could fund almost all of the National Institutes of Health.

Or we could take just half of the MX funds and pay for the entire school lunch program. For an extra $1.4 billion we could pay for the Women, Infants and Children [WIC] Nutrition Program as well. The possibilities are endless but the point is clear: That money can be put to far, far better use.

In spite of the high stakes, this is not a poker game. It is a debate over a nuclear weapon system that can kill millions of people and give destruction a new meaning. Every time we seem to be getting ready to put the brakes on this panic-like military buildup, we allow the President to redefine the basic argument. Every time the President tells us we will be harming the arms control negotiations if we do not approve the latest superweapon someone has dreamed up we back away from our duty. From what I've seen of this administration, its only real interest in arms control is in using negotiations as a bargaining ch[illegible] get all those new superweapons. The strategy seems to work every time, and all the while the deficit continues to grow and future generations are being saddled with the cost of our mistakes.

It is ludicrous to build the MX in the name of peace, for it is no peacekeeper. It is ludicrous for Congress to keep falling into the same trap. Let's return to common sense and vote down further funding for the MX.●

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, the argument that the MX missile is needed as a bargaining chip has been made for the past 6 years by two Presidents, and the argument has been unsound every time. President Carter said that he needed the MX to bargain with the Senate for ratification of the SALT II treaty. President Reagan asserts that he needs it to bargain with the Russians at the arms control negotiations in Geneva. It didn't work in 1979 and it won't work in 1985.

I've been voting against funding research, development, and production of MX for 6 years under a President of my own party and a President of the opposite party because I have been and am convinced that the MX missile is a waste of money and a grave threat to world peace and consequently to our national security. In addition, our Treasury cannot afford this kind of waste.

Ideally, Congress should have resolved the MX question long ago. We should have acted responsibly and directly to kill the MX. We haven't and we again face the cliffhanger outcome upon which the decision to spend $26–$40 billion ultimately depends. An affirmative vote by even the smallest of margins will set us on a course to waste even more money on this system—and the decision will have been made not on the merits of the MX as a weapons system but on its extremely questionable status as a symbol of national resolve.

The MX, like any weapons system, should be evaluated by assessing its contribution to national security. Under this evaluation, the MX is clearly deficient. The MX is extremely vulnerable to a Soviet first strike because the Minuteman silos are vulnerable. Hardening of the silos will not be completed until after deployment of the MX missiles and after the expenditure of $18 billion for hardening

alone. Furthermore, by the time the hardening is completed, the Soviets will have made significant improvements in accuracy overcoming the benefits of hardening, and we will have the Trident D-5 and the Midgetman ready for our arsenal.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that less than 10 percent of our MX missiles would survive a Soviet attack in 1990, and less than 5 percent after 1996 because of improvements in Soviet missile accuracy.

Consequently, the MX will be of little use in responding to a Soviet first-strike attack. Rather, its only potential effective use would be in a first-strike by the United States, a use which this administration has foresworn for the MX. Consequently, either the system is of no use or we intend to increase our first-strike capability.

The Soviets can either conclude that we would spend up to $40 billion on a useless system or that we intend the MX to be a first-strike weapon. Assuming at least a minimum of rationality on the part of the Soviets, this Congress must expect that the Soviets will conclude the latter—that, we intend the MX to be effective, and it is effective only as a first-strike offensive weapon. Their reaction will be to increase their arms development, and move to a "launch-on warning" response system, further accelerating the arms race.

So much for the argument that the MX will encourage the arms control negotiations and that we need an affirmative House vote to provide an incentive for the Soviets to bargain seriously at Geneva. Furthermore, although the President has proclaimed the MX a symbol of national resolve, I cannot see how the U.S. Congress approving a colossal waste of money can demonstrate national resolve to the Soviet Union.

In addition, the record of arms control negotiations actually suggests that MX production is not a bargaining chip. The Soviets withdrew from the talks when Congress had approved MX funding, and agreed to resume last year when we suspended MX funding for new missiles. Paul Nitze, President Reagan's arms control advisor, has said that the MX was not key to the arms talks and that they would not make a dramatic difference in the outcome of the negotiations.

Today's vote will be to authorize the release of an additional $1.5 billion for 21 new missiles. Today's vote may be the last chance to stop the MX and the ultimate expenditure of $40 billion.

It is the last chance because the issues are clear, the defects of the system obvious, the cost to our Treasury unaffordable.

This House should end the madness, reduce the risk of nuclear war, and stop the waste of taxpayer money.

We already have the capacity to destroy every major Soviet military and civilian target. Further funding of the MX system will divert resources not only from necessary and effective defense programs, but from critically needed nonmilitary uses. The MX will continue to be part of the deficit crisis facing the United States. We are borrowing from the future to fund the MX missile, and the effect is a significant erosion of true national security which this administration fails to appreciate.●

The CHAIRMAN. All time agreed upon for today has expired.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SHARP] having assumed the chair, Mr. KILDEE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 181) to approve the obligation and availability of prior year unobligated balances made available for fiscal year 1985 for the procurement of additional operational MX missiles, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO REVISE REMARKS IN DEBATE ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 181

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, which I did not previously ask, that I be allowed to revise, slightly, my remarks that the Parliamentarian called to my attention that I had inadvertently transgressed a rule by referring, in less than glowing terms, to the other body. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to conform my remarks to the rules.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1620

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of the special order speech today by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD].

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of the special order speech today by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

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

There was no objection.

ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORY: BUILDING A BETTER FUTURE WITH NUCLEAR ENERGY

(Mr. O'BRIEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the March 18, 1985, edition of the Chicago Tribune.

The subject of this article is a laboratory of international renown: Argonne National Laboratory. Long recognized as a leader in the field of nuclear energy, its discoveries and the technologies it has pioneered will have far-reaching effects and lasting significance for generations to come. One major initiative developed at Argonne is the integral fast reactor. This new generation of nuclear reactors will breed its own fuel and provide a steady, inexpensive, and nearly inexhaustible supply of energy needed to meet the growing energy demands of American industry. Yet deep cuts in the Department of Energy's fiscal 1986 budget threaten the viability of the integral fast reactor research program and a spate of other equally important projects at Argonne.

For 40 years, a cadre of hardworking researchers has charted undiscovered areas in the field of science in search of ways to improve the quality of life. Innovation, ingenuity, creativity, and a commitment of excellence to quality research have made Argonne a leading scientific force. The technologies it has developed have benefited American industries in fundamental, significant ways. Argonne is a friend, helping hand, and handmaiden—all in one—to industry. With the innovative ideas and solutions it provides, industry will continue to remain strong, competitive, and prosperous. Visionary ideas like the integral fast reactor could help this country not only to regain its technological superiority but also to build a better future. But ideas, like anything else, need nurturing and support. Snuff out the fires of invention and creativity with cuts like those proposed in the Energy Department's

budget, and the bright future is gone. Tend the fires by fueling them with needed research funds and they will burn brightly forever.

I commend this editorial to my colleagues and include it in the RECORD:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 18, 1985]

A BETTER NUCLEAR REACTOR

The nuclear reactor was developed by Argonne National Laboratory and its antecedents beginning with the Manhattan Project during World War II, and reactors that run ships and commercial power plants the world over trace their origins to the southwest suburban facility. Unfortunately, research into more advanced reactors at Argonne is now threatened by reductions in the U.S. Department of Energy's 1986 budget.

Argonne's subsidies from DOE may be reduced by $45 million next year, the bulk of that intended for research into advanced reactors. The cuts would result in the advanced reactors. The cuts would result in the cancellation of a program to develop what physicists there believe is a major breakthrough that has worldwide implications—a device called the integral fast reactor.

Other federal budget cuts will also gut research programs in such areas as development of improved batteries that could ultimately power cars, application of improved technology to the ailing U.S. steel and agricultural machine industries and removal of pollutants to permit high sulfur Midwest coal to be burned by utilities without raining acid on the East.

But the most important program in jeopardy is the integal reactor.

Over the years, Argonne's physicists naively believed that the scientific merit of the proposed machine would prove itself. What happened was that a succession of politically motivated decisions in Washington has kept the integal reactor on the back burner while the government undertook such boondoggles as the now canceled $4 billion Clinch River Breeder Reactor and discovered, as a result of the Three Mile Island accident, major safety problems with its existing commercial program.

The Three Mile Island machine is an evolutionary successor to the world standard light water-cooled reactor that Argonne originally developed. Cooling it requires a complex system of pipes and pumps. But the proposed integral reactor would be fueled by metal rods and cooled by a pool of liquid sodium that Argonne physicists claim would not be vulnerable to the same quality control and human failing that have plagued existing reactors.

Each integral reactor could also breed its own fuel, eliminating the need to transport hazardous radioactive fuel and waste across the country.

Argonne officials fear that cancellation of the integral reactor project will cost the United States its lead in nuclear technology and force it to buy that technology back from France or Japan at some future time.

There appear to be sufficient funds in the more than $370 million that the Energy Department plans to spend on nuclear research next year to continue work on the integral reactor project. Congress should order the department to do so.

THE KILLING FIELDS—AGAIN?

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Sunday Washington Post came to my attention that I believe has a powerful message for all of us in the Congress—both Chambers. It's about a 10-year anniversary that is coming up next month, a tragic gut-tugging double anniversay that we refer to as the fall of Phnom Penh, Cambodia, on April 17, 1975, and then, 13 days later on April 30 the fall of Saigon. "Fall" is such a weak word to describe the mind numbing events that followed the Communist conquest of Southeast Asia.

This Post guest column is by a gentleman I have never met. His name is David M. Fitzgerald. He is the president of a Washington, DC, political and public affairs consulting firm. In April 1975 he was a young Naval assistant attaché assigned to our Embassy in Phnom Penh. His article is entitled "The Killing Fields—Again?" It sears my memory and I hope my colleagues remembrance of that disgraceful month in American history.

Mr. Fitzgerald refers in his column to one of the many inspiring sayings carved in stone around our Archives Building. There are two statues on the north side of the Archives, the side that our Presidents drive in front of or walk in front of on the day they are inaugurated as the President of our country. Beneath the statue of wisdom to the left of the north door are the words "The Past Is Prologue," and beneath the statue on the right is the admonition "Study the Past." Will we ever, ever heed those words.

Dave Fitzgerald hits Congress hard, and I think every Member of this great deliberative body and every Member of the other body, particularly those who served here in April of 1975 must read his warning "The Killing Fields—Again?" I submit it for our RECORD. History will judge us and its only guide will be the truth.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 24, 1985]

THE KILLING FIELDS—AGAIN?

(By David M. Fitzgerald)

As we approach the tenth anniversary of the communist takeover in Cambodia, one may wonder when fighting and hardship will cease in that torn land. Mired in death and destruction, the Cambodian people have experienced a scenario of horror. The film, "The Killing Fields," grimly reminds us of the final days before their sentence to genocide. What is missing, however, is the role in bringing catastrophe that was played by actors whose interest in posturing overwhelmed Cambodia's cries for survival. At twenty-nine and a Navy Lieutenant, I was on the ground during that final year. I watched as Congress crafted a future that many today would rather forget.

A Seal commando first and intelligence officer second, I was one of the military attachés selected for duty in Phnom Penh. Our charter was clear—get the Cambodians through the offensive.

It was deja vu Vietnam. Phnom Penh, the capital city, was surrounded by thousands of communist gunners. By day and night, thundering rockets tore open the city. Bloodshed and hunger were everywhere.

Attachés did not suffer politicians easily. Congress was divided over whether Cambodia's problems were to be settled by conquest or negotiation. We wondered if anyone bothered reading combat intelligence reports written by the people who were there.

Days began at 5 a.m. It was then that I read press clips sent by my mother. Breakfast took conditioning: warm bread from the local market baked with insects, coffee and half-ripened fruit. Attachés lived off the local economy. Our thoughts drifted often to Congress at mealtime. It cut our cost-of-living allowance in its rift with the White House.

"The Killing Fields" reminded me of how tough it was for correspondents living at the Hotel Phnom. It was Phnom Penh's Plaza Hotel. Sitting by the pool at night they sipped cool drinks served by short-coated Cambodians. Constantly on the prowl, they dogged us by day to get a combat lead or a picture surreptitiously taken of an American officer poring over a map with a Cambodian. They would label it unlawful advising.

As deputy naval attaché, I observed the Cambodian performance in moving supplies from Saigon up the Mekong. It was nightmarish. Blasted by sophisticated rockets and mortars, raked by machine-gun fire, the small Cambodian navy paid the price. Expert communist gunners became better. The river became littered with battered hulks, rusting sentinels in a riverine graveyard.

As communist lethality on the rivers increased, so did the din of congressional outrage. The lawmakers tightened down on personnel numbers. In time only 200 Americans could lawfully remain in the country. It made our task more difficult. President Ford pleaded for humanitarian and military assistance. Congress needed to act quickly to save lives. We wondered if the politicans could see the Cambodians through this hurricane gate of bloodshed.

In Washington, Sens. Kennedy, Tunney, and McGovern painted a dismal picture of Americans' economic stagnation. They urged that not another dime be spent on Southeast Asia. Only Cambodians could solve Cambodian's problems, they said. Emergency supplemental assistance was not the answer.

News came that Bella Abzug and some congressional friends would visit—to menace, we feared—the U.S. embassy in Phnom Penh. Their actual reactions were sober and respectful after viewing first-hand the Cambodians' bone-chilling agony.

The war's reality was especially strong and discordant for young staffers. Some had dodged the draft only to find themselves, strangely, on a Navy combat vessel viewing remnants of war along the Mekong.

In Washington, debate continued, President Ford warned that without near-term relief the Cambodians would not make it to the rainy season: negotiations would have no chance. America's heartland was reaching out with sympathy and concern to the Khmer people. Would not Congress respond?

Assistant Secretary of State Philip Habib told the House Foreign Affairs Committee, "I guarantee 100 to 0 that without aid Cam-

bodia won't survive." In the Senate, Edward Kennedy bellowed, "Once again we are hearing the same old arguments and the same old controversies over the same old war. The lingering and bloody conflict there deserves more of our diplomacy and not more of our ammunition."

Intelligence reports told that the Khmer Rouge were on the march to Phnom Penh. Communist field commanders crushed skulls with hammers and chained men to machine guns in the face of government fire.

On March 13, 1975, the Senate Democratic Caucus voted 38-5 against further military aid to Cambodia, 34-6 against any supplemental aid in FY '75. This followed a similarly lopsided vote by House Democrats on March 12. The House resolution stated "the sense of the Democratic caucus to firmly oppose" any further aid. Senate Minority Leader Hugh Scott said he too favored a new government in Cambodia that could negotiate a truce and safe treatment of refugees.

The news came to us like a fusillade of Soviet rockets. We in the embassy felt scorched, deserted, betrayed. Saddened military attaches wept with their Cambodian comrades. The final indignity was having to explain away congressional justification for sending Phnom Penh down the drain into hell.

Ten years have passed since this devastation of humanity. Untold innocents still suffer. Graphically, the movie shows communist justice monstrous and murderous.

What about the Congress that played a leading part? Many still try to cleanse their souls by speaking out on hunger and refugee problems worldwide. Many villains, however, remain behind cold marble walls waiting for the next "Killing Fields."

Engraved in stone at the face of the National Archives building less than a mile from the Capitol is the message, "What Is Past Is Prologue." Will these words be ignored as Congress sets the stage again, this time for millions of people in Central America?

Clearly, the country, including the Reagan administration, contemplating lessons for dealing with Central America now, has lessons to sift from Cambodia's ashes. Close attention must be paid to the guardians of liberal politics and to their kind of commitment against communism. A Latin policy crafted after the Cambodian tragedy may result in another cinema that none of us may wish to see.

(The writer is president of a political and public affairs consulting firm.)

PROBLEMS WITH HEALTH SERVICES

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

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, I could not believe my eyes when I read a letter earlier this week that my colleague from Iowa, [Mr. TAUKE], received from Dr. Carolyne Davis regarding the revised wage indexes under Medicare. Dr. Davis states that the revised wage indexes would not be proposed until October 1, 1985. Considering congressional efforts this past year, this is a terribly unfair turn of events.

Let me first briefly summarize the events and important dates that led up to this most recent correspondence.

January 1984: It had already become very obvious that the new prospective payment system had calculated a large inequity in its rural wage indexes, which penalized our Nation's small cost efficient hospitals.

July 18, 1984: Congress enacted the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 which directed Secretary Heckler to conduct a study for the purpose of developing more equitable hospital area wage index to be reported to Congress within 30 days of the bill's enactment.

August 1984: After missing the first deadline, Secretary made a second commitment that the report would be complete by December 31, 1984.

February 28, 1985: Secretary Heckler stated in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee that the wage index report would be issued to Congress within 2 weeks.

Well it is now March 27, with no report in sight, and even if the report was issued tomorrow, Dr. Davis tells us that revised wage indexes would not be released until October 1, 1985. I have written six letters to the Department of Health and Human Services during the past year describing the plight of my rural hospitals and enclosing copies of hospital balance sheets showing tremendous losses, despite staff layoffs and other budget cutting efforts. Yet, no action. In this most recent response from HHS, Dr. Davis continues to fail to recognize two very important facts:

Without immediate relief, some of our Nation's most cost-efficient hospitals will close their doors, leaving access to care for rural elderly an even larger problem to deal with than it had been.

The retroactivity of the revised wage indexes will cause hardship for those hospitals who have been receiving larger than justified payments, and further delay will only compound their financial hardship.

I believe the Congress has been more than patient with HHS, considering three unmet deadlines. But we cannot tolerate this bureaucratic runaround any longer. Congressional intent was obvious on this matter and I urge Dr. Davis to relent and release the revised wage changes as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Nebraska [Mrs. SMITH] has clearly pointed out the details of the problem we face with Health and Human Services. The problem is pure and simple. It is that since it costs less money to provide equal health services in rural hospitals, Health and Human Services has said that the differential is going to be even much greater than the difference in cost.

What that Department would do is close up our rural hospitals, which they admit are less expensive, and have our people have to be transported to urban hospitals which they admit are more expensive. Time after time after time they have told us they would change those regulations, and now they tell us it is going to be next October.

I ask my colleagues what kind of an administration we have, Mr. Speaker. Everybody acknowledges that the family farm is the most efficient method of producing agricultural products. This administration would eliminate that family farm. Everybody is well aware of the fact that small business is more efficient than big business. This administration would eliminate the Small Business Administration.

Everybody recognizes, including the administration, that small hospitals are less costly than big hospitals. This administration would eliminate small hospitals.

I believe it is time to put some sense back into what we do.

PATRICIA ROBERTS HARRIS

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about someone we lost over the weekend—someone who appeared on many occasions before the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriation Subcommittee that I chair. Of course, I am talking about Patricia Harris.

When one dwells on the tributes that have been said in remembering Patricia Harris—one picks up a constant reference to her toughness on the one hand, and her uncompromising efforts to help those less fortunate Americans on the other. People talk about Pat Harris and her firsts—and there were many.

The first black woman to become a law school dean—the first black woman ambassador—the first black woman Cabinet member—the first black to ever serve as a delegate to the United Nations—but the most impressive first is the one in which she led a sit-in by a group of Howard University students protesting a segregated lunch counter in Washington in 1943.

As she herself described it, that was before the days of media events—before the days of constant TV coverage—in other words you were out there by yourself. That was a real first.

And that was precisely the kind of woman Pat Harris was. When she appeared before this subcommittee she was unyielding in her principles and always extremely effective in her efforts to help those who most needed help in this country.

We didn't always see eye to eye on every issue—we had our differences—but no matter which side of an issue one was on—you always knew you were dealing with someone who had the best interests of all Americans in mind. She was a tough lady—there was no doubt about that—but maybe that explains why she was as principled and dedicated as anyone I came to know in my 34 years in Congress.

Meg Greenfield in a piece in Sunday's Washington Post probably said it best—"Pat Harris finally had to yield in her fight with cancer, but she never gave up."

I am pleased to include Meg Greenfield's tribute in the RECORD.

PAT HARRIS: A FRIENDSHIP

(By Meg Greenfield)

When I met Pat Harris 16 years ago, she was recovering from the shock of her one-month career as dean of the Howard University Law School. I went to her house on Holly Street for an interview and we talked the afternoon away in her big sunny living room. The subject was the circumstances that had led to her abrupt departure from Howard amid great controversy. So it was a working encounter. But we also became friends that day.

Over the years, this friendship grew and it was, as you would expect, put severely to the test as she took on a series of public jobs and I found myself in the role of editorial commentator on them. There were some awful ruckuses during her time at HUD, and when The Post endorsed her opponent, Marion Barry, in the last mayoralty election, communication all but ceased for a year. It resumed, though, as did the friendship. Over the years, there were many more amicable times than strained ones.

I admired Pat for precisely those qualities that landed her in the soup so often and which made her, I thought, hopeless as a practicing politician, but awesome as a public figure. She was a woman of stunning, electric intelligence, obdurate, uncompromising, given to searching out the moral principal in an issue and, once deciding she had found it, refusing, come what may, to budge. Pat was always independent and (therefore) often desolately alone.

There was a poignancy in this. I felt it that first day we met as I came to understand both the temptation she had resisted in the Howard Law School conflict and the terrific assault she was taking as a result. The students were protesting violently. Their grievances had been essentially against law school teachers and officials who were there before this brand new dean took over. She in fact sympathized with some of the student's complaints.

But they had, among other things, seized the law school building and held it for a time, and she would not, absolutely not—that's spelled N-O-T—negotiate under that sort of unlawful pressure. She was outraged that law students of all people should do such things. Just about everybody on all sides of the dispute—the protestors and the old regime that was being protested against—wanted her to give in on this point. She wouldn't. She was ousted. She was right.

The Pat Harris I saw that day in the living room on Holly Street was the woman I was to see many times again over the years, as she recurrently got in this kind of predicament: strong, sad, angry, beat-up and yet undefeated all at once. There was a vulnerability, a gentleness mixed with her ferocity.

I sensed and saw this complexity of feelings as Pat fought her way through the bafflements of the past decade and a half, taking stands on racial issues and questions of public policy that often alienated people she wanted as friends and that regularly defied the easy, fashionable, self-protective wisdom of the moment.

But I never saw this particular spirit so strong or moving as it was when I visited her in the hospital and spoke with her on the phone in the last painful months of her life. She had lost Bill and now she was losing her battle to cancer. Pat was, as usual, forthright, strong, outspoken about her illness and her prospects, concerned about how she should die, determined to do the thing right. And all the while, in her physical agony and what must have been deep fear, she maintained the familiar sharp interest in what was going on in the public world around here. Pat Harris finally had to yield. But she never gave up.

NICARAGUA—THE STOLEN REVOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been very much concerned about the situation in Nicaragua. On March 12 of this year, I wrote President Reagan a letter in which I asked the President to consider following the recommendation of Congress embodied in Public Law 98-215, December 9, 1983, that the President should seek a prompt reconvening of the 17th Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States for the purpose of reevaluating the compliance by the Government of National Reconstruction of Nicaragua, and then upon that inquiry being made, it be determined whether or not the Sandinista Government of Nicaragua has kept that promise that it made to the Organization of American States in 1979, and if it is found that it has not kept the promise it made, that the President do what he could to induce the Organization of American States to see to it that Nicaragua did live up to the commitments that it made to the Organization of American States as a condition of which the Organization of American States recognized that group, the group that became the Sandinista Government in Nicaragua.

I discussed my letter with the Secretary of State, and Mr. McFarlane, our National Security Adviser, Mr. Freidersdorf, the congressional liaison for the White House, and other White House personnel. The President was kind enough to call me up personally and thank me for my suggestions and said that they were being very warmly considered.

So this morning I was very happy to have an invitation from Hon. J. William Middendorf II, our permanent Ambassador to the Organization of American States, to join him at a formal meeting of the Organization of American States Council in their beautiful building here in Washington.

At that meeting, Ambassador Middendorf made a magnificent presentation, from our point of view, of the situation in Nicaragua and how the Sandinista group that they now call the government of that country, had flagrantly violated the solemn commitment they made to the Organization of American States when the Organization of American States recognized them in 1979. He was kind enough to refer in his address to the fact that I had written this letter to which I referred to the President, and that I was sitting with them this morning while he was making that presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this magnificent statement by our permanent representative to the OAS because he very strongly insisted that it was the responsibility of the Organization of American States to make the Sandinistas live up to their promise that they would, if recognized and supported by the OAS, would conduct a government that was a free, democratic government which respected human rights, private property, and expression of political opinion as the people wish to express it, and the other accoutrements of a free and democratic state. He very strongly indicated that the OAS should discharge that responsibility and intimated that if it did not do so, he reserved the right to introduce a resolution on behalf of the United States calling upon the OAS to discharge its responsibility to see to it that that promise made to the OAS by the Sandinista group shall be kept by what is now the Sandinista government.

I thought this address by our able and permanent Ambassador was worthy of the consideration of the Congress and I include the address of Hon. J. William Middendorf II, our Ambassador and permanent representative to the Organization of American States, delivered to the permanent council meeting of the OAS this morning:

NICARAGUA—THE STOLEN REVOLUTION

(By Ambassador J. William Middendorf II, Ambassador, Permanent Representative, Organization of American States, March 27, 1985, OAS Permanent Council Meeting)

The U.S. delegation wishes to note that on July 18, 1984, we last raised the matter of Nicaragua's failure to live up to its solemn promises of July 12, 1979, to the Secretary General of this body. They promised to hold early free elections, to establish an independent judiciary, and to uphold human rights.

It is my delegation's sad duty to report that, since that date, nothing has happened to change the situation.

When Sandinista troops entered Managua on July 19, 1979, they were met by joyous throngs of Nicaraguan citizens who believed that, at long last, freedom and economic well-being were at hand. We all know now that the Sandinista revolution was stolen—stolen by a small, hard-core group of Marxist-Leninists who did not represent majority opinion within the Sandinista movement, but who had long conspired to take the movement over, and who were armed to make it possible to carry out their plan.

Let us look first at the impact almost six years of Sandinismo have had on the ordinary Nicaraguan people. We are not talking now about political figures, or business leaders, but about the Nicaraguan "man-in-the-street," the ordinary Nicaraguan whose only ambition is to make a decent enough living to support his family.

What is happening to this ordinary Nicaraguan today?

His children don't have enough to eat. Robert Leiken, who initially strongly supported the revolution, wrote in the New Republic on October 8, 1984, that children were supposed to be the "spoiled ones" of the revolution. Instead, he noted, on his visit last year, he noticed far more naked children with signs of malnutrition than he had ever seen before in Nicaragua. Most foodstuffs are rationed, with the local committees for the defense of Sandinismo handing out ration cards—or withholding them—for citizens who show "insufficient revolutionary fervor."

His older children, from age 11 on up, face the possibility of being drafted into the Sandinista Armed Forces. Strong-arm recruiters snatch them off the streets or from their school rooms to fill the ranks of the Sandinista military. Which now outnumbers all of the other military forces of Central America combined.

His freedom of speech is sorely limited. The Committees for the defense of Sandinismo keep their eye on him. If he complains to a neighbor about something the government has done, he may find himself hauled before a neighborhood court, with no appeal of any sentence that court hands down allowed.

His freedom to be informed about national and international events is restricted. Radio and televisions news are under government control, and they broadcast only what the Sandinista party wants them to. There is only one opposition newspaper. La Prensa, and it is so heavily censored by government censors that it frequently suspends publication because after the censors are through, there is not enough news left to print. And sometimes the government orders it to suspend publication anyway.

His livelihood is threatened. If he works in the private sector, the gradual elimination of private enterprise by the Sandinista government may leave him without a job. If he is a farmer, under the laws establishing state agencies which are the only entities to which he is allowed to sell his produce, at a non-negotiable price fixed by the government, he may not even hold back seed for next season's planting. He may not receive enough income to make ends meet.

The average Nicaraguan has always been religious. He has usually been a devout Catholic, or in the case of the Miskito Indians, a devout Moravian. Now, he finds his church leaders, including the Pope, harassed by Sandinista youth mobs, the "Turbas Divinas." He finds his priest or pastor accused of being "a counter-revolutionary" when he refuses to praise the Sandinista government in his sermons. He can no longer hear the archbishop's homily on radio or television, because the Sandinistas do not allow it to be broadcast without their prior censorship, something to which the archbishop has understandably refused to submit.

Compare his situation with that of ordinary citizens in neighboring Costa Rica and Honduras, and you will see the contrast. While those countries have problems, they are working democracies where people can say what they please, don't have to worry about their children being drafted, and where farmers can sell their produce in the market themselves or choose among several competing middlemen, who will buy the produce for resale.

Yet, the Sandinista leaders say that countries such as Honduras and Costa Rica must undergo their own revolutions. Interior Minister Tomas Borge, in his interview in Playboy magazine of September 1983, was asked to respond to the Reagan administration contention that, following its triumph in Nicaragua, the revolution will be exported to El Salvador, then Guatemala, then Honduras, then Mexico. Borge replied, "that is one historical prophecy of Ronald Reagan's that is absolutely true."

On the second anniversary of the Sandinista revolution, Borge gave a speech in Managua, in which he said: "This revolution goes beyond our borders. Our revolution was always internationalist . . ."

In our special session on February 29, 1984, my esteemed colleague from Nicaragua told this body: "If we had wanted to attack Costa Rica with a specific end in mind, we would have done so, and they wouldn't even have had enough time to ask that a special session be called, because by then they would have been occupied . . ." While supposedly denying an intention of invading Costa Rica, this statement shows how confident the Sandinistas are in their ability to invade their southern neighbor successfully, if they ever feel the desire to do so.

I think it is worth asking, taking into account these statements I have just mentioned, as well as many others, what makes anyone believe that the Sandinista government is willing to live in peace with its neighbors? Just because they have stated their peaceful intention?

You will recall that promises made to this body on June 12, 1979, have not been kept. How, then, can we assume that promises not to attack their neighbors will be kept by the Sandinistas? When almost daily we observe shots fired by the Sandinistas across the Honduran and Costa Rican borders, and guerrillas trained by the Sandinistas carry on their activities in El Salvador and Guatemala, and Managua has been the command center for guerrilla activities throughout Central America. Can we believe their approval of peaceful intentions?

Let us review the record again. In 1979 the Sandinista junta promised the Secretary General that it would respect human rights, set up an independent judiciary, and hold "the first free elections in this country".

As I have already pointed out, human rights have been violated on a massive scale. The mistreatment of the Miskito and other Indian tribes was especially noteworthy. Shortly after the revolution. The Miskito Indians' traditional homelands were flooded with Cuban and Nicaraguan personnel who said they were there to "rescue" them. The attempt was made to force them to give up their traditional way of life and adopt the Marxism-Leninism of the revolution. As Freedom House said at the time, the program "is to deprive them of their socio-cultural identity". Their traditional, freely-elected leaders were replaced with Sandinista-appointed authorities—some of them Cubans.

Massive relocation of the Miskitos, as well as other tribes, as the Sumo and the Rama, were undertaken. In some instances where they resisted, Miskitos were killed. Men, women and children were forced to walk long distances on foot. Their farm animals were ofter appropriated by the state. Ominously, we hear reports today of a similar involuntary forced relocation of people from a wide area in rural northern Nicaragua, and of Sandinista army personnel putting the torch to the fields left behind. So much for respect for human rights!

In 1979, the Sandinista junta promised this body that an independent judiciary would be established. Yet justice has become the servant of Sandinista totalitarianism. The neighborhood courts, where people are judged for such "crimes" as failing to attend Sandinista Party rallies, hand down sentences which are not subject to judicial review. The nominally independent Supreme Court of Justice has limited power to review decisions handed down by lower courts. The right of habeas corpus has been practically eliminated.

The recent Urbina Lara case illustrates the lack of respect Sandinista justice has for the traditional Latin American doctrine of asylum. Mr. Urbina Lara, who had taken refuge in the Costa Rican Embassy, was forcibly removed from the embassy building, wounded and imprisoned, by Sandinista authorities at a moment when the Costa Rican diplomats had briefly left the embassy building unoccupied except for Mr. Urbina Lara. Mr. Urbina Lara was allowed to leave Nicaragua only after the incident threatened to disrupt the Contadora peace process. We understand that President Ortega has told high-level visitors to Managua that Urbina Lara left the embassy of his own accord. On his arrival in Colombia. However, Mr. Urbina Lara confirmed the details of this breach of the principle of diplomatic asylum. Meanwhile, his defense lawyer was detained for several days in a Managua jail without charges. So much for Sandinista justice!

Finally, in 1979 the Sandinista junta promised early, free elections. Late last year, "elections" were held. But they were nothing but a sham, as the Sandinista government refused to create the conditions whereby the largest opposition coalition, the Coordinadora Democratica, could have any chance to compete. That group's candidate, Arturo Cruz, who had at one time been the Sandinista government's own Ambassador to Washington, had his rallies disrupted by Sandinista youth mobs—the so-called "Turbas Divinas"—on repeated occasions during the pre-electoral period. His pronouncements were censored from the opposition newspaper "La Prensa", and were not carried by the government print and broadcast media. Indeed, Sandinista censors have assured that criticism of the government is all but absent from the media.

Faced with the situation in which the Sandinista government would not allow Cruz to conduct a full and free campaign, after many attempts to negotiate campaign

guarantees, the Coordinadora refused to participate in the election campaign.

Two other parties intended to pull out also. In one case, mobs broke up a meeting of the Partido Conservador Democrata at which a vote to pull out of the elections was about to be taken, with a clear majority in favor. In the other case, Partido Liberal Independiente candidate Virigilio Godoy announced on October 21 that he was withdrawing his candidacy, but the government press continued to run his campaign advertisements, and La Prensa was censored when it attempted to report the withdrawal.

No matter how honest the vote-counting itself, an election is nothing more than a sham if parties who wish to run are not given the chance to mount a full and fair campaign.

I think it would be interesting to see what Sandinista leaders themselves have said about elections.

In May 1984, Comandante Bayardo Arce, one of the nine members of the Sandinista Directorate gave a speech to the Nicaraguan Socialist Party. He did not realize that the speech was being tape-recorded. A text of it appeared in the Barcelona newspaper, La Vanguardia, on July 31, 1984, and I note that the Sandinista government has never denied the authenticity of the text.

Comandante Arce said, ". . . of course, if we did not have the war situation imposed on us by the United States, the electoral problem would be totally out of place in terms of its usefulness . . .".

If we analyze this statement, we are led to believe that if the Freedom Fighters had not waged their valiant fight to force Sandinistas to live up to their promises, the junta never would have held elections.

Comandante Arce also said ". . . We think the electoral process . . . was and continues being an offensive tool from the standpoint of confronting U.S. policy . . . It is well to be able to call elections and take away from American policy one of its justifications for aggression against Nicaragua . . . bourgeois democracy has an element which we can manage and even derive advantages from for the construction of socialism in Nicaragua . . . we are using an instrument claimed by the bourgeoisie, which disarms the international bourgeoisie, in order to move ahead to matters that are for us strategic . . . we believe that the elections should be used in order to vote for Sandinismo, which is being challenged and stigmatized by imperialism, in order to demonstrate that, in any event, the Nicaraguan people are for that totalitarianism, the Nicaraguan people are for Marxism-Leninism . . . we see the elections as one more weapon of the revolution . . .".

There you have the affirmation, in Comandante Arce's own words, that the elections were held not because of the Sandinistas love for democracy, but for purely tactical reasons. Is it any wonder, then, that they established conditions under which only the Sandinista Party had any chance of victory? Had they given the Coordinadora Democratica a fair chance to campaign on an equal footing, the Sandinistas have been in danger of being swept out of office, something they could not risk. Thus, on November 4, 1984, the election which was held had to be the sham that it was. So much for the Sandinista promises to the OAS Secretary General in 1979.

In this connection, Mr. President, I would like to note that Congressman Claude Pepper, who honors us with his presence today, has written my country's President, Ronald Reagan, to call attention to the recommendation of the U.S. Congress, embodied in Public Law 98-215 of December 9, 1983. This recommendation proposes that the President seek the prompt reconvening of the Seventeenth Meeting of Consultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs for the purpose of evaluating the compliance of the Sandinista government with respect to the promises to the OAS and also to consider whether that Government is living up to the terms of the OAS Charter.

I would also note that I have received the text of House Congressional Resolution 81 of March 7, 1985, sponsored by 56 members of the U.S. Congress, which calls on the President to grant explicit recognition to the democratic Nicaraguan resistance, and urges the President and all members of the OAS to support the Nicaraguan resistance—the so-called "contras"—in their quest for peace, human rights, free elections and national reconciliation. Yesterday, Sen. Durenberger spoke to the National Press Club about the Nicaraguan situation.

My government's efforts to get the Sandinistas to live up to their promises has often been branded by them as a lonely effort by President Reagan which does not have the support of the American people or their elected representatives in the Congress. I would submit that the existence of these Congressional initiatives by Congressmen from both the Democratic and Republican parties shows the deep concern of the American people about the danger to the peace and security of the hemisphere posed by the actions of the Sandinista dictatorship.

I would also like to take note of the recent document on national dialogue of the Nicaraguan resistance, proclaimed in San Jose, Costa Rica, on March 2, 1985, by the Coordinadora Democratica, which has named as its representatives Arturo Cruz, Alfonso Robelo and Adolfo Calero.

In it, they request that the Sandinista government engage in a National Dialogue, leading to democratization of Nicaragua, a political system which guarantees real separation of power, development and reconstruction, recognition of civilian primacy over the state, full respect for human rights, de-militarization of the society, a foreign policy which emphasizes good relations with neighboring states, an economic system which gives importance to the development of the private sector, institution of a multi-party system which guarantees alternation in power and respect for minorities, freedom to organize labor unions, agrarian reform, municipal autonomy, respect for the culture and traditions of the Atlantic Coast, a general political amnesty, and expulsion from the country of advisors from Cuba and other Communist countries.

In this connection, the Coordinadora is not asking that Daniel Ortega be ousted as president, but only that he live up to the 1979 promises to the OAS.

Mr. President, it is Sandinista government did not take advantage of this opportunity to resolve Nicaragua's problems by peaceful means.

Up to now, the Sandinistas have refused calls for dialogue with the opposition. Yet in El Salvador and Colombia, we have recently seen the occurrence of dialogue with the armed opposition, so why should Nicaragua be a special case where dialogue is inadmissible?

We are told constantly by the Sandinistas that the armed resistance in Nicaragua is nothing more than a movement of former Somocistas who are battling to return to power. This lie has been repeated so often that even some of my own country's press seems to have accepted it as true.

I note also that the Contadora group will meet next month in the hopes of establishing a final solution to the Central American problem. It is my hope that this process will finally resolve the crisis not only in Nicaragua but in all of Central America. I would like to say at this point, however, that any agreement is only so many pieces of paper until it is put into practice. Once again, foolproof measures of verification must be included in any such agreement if it is to be effective. I note the words of Lenin, as quoted by C.L. Sulzberger in the New York Times of June 13, 1956. Lenin said "We must be ready to employ trickery, deceit, law breaking, withholding and concealing truth". The Sandinista leaders have proclaimed many times that they are Marxist-Leninists. Are they in accord with this statement by Lenin?

Mr. President, my government only asks that the Sandinista government live up to its commitments to the OAS. I would note, that no government provided more aid to the Sandinistas during its first 18 months in power than the United States, which gave $118 million in aid. The Sandinista government began its inordinate military buildup immediately upon taking office, when the resistance had not yet formed. Texts used in literacy programs and elementary education from the beginning of the revolution used perjorative terms against my country. Radio Sandino, from the beginning of the revolution, attacked my country in the most vicious terms. On 15 different occasions over a period of four years, President Ortega falsely and irresponsibly accused my government of organizing an imminent invasion of his country, a tactic similar to that used by Castro 20 years ago in Cuba to consolidate power. The record shows that militarism and hostility to the United States were hallmarks of this Cuba-Soviet style revolution from the very beginning.

It is my hope that peace will return to Nicaragua through one or another of the processes that I have mentioned here, but, if no process is successful, I would remind this body of its responsibilities. In the final instance, the Organization of American States has a responsibility to assure peace in Nicaragua, since in 1979, it took the unprecedented step of withdrawal support from a sitting member government in Nicaragua and replacing it with the Sandinista junta. My government does not intend to allow this Organization to ignore its responsibilities in this regard, and reserves the right at some future date to introduce a resolution leading toward the satisfactory resolution of the Nicaraguan problem, if the processes which I have already detailed do not bear fruit.

Thank you.

THE UNITED STATES AS A DEBTOR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, since the establishment of the Bretton Woods agreement and the system which was put into place following that agreement after World War II, the American economy has grown at a

fantastic pace, and that growth was exported into the world economy.

As late as 1981, our current export account in the United States was in surplus by over $6 billion, but by 1984, America's current export account surplus had turned to deficit, with the deficit rising about $100 billion. For the first time in history, we are buying more than $100 billion a year than we can afford to pay for. It is like an individual who goes to the store and charges more than they can afford. The United States is buying about $100 billion a year more than it can afford.

Our international trade and financial position has, in fact, become so precarious that the United States will become a debtor nation this year. By the end of 1985, the United States will become, in fact, the largest debtor in the world.

Fred Bergsten, an authority on international economics, and many other authorities, have estimated that unless the value of the dollar, which is now overvalued by as much as 60 percent, is corrected, U.S. external debt by 1989 could exceed the debt of all the developing nations of the world combined.

□ 1630

The problem is so severe that our external debt could rise above $1 trillion—I repeat, $1 trillion—by the end of the decade. If you started out spending a million dollars a day from the birth of Christ until today, you would not spend one-half of $1 trillion. That is how much a trillion dollars is.

The result, which we are beginning to see already, is a crisis in confidence in the soundness and the integrity of the American economy. The pain is now severe among many, many sectors of our economy. Farmers, for example, are in a state of economic depression. Workers in textile manufacturing and in shoe manufacturing, as well as many other businesses across our country, are in a state of depression because of the trade deficit which is mounting and which no one is doing anything about.

Mr. Speaker, for every $1 billion in trade deficit, over 25,000 American jobs are destroyed. They are exported. Last year, in my hometown of Osceola, AR, two textile manufacturing firms were closed because they could not compete with the cheap, subsidized foreign exports, and 1,000 of my fellow townsmen lost their jobs, not because they were not productive or efficient but because our trade deficit in effect subsidizes foreign imports which put them out of work.

Shoe factories are closing as well from Maine to Arkansas. Farmers are going bankrupt in record numbers every day. Someone from my district sends me full-page advertisements giving notice of foreclosure sales of farmers who are bankrupt because of our current economic policy. Textile workers are being laid off, and high-technology workers are facing intense foreign competition.

Today a number of my colleagues and I are beginning a series of special orders on the current and the increasing crisis in the trade deficit. The special orders are designed to discuss and to develop a set of trade policies for the future of all America. We will look at trade problems from the farms to the factories. We will explore the challenges facing new and old industries alike. We will look at foreign trade barriers and propose new export promotion initiatives. We will suggest new ways to make American industry and American agriculture more competitive with their competition around the world.

I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in this special-order effort, with the hopes that it will be worthwhile to all Americans.

Madam Speaker, as we begin these special orders, I would like to emphasize a few points that I believe are fundamental to our national economic health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mrs. BURTON of California]. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] has expired.

AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHARP. Madam Speaker, I join my other colleagues this afternoon who have been speaking about the need for a more effective trade policy for this country and I particularly want to highlight the serious nature of the problems we are facing in agricultural exports.

This is of great concern to my part of the country, but I think it also is very important to the entire Nation, because exports have in the past, certainly in the last 10 years, been a critical part of the farm economy of the United States, and yet for the last several years we have been slipping in this area of exports as in too many others.

I trust that there are going to be many speakers in the House this year to address the ramifications of trade, whether in agricultural or industrial products, and we are going to find it very difficult to find a sensible long-term policy for this country that somehow can avoid the dangers of extreme protectionism and at the same time not follow the false flag of free trade, which I believe is a very noble goal and which would be nice if we could follow it, but which we find very few countries around the world in fact who do follow it.

Today I simply want to join my colleagues who are focusing attention particularly on the plight of our farmers and the need for us to pursue far more aggressively than we have in recent years efforts to see that we export more through our own initiative and our own improvements in competition, as well as trying to get our trading partners to more aggressively alter the trading practices that work against their purchase of our products.

Madam Speaker, American agriculture is facing a wide range of problems, all of which cannot be solved by increasing farm exports, or any one specific action. We can however, make a dent in them, which is more than has been done up to this time to solve problems farmers face.

The Department of Agriculture's reluctance to stimulate farm exports is inexplicable. At a time when the administration is extolling American business to compete, it does nothing to stimulate competition in agriculture abroad. In fact, it has opposed many of our efforts in the House over the last 4 years to expand farm exports and other exports.

A central point which must be addressed, as in any discussion of import-export policy, is the high value of the dollar overseas. It is automatically giving our foreign trade competitors a massive advantage which is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to overcome. In the past, up to 40 percent of U.S. farm produce went to foreign markets. That percentage has been dropping, and the domestic consequences alone should lead us to the development of an effective and aggressive farm export policy. Many farmers across the country are in deep trouble for various reasons, some so deeply that the Government cannot save them. Others can and should be helped. Because it appears increasingly unlikely that direct Government aid will be forthcoming, we can and should aid on other fronts.

Farm income has been catastrophically low for several years. American farmers are unjustly paying a high price for massive and efficient production. In any other industry or business, a combination of efficiency and productivity would produce large profits. The domestic market, however, has limited capacity to absorb production. Surpluses have resulted in lower prices, less farm income, and widespread bankruptcies should surprise no one. Is bankruptcy an acceptable policy?

We live in an increasingly complex world, one which has changed greatly in the last 20 years. Part of the change we face is stiff competition in international markets, played by rules that have also changed. Unless we can adapt, and meet the challenges, we

will fail—in agriculture policy and in every other basic industry in this Nation.

A major revision of current farm programs will be undertaken this year. There will be many hard decisions to be made. One part of it, however, must be to help get our massive and costly surpluses to markets overseas. We can minimize the costs to taxpayers while boosting farm income. We will have such an opportunity, and I urge that we take it by developing a strong, aggressive farm export program.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FISCAL POLICY AND THE TRADE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, we have had in the last year a $123 billion products trade deficit. This year we are probably going to have a trade deficit that will be substantially higher than that. There are no quick fixes in any of this. The real problem is not trade policy; the real problem is domestic economic policy, specifically the fiscal policy that we follow.

Being very specific, this country is now running in this year at the present time a $248 billion fiscal deficit. It has run that kind of fiscal deficit for quite some time. The impact of all of that is a monetary policy that causes real interest rates to rise, and while we have almost a zero inflation rate, the average interest rate on Federal obligations is now around 11 percent. Therefore, we have a very high real interest rate of around 10 percent.

In no place on Earth can money earn that kind of real growth just by letting money sit in a bank. So investments in American obligations are very profitable for everyone, particularly for foreigners. Not only is an investment in an American obligation safe, but it is also at the highest real return you can get for your money. All of this drives up the value of the dollar. As the value of the dollar goes up, it acts like a tax on exports of American products and it acts like a subsidy on imports of foreign products.

So the real cause of our trade deficit is our fiscal policy, our domestic economic policy. The results of it are as natural as night following day. You cannot run the kind of deficits that we have been running year after year, and particularly for the last 4 years, and have any other result than the result we are currently seeing.

Now, it is easy to call for changes in trade policy. It makes good political fodder, but it will not solve the problem. The problem is that most of the remedies that have been suggested in the area of trade policy will not solve the problem but will only make it worse. So the challenge facing this Congress and the challenge facing the President and the White House is, how do we get the fiscal deficit down?

It is a very tough challenge. Obviously it must be done by limiting Government expenditures to the very bare bones, with belt-tightening of the most inordinate kind. It also means that at a time when we are talking about revising our basic tax policy—and this is a general criticism of all the proposals I have seen—most of them shift the burden away from the individual taxpayer to the business taxpayer. Now, there is no excuse for any business not paying any taxes, but we could cure that by imposing an effective minimal tax.

□ 1640

But you cannot add more taxes to business in total in America and make it anything other than less competitive in the international scene; so at this time I hope that the administration and all people who are advocating tax reform will realize that you cannot throw a distressed, perhaps drowning industry, farms and factories, greater weight to carry and expect anything other than the responsibility for a greater rescue effort of them.

What is happening to the farms of Iowa and the factories of the United States is an economic consequence of the policy we follow. You cannot run these high fiscal deficits without having a high trade deficit.

Now, there are other problems in the trade picture. Some of our trading partners are greedy. We do have remedies for those. Some of them are not following the law. They are subsidizing product into our markets. But why anybody would want to subsidize into this market today with the vast incentives that are given, almost subsidies by this Government, with the overvalued dollar, I do not know why anybody would want to subsidize them, but they do.

OUR TRADE PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I want to follow the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] in talking about this trade deficit problem. It is a very real problem; but what concerns me in the Congress and in the administration is that we may be wanting to treat the symptom and not get at the root cause. I think very clearly the root cause of our trade deficit, which is growing larger and becoming a problem all across this country, the root cause is the Federal budget deficit, because you can clearly show a connection between the high Federal budget deficits and the real rates of interest, which are still at record highs. Those high interest rates have had an effect of attracting foreign investments and foreign purchasing of our debt. That has had an effect of overvaluing the U.S. dollar in relation to the other currencies by something like 30 percent. Therefore, it really matters not how efficient our management is or how productive our workers are. The overvalued dollar puts the American worker and American management at a disadvantage in the international marketplace or in our own marketplace. It is the same as producing an American item, an American piece of equipment as efficiently as any other piece of equipment, but putting a 30-percent tax on the American item, or conversely, giving a 30-percent subsidy to the foreign produced item. That is the effect of the overvalued dollar in making American products noncompetitive in the international marketplace. That is why primarily we have the trade deficit that is also setting all time records.

In order to reverse that, in order to become competitive again, we are going to have to deal with this Federal budget deficit.

Quite frankly, I am very disappointed in the Reagan administration to this point because the signals they have sent are that deficits do not matter. We are going to have to have some strong leadership from the President, from the administration and from both parties in the Congress if we are going to deal substantially in getting these budget deficits under control. Until we do that, we are not going to see a harmonious or complimentary monetary policy that will allow this economic recovery to continue and to allow a soft landing of the overvalued dollar so that we can again become competitive in the international marketplace.

So I would hope that Members on both sides of the aisle and that the administration, the President and his leaders in the administration, will give very serious attention to this Federal budget deficit, that we will reach some bipartisan consensus or some sort of an across-the-board freeze, plus other eliminations and reductions in Federal programs so that we can send a positive signal to the financial markets that we do have some fiscal discipline and send some signals to the Federal Reserve Board to loosen up on monetary policy so that we can bring the value of the dollar down in relation to other currencies and can have continued economic recovery.

I might also say in the meantime that there are going to be some individual problems with individual countries and the President has the tools,

thanks to the law passed by Congress last year, called the reciprocity trade legislation, the President does have the tools to deal on a case-by-case basis with those countries who are discriminating with tariff and nontariff barriers, discriminating against U.S. products.

I would hope that the President would use those tools to reciprocate and to tell those countries that discriminate against our products that we are going to reciprocate against your products in our own markets.

These two items, the reciprocity trade legislation that is on the books, plus a resolve to lower these Federal deficits, can have a marked improvement in our international trade deficit and can get us on the road to increased productivity, get us back on the road to job development in our own country.

THE STAGGERING TRADE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KANJORSKI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BONKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Oklahoma who have addressed this very important and timely topic.

This week the Secretary of Commerce will once again announce the trade deficit for the preceding month. He does this on a regular basis and each month the trade deficit is staggering. It is usually a record setter. Every month when the Secretary announces this amount, it was $10.3 billion last month and it may be higher this month, everybody expresses concern. There is a problem with the trade deficit, but each time that the announcement is made, there is no particular plan announced. There is no proposal. There is no strategy. There is no effort by this administration to deal with that staggering trade deficit, no policy recommendations to the Congress. There is nothing but a shrug of the shoulders. "It's too bad that the trade deficit is this high," they say, "but we cannot do anything about it". Well, the truth is, if we do not do something about it soon, that so-called soft landing to which the gentleman from Oklahoma referred will be a crash landing.

There are two serious problems now associated with the trade deficit. The first is the new status that we take on this year as a debtor nation. For the first time in 65 years, the United States will be a debtor nation. We will owe more than we own abroad. The amount will be somewhere around $1 trillion by the end of this decade, $1 trillion that we will owe foreign sources.

The head of the Federal Reserve Board testified before congressional committees and made reference to this as not being sustainable. While it may not pose an imminent danger at the moment, it simply is not sustainable.

He also said that we are living on borrowed time. We are living on borrowed money and borrowed time, money borrowed to service this debt, not only from future generations of Americans, but also from abroad to help finance the staggering budget deficit this administration has created.

□ 1650

The second problem associated with our massive trade deficit is the dramatic shift it has caused in this country's economy. We are experiencing a deterioration of our industrial base. We are seeing the export of our manufacturing capability and the export of American jobs.

In a headline last week it was pointed out that we are now seeing a rather dramatic slowing of our production capability. Our GNP growth for the first quarter was pegged at 2.1 percent, which is a very dramatic decline. At the same time our production capability is down while the consumer demand is up. And what makes up the difference is the large volume of imports that are now flooding American markets.

There is no way that you can reconcile the trade deficit without looking at the inflated dollar. The inflated dollar has been called variously the strong dollar, the bloated dollar, the overvalued dollar, the high flying dollar. But however you characterize it, it is like a 40-percent tax on American exporters and a 40-percent subsidy on imports into America.

Those imports, if they are the result of an artificially high dollar, or unfair trade practices, threaten American domestic industries.

And what does this administration expect to do about the strong dollar? First of all, they do not even recognize that there is a problem. The President at press conferences has said that the strong dollar is really good for the American economy. He says that it is helping to support the present economic growth of this country by keeping inflation down. But he doesn't recognize the staggering cost the inflated dollar is exacting from vital industries and productive American workers. He has no plan whatsoever to deal with the overvalued dollar.

Meanwhile we are experiencing the export of American jobs and American industrial capability. All of our European friends and other trading partners are concerned about the inflated dollar. They realize that the capital flows are moving artificially and that not only are they bringing forth cheap imports to this country but they are denying capital that is vital to their own industrial growth. Yet this President has no plan and no policy, no program. Indeed, he has no concern at all about the inflated dollar.

So unless America can get its act together fiscally, until we can deal with both deficits, the twin deficits, we are going to go through a very agonizing period of watching our industrial base decline and watching those jobs be exported abroad.

I call upon the President and his Secretary of Commerce to come forth with a bold plan to deal with this embarrassing trade deficit and to do it now.

HEALTH INSURANCE AVAILABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide incentives for States to create "risk pools" to provide health insurance for individuals and families who cannot purchase this insurance on the open market due to poor health.

A vast majority of Americans are covered by private health insurance. In 1982, 162 million Americans under age 65 were covered by some form of group health insurance, and millions more were covered by individual health insurance policies. However, some Americans still fall between the cracks of our current system for one reason or another. Many of these people are working, are willing and able to pay for private health insurance, are financially solvent but in poor health, are not in any group health plan, and are not covered or eligible for individual insurance; they are, in effect, uninsurable.

In 1975, my own State of Connecticut enacted a program to solve the problem by guaranteeing the availability of comprehensive major medical coverage for all Connecticut citizens. Under Public Acts 75-616 and 76-399, the Connecticut Health Reinsurance Association was established to provide for a State pool for uninsurables which offered comprehensive health insurance to all citizens of Connecticut regardless of the status of their health. The coverage is expensive since the pool is composed of individuals who cannot obtain coverage on the open market due to their health problems.

There is an upper limit on the premiums charged, which when combined with the health status of the people in the pool, can be generally expected to produce pool losses. These losses are shared on a pro-rata basis among all the members of the pool in the State; that is, all the competitors in the insurance market in the State including

insurance companies, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, health maintenance organizations, and self-insured employers. Thus, the losses experienced by the pool do not disadvantage anyone competitively and are spread evenly across the entire spectrum of good business in the State. Four other States currently have similar pools.

The Health Insurance Availability Act provides a powerful incentive for all States to establish this type of pool by levying a 10-percent excise tax on health plans which do not participate in a qualified risk pool after January 1, 1987, this guaranteeing to all Americans the opportunity to purchase comprehensive health insurance. It also resolves a problem created by a provision in the 1974 Employees Retirement Income Security Act [ERISA] which precludes the States from regulating employees benefit plans. This provision prevents the States from requiring self-insured employers to participate in any pool losses, driving up the cost of the pools for those who do participate. This bill encourages self-insured employers to join the pool through the mechanism of the excise tax.

This bill does not directly address the high cost of health care. But it does give a number of people the opportunity to obtain the same protection now available to the vast majority of Americans.

It will ease the increasingly serious uncompensated care problem faced by hospitals and other health providers when unprotected Americans face higher and higher medical bills.

It does not resolve the health care problems of the poor. But it does protect those middle-class Americans who want protection from catastrophic medical bills and who are willing and able to pay for it. It does not guarantee insurance coverage for everyone, only its availability.

Finally, the bill does not require the appropriation of a single Federal dollar. All costs of administration are borne by the insurance pool. All pool losses are borne by private competitors in the insurance marketplace. No new Federal bureaucracy or program is involved. The plans will be established in the States, on a State-by-State basis, and are to be regulated by the States just like any other insurance.

This bill simply lays down minimum standards for qualification of the pooling associations for Internal Revenue Service purposes. The bill makes available health insurance with deductibles not to exceed $2,500, coinsurance not to exceed 20 percent, out-of-pocket payments for covered medical expenses not to exceed in the aggregate $3,500 per individual per year adjusted for inflation, and a preexisting conditions clause not to exceed 12 months.

I believe this legislation cures a large problem for a small group of Americans. I am inserting the legislative language in the Record at this point.

H.R. 1770

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide incentives for the establishment of statewide insurance pools to provide health insurance to high-risk individuals

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Health Insurance Availability Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) there is a significant number of persons not covered by health insurance who, because of health conditions, cannot qualify for health insurance;

(2) the unavailability of coverage to such persons may adversely affect the availability of health care to them;

(3) the lack of adequate health insurance for such persons jeopardizes the viability of health care financing and aggravates the bad debt and cash flow problems of health care providers; and

(4) such persons include some who lose their employment related coverages under both insured and self-funded employee benefit plans.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purpose of this Act is to—

(1) establish minimal standards for voluntary State action to establish pooling mechanisms for such persons resident in each State;

(2) encourage the establishment of such pooling mechanisms through the initiatives and resources of the State and private sector; and

(3) provide incentives for participation by all private health care financing mechanisms including self-funded employee health benefit plans.

SEC. 3. TAX ON HEALTH PLANS OF LARGE EMPLOYERS NOT MEMBERS OF QUALIFIED STATE POOLING ASSOCIATIONS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Chapter 41 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER B—HEALTH PLANS OF LARGE EMPLOYERS NOT MEMBERS OF QUALIFIED STATE POOLING ASSOCIATIONS

"Sec. 4912. Tax on expenses of health plans of large employers not members of qualified State pooling associations.

"SEC. 4912. TAX ON EXPENSES OF HEALTH PLANS OF LARGE EMPLOYERS NOT MEMBERS OF QUALIFIED STATE POOLING ASSOCIATIONS.

"(a) Tax Imposed.—In the case of a large employer, there is hereby imposed a tax equal to 10 percent of the amount of the nonqualified employee health expenses paid or incurred during the taxable year.

"(b) LARGE EMPLOYER.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the term 'large employer' means an employer who, on each of some 20 days during the taxable year or the preceding taxable year, each day being in a different calendar week, employed for some portion of the day (whether or not at the same moment of time) 25 or more individuals.

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR GOVERNMENTAL UNITS.—The term 'large employer' shall not include the United States, any State or political subdivision thereof, or any possession of the United States or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing (including the United States Postal Service and Postal Rate Commission); except that such term shall include any nonappropriated fund instrumentality of the United States.

"(c) NONQUALIFIED EMPLOYEE HEALTH EXPENSES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'nonqualified employee health expenses' means the expenses paid or incurred by the employer for a group health plan to the extent such expenses are allocable—

"(A) to employment within a State, and

"(B) to a period during which neither

"(i) the employer, nor

"(ii) any entity through which benefits under the plan are provided,

is a member of a qualified pooling association in such State.

"(2) GROUP HEALTH PLAN.—the term 'group health plan' has the meaning given to such term by section 162(i)(2).

"(3) QUALIFIED POOLING ASSOCIATION.—The term qualified pooling association' means any organization which—

"(A) is a nonprofit corporation established pursuant to and regulated by State law;

"(B) permits any of the following doing business in the State to be participating members:

"(i) insurers writing expense incurred health insurance,

"(ii) hospital and medical service plan corporations,

"(iii) health maintenance organizations, and

"(iv) employers and other health financing entities;

"(C) makes available (without regard to health conditions) to all residents of the State not eligible for Medicare levels of health insurance typical of the levels of coverage provided through large employer groups with deductibles not to exceed $2,500, coinsurance not to exceed 20 percent, with out-of-pocket payments for covered medical expenses by the insured not to exceed in the aggregate $3,500 per individual per year including amounts paid to satisfy the deductible (such dollar amounts to be adjusted according to the Medical Care Component of the Consumer Price Index), except that variations in the amounts and applications of such deductibles, coinsurance, out-of-pocket limits and other policy provisions such as restrictions on coverage for pre-existing conditions (not to exceed 12 months) shall be permitted in accordance with customary insurance practice;

"(D) charges a pool permium rate expected to be self-supporting based upon a reasonable actuarial determination of anticipated experience and expected expenses, such pool premium rate in no event to exceed 200 percent of average premium rates for individual standard risks in the State for comparable coverage; and

"(E) assesses losses of the pool equitably among all participating members.

"(4) MEDICARE.—The term 'medicare' means the insurance program established under part A of title XVIII of the Social Security Act.

"(d) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"(1) For provisions denying deduction for tax imposed by this section, see section 275(a)(6).

"(2) For provisions making deficiency procedures applicable to tax imposed by this section, see section 6211 et seq."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Chapter 41 of such Code is amended by striking out the chapter heading and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"CHAPTER 41—PUBLIC CHARITIES; CERTAIN HEALTH PLANS OF LARGE EMPLOYERS

"Subchapter A. Public charities.
"Subchapter B. Health plans of large employers not members of qualified State pooling associations.
"Subchapter A—Public Charities".

(2) The table of chapters for subtitle D of such Code is amended by striking out the item relating to chapter 41 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Chapter 41. Public charities; certain health plans of large employers."

(3) Subparagraph (B) of section 6104(c)(1) of such Code is amended by striking out "or chapter 41 or 42" and inserting in lieu thereof ", subchapter A of chapter 41 or chapter 42".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1987.●

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my 10-minute special order for today be vacated, and I be allowed to address the House for 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

LIVER TRANSPLANT FOR A 6-MONTH-OLD INFANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today with a very serious plea for your help and attention. An opportunity is before us to assist a young family in a matter quite literally involving life and death. Daniel J. Gasparini, 6-month-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Jeffery Gasparini, is in desperate need of a liver. Technically, Daniel was born without a bile duct, and consequently suffers from biliary artresia, a debilitating disease affecting the liver. In layman's terms, that medical parlance translates into the stark reality that Daniel will die if a suitable transplant organ is not found for him in time.

Efforts to locate a healthy, appropriate liver for Daniel are ongoing. As you may imagine, however, it is a monumental task for the persons directly involved to keep abreast of potential donors from across the Nation. This is where your help, and the help of your staff, is needed. I would like to ask you or someone in your office to contact the hospitals in your district, alerting them to the need of a liver for Daniel. Your calls may turn up nothing; nevertheless they will be an important, personal exercise in humanity and compassion. Your calls, on the other hand, may unearth a donor, and give hope and life to a family that too long has agonized over a perilously ill infant. No description I can give adequately conveys the pain experienced by Daniel and his parent. No appeal I make can approach what a few phone calls on your part might accomplish for this family. Therefore I ask you simply, please help.

Daniel is currently a patient in Yale New Haven Hospital, New Haven, CT. Dr. Flye, his physician, may be contacted at the Yale New Haven Hospital Transplant Center at (203) 785-2565. Any information concerning the availability of an organ for transplant may be directed to my office (202) 225-4136, or passed on directly to Dr. Flye at the number above. Your timely attention to this situation is critical, and cannot be underestimated. The thanks and overwhelming gratitude of the Gasparinis, of myself, and my office, and of all persons who have ever been faced with the same life-sustaining need of an organ donor, attend your efforts. Thank your for your service and care.

AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this special order today so that Members of Congress can discuss the current state of U.S. agricultural exports, the causes of the problems we are experiencing in this area, and offer their suggestions as to what, if anything, we can do to reverse the downward trend in U.S. agricultural exports we have seen in recent years.

According to recent forecasts by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, both the value of U.S. agricultural exports and U.S. agricultural export volume continue to lag well behind the historic highs reached in the years 1979-81. Although this decrease in agricultural exports is not the sole cause of the financial crisis facing American farmers today, it certainly has been a major factor. The area of agricultural export trade must be addressed by Congress as it considers the 1985 farm bill this session. It is my belief that there will be no substantial, long-term improvement in our farm economy until we reverse the decline in agricultural exports and begin to create new markets for our agricultural products, and expand existing ones.

A brief review of the agricultural export boom of the 1970's helps explain the current situation. U.S. agricultural exports increased tremendously in the 1970's and into the early 1980's. The value of U.S. agricultural exports increased over sixfold from 1970 to 1981. The volume peaked in 1980 at two and one-half times the 1970 level. The main reasons for this boom were rapid economic growth, especially in the developing countries, the easy availability of credit, the relatively steady depreciation of the dollar throughout the decade, and a policy change in the Soviet Union and other nations with centrally planned economies to import food and feedstuffs instead of tightening the belt. The United States was in a good position to respond to increased global demand for food and feedstuffs. First, we had surplus stocks which enabled us to respond to short-run demand changes. In addition, as an efficient producer with abundant agricultural resources, we had the capacity to increase production.

In the early 1980's, however, a dramatic reversal of the economic conditions of the previous decade led to a sharp drop in U.S. agricultural exports. The major causes were the worldwide economic recession, the enormous debt problems of developing countries, the rapid appreciation of the U.S. dollar, increased worldwide production of major agricultural commodities, and agricultural trade policies including both the partial U.S. embargo on grain sales to the Soviet Union and policies of our competitor nations. As a result of this declining demand for U.S. agricultural exports, we lost export market shares, especially for wheat and corn, while our competitors gained or maintained shares.

This decline in agricultural exports played a major role in the financial stress we see on American farms today. Our agriculture is no longer national in scope. In the 1950's only 10 percent of farm income was from exports. Today, production of 4 acres out of every 10 is destined for foreign markets. We export one-fourth of our corn crop, one-half of the soybean crop, 60 to 65 percent of our wheat, and over 40 percent of our cotton and rice.

Agricultural exports are also important to the national economy. They represent one-fifth of all merchandise exports, they reduce the overall deficit in the balance of trade, and they help pay for imports. Moreover, U.S. agricultural exports generate employment, income, and purchasing power across the entire economy. Each dollar of agricultural exports generates an additional dollar of domestic business activity. Every $1 billion in farm exports creates 35,000 jobs. To put it another way, in 1982, more than 580,000 jobs in the nonfarm sector existed because of agricultural exports.

These statistics establish how important it is for our Nation to maintain and expand our share of foreign agricultural markets. Accomplishing this will not be easy. There is no one magic solution to our export problems. If the world economy remains in recession, with heavy debt inhibiting growth in the developing nations that have the most potential for agricultural export

expansion, then there will be strong competition for world agricultural markets. This is a realistic scenario, and we must be prepared to deal with it. We must be prepared to meet our competition with flexible credit terms and we must be prepared to counter the predatory export subsidies used by many of our competitors and to fight unfair trade barriers.

In my opinion we should aggressively use the agricultural export credit revolving fund which has laid dormant since being authorized by Congress in 1981. This would make funds available for short-term financing of commercial export sales of U.S. agricultural products, export sales of U.S. breeding animals, and the establishment of grain-handling and storage facilities in important nations. It would make use more competitive, and moreover, since it is a revolving fund, the program would be fully self-supporting. In addition, I advocate the passage of legislation such as I introduced last year, and which other Members have also sponsored, which would provide the Secretary of Agriculture with the authority to use Government surplus commodities to promote the increased use of U.S. agricultural products by tendering them as bonuses to U.S. exporters, processors, and foreign purchasers.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, is an aggressive U.S. agricultural export policy. We need to take advantage of our strengths—farm productivity and an efficient agribusiness marketing system. We must also recognize and correct our weaknesses. We can take nothing for granted. We will have to do our homework and become export oriented. We will have to analyze our customers' needs and tailor our export programs to meet those needs. We will have to recognize that demands has leveled off in the industrial countries, and that the developing world offers the best opportunities for expansion in the years ahead, if and when those nations begin to grow economically once again.

This brings me to a final point, Mr. Speaker. We can do nothing in international agricultural trade unless we preserve the production capacity of U.S. agriculture. If the world economy returns to a reasonable level of growth and prosperity, we must be able to respond. We must, therefore, Mr. Speaker, adopt policies, both in the Federal budget and the 1985 farm bill, which will preserve and protect an agricultural structure based on the owner-operated family farm. These family farmers are not only a significant part of our productive capacity, but they also are a vital part of the social and cultural fabric of rural America.

□ 1700

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri for the very fine statement that he is making and note that the speaker is the chairman of the rural caucus of the House of Representatives, on which I am privileged to serve as a member of the executive committee.

I want to commend the chairman of that caucus for the leadership that is showing in inquiring into a number of our export-related problems and say that I think this effort of the rural caucus can hold some real promise. I hope we can come up with some suggestions and solutions that we will share with the Agriculture Committee as we deliberate on the 1985 farm bill. And beyond that, that we share with other committees which have jurisdiction in the trade area.

I commend the gentleman for his statement and for his efforts.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleague from Missouri for his kind comments and also thank him for the work that he is doing in the area of agriculture. Agricultural exports are so terribly important to us.

For so many years it has been agricultural exports that kept our balance of trade in the black. For so many years it is agricultural exports that have kept us from being a debtor nation.

Now we see that agricultural exports have begun to slip. As a result, we have and we are becoming a debtor nation. This must be reversed, Mr. Speaker. We in this Congress have an opportunity through the farm bill of 1985 to reverse the trend, to cause our export policy to be one that is positive rather than something that for so many years has been taken for granted.

So with the determination that I know that we have in this body we can make our agricultural export policy a positive one, one that will put us back in competition throughout the world so that we can get the balance of trade where it should be, we can assist our American farmers, and that we again will be a proud exporting agricultural nation.

I thank the Speaker.

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Missouri for calling a special order to focus on the need to do more to promote agricultural exports. Personally, I find this special order very timely, since Secretary of Agriculture John Block will be visiting my district this Friday, March 29. I will be hosting a farm forum so that the farmers of northeast Wisconsin can question the Secretary on the administration's agricultural proposals. A longstanding interest of the farmers of my district has been increasing their markets through exporting.

Given our overall 1984 trade deficit of $123 billion, it is ironic that the United States pays so little attention to its most profitable export, agricultural products. Last year alone, the United States exported $38 billion in farm goods and imported only $18.9 billion.

U.S. agriculture enjoys a comparative advantage over other countries for many products. The reasons are the favorable American climate, an abundance of fertile land, and modern farming technology. As a policy, the United States should maximize these advantages and take additional steps to enhance farm exports.

Last year, I proposed a four-point plan to enhance the potential of our agricultural community by increasing its exports. Steps have been and are currently being taken to follow through with the ideas that I put forth, but we can do more.

First, I called for a vigorous and hardline bargaining approach by the U.S. Government in pursuit of expanded markets, and elimination of restrictions against U.S. agricultural products. The 1985 farm bill addresses the importance of agricultural exports and the need to expand our trade. The major provisions would provide a commitment on the part of the U.S. Government to promote open access in world markets for U.S. farm products. They call for expanded trade through the elimination of restrictive trade deficits.

Second, I urged congressional action to ensure that agriculture be given equal treatment with other export interests in multilateral trade negotiations. We cannot afford to play "innocents abroad." Many nations are agressively selling products in traditional U.S. markets at below the cost of actual production.

I will soon be introducing a resolution calling on the President to negotiate with our trading partners to revise GATT rules so that agricultural export subsidies would be treated the same as tariffs. Primary products would be treated the same as manufactured products. Current rules make an artificial distinction between primary and manufactured products. They provide an excuse for subsidized agricultural exports by many of our friends and allies.

The protectionist nature of the European Community's common agricultural policy has been widely documented. GATT procedures should explicitly recognize that domestic subsidies alter trade by reducing the demand for imports and increasing the supply of exports.

Third, I declared the need for the U.S. Government to more fully utilize the barter and countertrade provisions of the last farm bill to acquire strategic materials in exchange for our agri-

cultural products. This provision was responsible for $13.6 million in dairy for bauxite trade with Jamaica in 1983. Last year the trade was increased by almost $7 million. This is only the tip of the iceberg. From 1960 to 1968, we were engaged in countertrade or barter up to about $1.2 billion; I believe we can make this a goal for the future.

Fourth, I called for new and innovative marketing techniques to expand our farm exports. Wheat, corn, and soybeans form the bulk of agricultural exports. But there is no reason why we cannot compete in other areas. As the representative of the third largest dairy district in the Nation, I believe we are overlooking the many opportunities this agriculture sector provides. Recent sales of dairy products to Egypt and Iraq show there is an international market for our products. We must tap new markets and aggressively meet overseas competition.

There is much to be gained if the U.S. dairy industry can expand into these new foreign markets. Dairy products containing low levels of lactose may find a new home in the People's Republic of China and other Asian countries. I have seen some innovative marketing schemes for low lactose yogart. The sales potential here is enormous. Imagine what this could do for our trade account.

In 1983, Land O' Lakes, with assistance of the Agency for International Development, devised a private sector mechanism to utilize dairy products being held by the CCC to promote economic development in developing countries. Under the plan, Public Law 480 commodities are granted to a small nonprofit foundation in Jamaica. It then contracts with the lowest bidder in the country to have the bulk commodities processed into value-added products. The products are then sold commercially in markets outside the United States and which are not available to U.S. dairy products. The profits generated from the sale of these products are used for two purposes: First, to provide financing in the form of loans, loan guarantees, investments of grants, for large or small scale projects to increase Jamaican production. Second, to promote the growth of the Jamaican economy. The goal is to assist Jamaica to become a viable trading partner with the United States. I would like to see more of these types of projects—partnerships between private enterprise and government that benefits developing countries, as well as the United States.

In conclusion, I'd like to say that I am pleased that the U.S. Government is finally recognizing the importance expanding its agricultural exports. This importance has been recognized by the administration which has made export promotion title I of the 1985 farm bill. The United States has everything to gain from encouraging farm exports. In promoting agricultural exports, we can both help the American farmer and the citizens of a hungry world. And, from a national perspective, we can reduce the trade deficit to the benefit of our entire economy.●

● Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, agricultural exports are of particular importance to my district and so I greatly appreciate the chance to join in this important discussion today. My home State of Nebraska ranks sixth of the 50 States in the value of agricultural exports.

I especially would like to address my urban colleagues as to why they should be concerned about agricultural exports. First of all, a great deal of nonfarm economic activity is generated by agricultural exports. Each dollar earned from farm exports stimulates $1.23 of output in the U.S. economy. Approximately 80 percent of this additional economic activity accrued to the nonfarm sector. USDA estimates that $81.8 billion in total U.S. business activity was generated by farm product exports.

Second, an estimated 1.1 million full-time jobs were related to the production, processing and transportation of U.S. agricultural exports. Less than half of these jobs were on the farm. Keep in mind these are just the jobs directly related to exports. More than 1 in 5 jobs in America can be traced to the farm. USDA estimates that 23 million people earn their living in the food and fiber system.

A third reason agricultural exports are so important to every person in the United States is that the overall U.S. trade deficit is expected to reach $140 billion this year, far surpassing last year's record trade deficit of $123 billion. Over the last 5 years farm exports, on the other hand, contributed a positive $112 billion to the balance of trade. Agricultural exports are a bright light in an otherwise dark trade picture.

Of course to farmers exports are even more important, accounting for 28 percent of farm income. Approximately 1 of every 3 crop acres—112 million—are used to produce agricultural commodities for export. By the year 2000, 50 percent of the crop acreage in the United States may be harvested for export.

Export embargoes, unstable fiscal and monetary policies, and an overvalued dollar have dealt repeated and brutal blows to agricultural exports. The strong dollar has been particularly burdensome to grain farmers, especially considering, for example, that nearly 2 of each 3 bushels of wheat produced by American farmers must find an overseas market.

The value of the U.S. dollar has increased over 100 percent compared to the franc since 1979, and over 750 percent compared to the peso. Using August 1981 exchange rates as the base and a price of $3.25 per bushel for wheat in western Nebraska, the effective price of U.S. wheat is $4.36 in The Netherlands, $5.40 in Great Britain, and $5.78 per bushel in Spain. This is before any transportation costs are added to get the wheat from the farm to the ports and overseas.

The dollar is so strong that European Economic Community wheat export subsidies have been reduced from $1.77 per bushel in 1982 to only 40 cents per bushel today.

Our competitors are shielded by the dollar's own subsidizing effect. The strength of the dollar is responsible for $5 to $6 billion of the $9 billion drop in farm exports between 1981 and 1983.

The dollar's strength has eroded our market share and has encouraged a flood of imports into the United States. It makes imports cheaper while our foreign customers must pay more for our exports. Again, a good example is wheat. The U.S. market share for wheat is around 38 percent. This compares to 48 percent in 1981. In July 1980, a Japanese buyer would have had to pay 860 yen for a bushel of U.S. wheat. Three years later it would cost a U.S. purchaser the same price, but to a Japanese buyer, the price increased to 916 yen per bushel.

The European Community has captured 14 percent of the world wheat market, and is threatening to expand its share. One study indicates that a 1 percent change in the value of the dollar in relation to special drawing rights [SDR's] will inversely affect wheat exports by 1.9 percent.

Not only does the relative value of the dollar make foreign wheat more price attractive to the buyer, but it also translates into a higher domestic price for the producer in a foreign country. This stimulates production, and given the marketing system of other countries, this stimulated production is place on the world market at a level that will clear their granaries.

The high value of the dollar has hurt the livestock industry as well. Canada's pork exports are up 10 times from their 1981 level, and 1.5 million head are expected to cross the border this year.

Positive action must be taken to ensure agricultural exports do not continue their current slide. As a start I introduced the Agricultural Export Expansion Act on March 7. This legislation would assist in the export of U.S. agricultural commodities and improve farm income through the exemption of those farm commodities sold through export promotion programs from cargo preference requirements. This is vitally important to the success of our export programs. Shipping costs on U.S. bottoms are 100 to

300 percent higher than non-U.S. vessels, and a recent U.S. district court ruling has placed this burden on the American farmer, thus effectively killed the congressionally authorized blended credit and other USDA commercial export programs.

This is only a beginning. The 1985 farm bill must have the strongest export title ever enacted in long-term farm legislation. This country is the breadbasket of the world and we must work to keep it that way.●

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity which has been arranged by the gentleman from Missouri to discuss one of the more important issues facing American agriculture today, both in terms of farm operators and agribusinesses.

During the decade of the 1970's, the market for agricultural exports from the United States seemed limitless. American farmers were told by Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz to plant fence row to fence row, and to base their future plans on continued growth in the export market.

As a lifelong soil conservationist, I was appalled by the total disregard for our agriculture resource base associated with Secretary Butz' policy. When I look out across the thousands of acres of soybeans growing today on some of the steepest farmland in west Tennessee, I see topsoil washing away down the Mississippi River at levels 10 to 20 times the acceptable rate for soil loss. These highly erodible acres were sodbusted from pastureland and timberland and brought into new cropland production as a direct result of Secretary Butz' evangelical call to the American farmer to expand his production and export his way to financial health.

For a while this policy seemed to work. Millions of acres of new cropland—much of it highly fragile—were brought into production in the 1970's, and the volume and the value of U.S. farm exports continued to increase every year. The value of U.S. agricultural exports increased almost sixfold from 1970 to 1980. Agricultural exports reached their peak value in 1981 at nearly $44 billion, and the volume of U.S. agricultural exports peaked at almost 164 million metric tons in 1980, 2½ times the 1970 level.

For more than 10 years American farm policy was based chiefly on this never-ending export prosperity. Then the bubble burst.

From 1981 to 1983, the value of U.S. agricultural exports fell by more than $9 billion, and the volume of agricultural exports fell by more than 19 million metric tons. Worldwide economic recession, the enormous debt problems of the developing countries, and the rapid appreciation of the U.S. dollar have been major contributors to the declining demand for U.S. agricultural exports. In addition to these factors, there also have been an increased worldwide production of major agricultural commodities, the unfair and anticompetitive agricultural and trade policies of foreign countries, and several U.S. embargoes of sales of farm commodities.

Unfortunately, not much can be done in the 1985 general farm bill to address the real problems which have crippled our exports. In my opinion, these problems can only be addressed in the larger context of our overall economic and foreign relations policies.

In any event, I do intend to do all I can in this year's farm bill to enact a long-term land retirement conservation reserve. Such a program would take out of production some of the most erodible land which was sodbusted in the 1970's, and which today is contributing excessively to the total annual erosion rate. In addition, I intend to work for a strong antisodbusting program to discourage additional fragile land from being brought into production in the future unless proper conservation systems are applied.

We may not be able to change the past, but we must certainly learn from it. Overreliance on export markets was a foolish policy 10 years ago, and we shouldn't allow ourselves to be sucked into that false promise again.

Instead, I believe we should face up to a few facts. As long as real interest rates in this country remain at record rates and the rest of the world's economy remains stagnant, American exports, especially agriculture exports, will not be the cure-all to our economic ills. As long as American farmers receive market prices for their commodities which are lower than the cost of production, I fail to understand how they can make a profit by selling more overseas at a larger loss.

In my opinion we need to take a serious look at our agriculture policy as we have known it for the past decade. I believe we have reached the point where we need to decide whether American agriculture should continue chasing the elusive export rainbow. As distasteful as it may be to some people, I think it's time we returned to a policy of strong supply controls to get our surpluses down and our production more in line with demand for our farm products.●

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

THE NATIONAL CHILDHOOD VACCINE-INJURY COMPENSATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADIGAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing the National Childhood Vaccine-Injury Compensation Act of 1985. We have heard much talk about vaccine safety, availability and affordability over the past few years. The Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, of which I am the ranking minority member, has held two hearings on these issues within the past 6 months. I am introducing this legislation today to get the ball rolling and force all of us in Congress to address this crucial situation in a timely fashion.

This legislation is based on three major principles: First, the childhood immunization program in this country is one of our most important health efforts; second, the future availability of some vaccines is in severe jeopardy; and third, those children injured by vaccines deserve fast and equitable compensation.

First, the use of vaccines in children has had a dramatic impact on diseases which one claimed thousands and thousands of lives each year. Widespread use of DPT vaccine has brought about reductions of greater than 99 percent in the incidence of diphtheria, pertussis and tetanus when compared with the prevaccine era.

Second, the future availability of certain childhood vaccines is now in severe jeopardy. Aside from the health departments in Michigan and Massachusetts, there is only one remaining distributor of DPT in the United States. This is a drop from three distributors in less than a year. As a direct consequence of that drop in distribution capacity, we are currently experiencing a shortage of this vaccine.

At hearings conducted by the Health and Environment Subcommittee in September and December 1984, manufacturers testified that the major reason they are dropping out of the vaccine market is that the number and size of liability claims is increasing astronomically. The remaining distributor of DPT must renew its liability insurance by midyear. Its ability to renew that insurance is in jeopardy unless its insurers can predict potential liability with some certainty.

Finally, approximately one dose of DPT vaccine in 310,000 will cause a severe adverse reaction. Other vaccines also cause problems in some recipients. These children have a right to prompt compensation.

The bill I am introducing today will address all of these concerns by estab-

lishing, at very little government expense, a fast, reliable, no-fault compensation system for those injured by vaccines. It will assure continued availability by establishing liability ceilings which enable insurers to predict the potential liability associated with manufacturing and administering a vaccine. The bill will also encourage the development of safer vaccines by hopefully keeping existing companies in the business, bringing others back in, and establishing an advisory commission on childhood vaccines and a program to provide incentives for safer vaccines. Finally, this legislation will bring greater awareness of the benefits and potential risks of vaccines by requiring mandatory dissemination of parent information.

A section-by-section summary of the bill and outline of the major points are available for you today. I thought I would just briefly address some of the key provisions.

First, the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services must compile a list of experts for eleven regions of the country to serve on hearing panels. A victim must then file a claim with the Secretary who will arrange for the convening of a three-person hearing panel. Respondents, including both manufacturers and health care providers, would be asked to make an irrevocable election to participate in the hearing and be bound by an award. The parties would choose their hearing panel from the list of experts, and the panel would determine if the injury was caused by a vaccine and, if so, calculate the damages. Respondents would pay all costs.

A hearing panel would enter a binding award for actual and projected out-of-pocket expenses, including costs of medical and custodial care and special education and therapy; actual and projected loss of earnings; pain and suffering; and reasonable attorneys' fees. Compensation would be capped at $1 million per claim, with $100,000 of this being available for pain and suffering. Claimants who accepted the hearing panel decision could receive immediate compensation from respondents.

If a claimant rejects the hearing panel decision for any reason, he/she is free to file a normal civil action for damages, but the statutory ceiling of $1 million would still apply. If any respondent refuses to participate in the administrative hearings, the claimant can file a civil action and no cap on awards would apply.

I know that many of you are aware of the bill developed last year by the Parents' Group and the American Academy of Pediatricians, as well as a new, revised version which I understand will soon be ready. I commend them for their work, but I feel that this legislation is superior to that introduced during the last Congress for a variety of reasons:

First, the Federal expense is very minimal as respondents pay all awards directly. This is particularly important at a time when deficits are at historical highs.

Second, it does not restrict awards to individuals who have suffered one of a limited number of symptoms.

Third, it is administratively simple—there would be no need to levy surcharges to finance a government compensation pool.

Fourth, it encourages manufacturers and providers to minimize risk by making them individually, directly responsible for their actions.

And, finally, it makes the maximum liability that manufacturers and health professionals may be exposed to more predictable and, therefore, more insurable.

I understand the risks associated with vaccines. At the same time, our childhood immunization program in this country saves many thousands of children's lives each year. If manufacturers and distributors are not able to get insurance, there is a possibility that manufacture and distribution may have to cease until an alternative can be implemented. I would like to preempt that type of crisis by authorizing a system that is fair to the manufacturers as well as the recipients of vaccines.

I am not wedded to every provision of this bill. I look forward to continued talks with the chairman of the Health and the Environment Subcommittee and other interested parties as we work with this legislation to develop a thoughtful, bipartisan markup vehicle. Only in that way can we assure quick action on this important issue.

One last note—this legislation is designed to address the childhood vaccine injury problem specifically and exclusively. There is no relation between this legislation and legislation that would establish a uniform product liability standard. There is a unique public interest in assuring the availability of vaccines that is not applicable to any other product sold in interstate commerce. Childhood vaccines, for all intents and purposes, are mandatory and there is therefore no consumer choice allowed. I will strongly and quickly disavow any claim that this legislation is designed to be a forerunner to a uniform product liability bill. That issue is separate; vaccines are different.

NATIONAL CHILDHOOD VACCINE-INJURY COMPENSATION ACT OF 1985 SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1—SHORT TITLE

Section 1 is the "short title" provision, stating that the Act may be cited as the "National Childhood Vaccine-Injury Compensation Act of 1985."

SECTION 2—FINDINGS

The Act rests on a number of Congressional findings relating to the Federal Government's involvement in childhood vaccination programs, the value of those programs, the occurrence of injuries associated with vaccinations, the pendency of large numbers of tort claims relating to those injuries, and the threat to the continued supply of certain vaccines caused by this litigation.

SECTION 3—NATIONAL VACCINE-INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM

This section contains a new title, to be added as Title XXI of the Public Health Service Act, that would establish a National Vaccine-Injury Compensation Program. The sections to be added to the Public Health Service Act are discussed below.

Section 2101.—This section establishes the basic requirement that administrative remedies under the Program be exhausted before a civil action for damages for vaccine-related injuries can be filed in any court. It also provides that, with the exception of appeals filed under section 2108(b) and actions to recover awards paid under section 2111(b), no new federal court jurisdiction is being established under either section 1331 or 1337 of title 28, United States Code, which govern "federal question" cases and cases arising under statutes regulating commerce.

Section 2101.—Lists of persons willing to serve as members of hearing panels would be published by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. These lists, which are to be published within 90 days after the date of enactment and after appropriate consultation with interested persons, would include persons the Secretary deems qualified to make the determinations required by the Act. The lists would be divided into regional groups and would contain a sufficient number of persons in each region to provide for the staffing of the predicted number of panels. Compensation for hearing panel members would be paid through assessments levied, pro rata, on respondents at the conclusion of each proceeding.

Section 2103.—This section sets forth the basic procedural requirements relating to the filing and initial processing of claims. No action for damages for a vaccine-related injury can be filed against any person unless that person is first named as a respondent in a claim filed pursuant to the Act, and unless that claim is filed within the time periods specified in section 2112 (ordinarily, two years after the first manifestation of a vaccine-related injury).

The content of claims and procedures for filing them are to be governed by regulations to be issued by the Secretary, although certain basic requirements are set forth in the Act. This section, in conjunction with the related definition contained in section 2114(1)(B), requires that all claimants and all respondents who are seeking compensation, or from whom compensation is sought, with respect to a vaccine-related injury alleged to have resulted from the vaccination of a single individual must be joined as parties in a single claim. After service of this claim, and after the joinder of any additional respondents, each side in the proceeding would select a hearing panel member from the lists compiled by the Secretary under section 2101. These two members would meet and select a third member. If selections are not made as required, the Secretary would make them. The section also provides procedures for the replacement of hearing panel members who

become unable to continue to serve and for removal of members for personal bias and prejudice.

Section 2104.—Before hearing panel members are selected, respondents would have the opportunity to file a consent, in the form specified by the Secretary, waiving any right they might have to a trial by a judge or jury and agreeing to be bound by the decision of the hearing panel. Such consents would remain in effect unless and until revoked on 90 days advance written notice. Hearing panels would be convened, and the hearing process would proceed as provided in the Act, as to all respondents who filed the required consent. Those respondents who did not file such a consent would be subject to immediate tort suit in a State or Federal Court, and the award of damages in such a suit would not be subject to the limitations prescribed by section 2110(b) and 2107.

Section 2105.—Claims are to be processed through informal procedures designed to elicit all relevant information in a cost-effective manner. Decisions of the panel would be by majority vote and would be in writing.

Section 2106.—The hearing panel would decide, based on the evidence presented to it and the experience and expertise of its members, whether any injuries alleged in the claim met the statutory definition of vaccine-related injuries, i.e., whether they were caused by a covered vaccine or by the manner in which it was administered. The panel would have the power to dismiss the proceedings against a respondent if that respondent established, by the preponderance of the evidence, that it did not participate in the manufacture, distribution, sale, or administration of the dose or doses of vaccine that are alleged to have caused the claimant's injury. If the panel found that the alleged injuries were vaccine-related, it would render a decision in favor of the claimant and against any respondents that had not been dismissed as parties. It would then proceed to determine the amount of damages suffered by the claimant.

Section 2107.—Damages could be awarded for actual and projected reasonable, unreimbursed expenses of medical care and other related costs; for loss of earnings and projected earnings; for non-economic, general damages arising from pain, suffering, and emotional distress; and for reasonable attorneys' fees. The total award with respect to all injuries claimed to have resulted from the administration of a covered vaccine to a single individual could not exceed $1,000,000, and no more than $100,000 of this total could be for non-economic, general damages arising from pain, suffering, and emotional distress. No punitive or exemplary damages could be awarded. Unless a notice of objection or an appeal is filed under section 2108, the award would be entered jointly and severally against all participating respondents not previously dismissed as parties to the proceeding.

Section 2108.—Decisions of the hearing panel would generally not be subject to appeal and would be final and binding. Nevertheless, the claimant would retain the right to reject a decision for any reason by filing a notice of objection. If no notice of objection is filed, respondents would have a limited right of appeal, and the award could be set aside if it were found to have been procured by corruption or fraud, that the panel exceeded its authority, or that a party was denied a fair hearing. If neither a notice of objection nor an appeal were filed within the applicable time periods, the award would become final and would be enforceable in a State or Federal Court as a final judgment.

Section 2109.—If a claimant rejected an award he could thereafter maintain an action for damages in a State or Federal court against any participating respondent. The standards of liability applicable to the hearing panel proceeding would not apply, and substantive and procedural issues would be governed by otherwise applicable State or Federal law, except that the applicable limitations period would be modified by section 2112(c), which generally provides for the tolling of the statute of limitations during the pendency of the hearing panel proceedings. At a trial of the claimant's tort suit, the decision of the hearing panel would be admissible in evidence unless it were excluded on grounds identical to those applicable to a respondent's appeal under section 2108. Upon admission of the decision into evidence, it would be presumed to be correct, and a party who contends otherwise would bear the burden of proof. No eligible hearing panel member could be called to testify with respect to the performance of any duty under the Act, although a hearing panel member could testify with respect to any issue of fact raised on a motion to exclude a decision of the hearing panel on such grounds as fraud or denial of a fair hearing.

Section 2110.—Money judgments in a tort suit would be subject to the same limitations applicable before a hearing panel, except that with respect to persons who did not file consents pursuant to section 2104(a), or who waived compliance with the procedures prescribed by the Act, monetary damages could be awarded to the full extent provided by otherwise applicable State or Federal law.

Section 2111.—After a participating respondent has paid a vaccine-injury claim, the respondent would be authorized to bring a civil action seeking to recover all or part of the payment made. In such an action, liability would be reallocated on the basis of comparative fault, except that if the court should find that the claimant's injury was not caused by the fault of any party, liability would be assessed in equal shares against the manufacturers of the vaccine administered which are parties to the action. Actions for contribution or indemnification could be filed on behalf of persons who had not filed a consent pursuant to Section 2104(a) or who waived compliance with the procedures specified by the Act only to the extent permitted by otherwise applicable law apart from this section, and no such action could be filed against either a participating respondent or against someone whom the claimant had not named as a respondent.

Section 2112.—Except during the first two years after enactment, claims filed more than two years after the first manifestation of a vaccine-related injury would be barred. Claims on behalf of minors or incompetent persons would have to be filed by their parents or guardians within the same limitations period applicable to other claims. During the first two years after the date of enactment, claims could be filed notwithstanding the otherwise applicable two-year limitation period unless, on the date the claim was filed, the applicable statute of limitations would prohibit the filing of an action for damages with respect to the subject matter of the claim. Applicable statutes of limitations would also be tolled during the pendency of proceedings under the Act.

Section 2113.—The Act would apply to all claims for injuries first manifested after March 27, 1985, and to those claims for vaccine-related injuries first manifested before that date as to which no action for damages had yet been filed. If such an action were pending, the Act would apply only if all parties so stipulated.

Section 2114.—This section contains definitions of certain terms used throughout the Act.

SECTION 4—ADVISORY COMMISSION

An Advisory Commission on Childhood Vaccines would be appointed to advise the Secretary on (1) the implementation of the Program, (2) actions to encourage the availability of an adequate supply of safe and effective vaccines, (3) available ways to obtain and use credible data on the frequency and severity of adverse reactions, and (4) research priorities. The Commission would have eleven members including health professionals, parents of injured children, attorneys, manufacturers, and government officials (who would serve as ex officio, nonvoting members).

SECTION 5—PARENT INFORMATION

The Secretary would, within one year, develop parent information materials for distribution by health care providers to the parents or legal guardians of any child receiving a vaccine. The materials would include information on (1) the frequency, severity, and potential long-term effects of the disease to be prevented by the vaccine; (2) reactions to the vaccine that should be brought to the attention of the health care provider; (3) precautionary measures; (4) early warning signs or symptoms; (5) reporting procedures; (6) contraindications; (7) a summary of relevant State and Federal laws; and (8) other relevant information. Health care providers would be required to provide these materials to parents or legal guardians prior to the administration of a vaccine.

SECTION 6—INCENTIVES FOR SAFER CHILDHOOD VACCINES

The Secretary would be required to encourage the development or refinement of vaccines that result in fewer major adverse reactions, and to make or assure improvements in licensing, manufacturing, testing, labeling, warnings, distribution, storage, and administration of vaccines to reduce the risks of major adverse reactions. Reports to Congress would be required every two years.●

HOUSING FOR THE HANDICAPPED ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McKINNEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Housing for the Handicapped Act of 1985, a measure which will assist the plight of the mentally ill homeless of this Nation.

This legislation is largely a response to the policy of deinstitutionalization of the mentally ill. For a number of years I have been stating that during the past 20 years, the noble philosophy of deinstitutionalization has resulted, in part, in a plethora of desti-

tute, ill-equipped, chronic mentally ill individuals being dumped on the streets of our Nation's communities. While the original intent of deinstitutionalization—that is, care of the chronic mentally ill in the community rather than "warehousing" in an institution—was laudable and one that I support, it remains a fact that the community support structures are lacking resources to care for this population.

In essence, deinstitutionalization has been achieved far more easily than the complementary development of community-based service networks and residential opportunities appropriate to the needs of the chronically mentally ill. As a result, many deinstitutionalized chronically mentally ill persons are found on the grates in American cities and have been unable to gain access to supportive and habilitative services and, more importantly, shelter.

Mr. Speaker, with this as background, I have been reviewing existing Federal programs to find a mechanism to further the goal of deinstitutionalization. I found such a program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959. Most of us know this as section 202 housing for the elderly. However, this program has also been providing housing for the handicapped, that is, physically handicapped, developmentally disabled, and chronically mentally ill. The housing for the handicapped component of the section 202 program is one of the best kept secrets of our federally assisted housing programs.

The Housing for the Handicapped Act of 1985 would improve the direct loan program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 to ensure that the existing program meets the special housing and related service needs of physically handicapped, developmentally disabled, and chronically mentally ill persons. The primary goal of this legislation is to enhance the present statute based on recommendations from previous congressionally mandated demonstration studies as well as the Department of Housing and Urban Development's own 9-year experience in providing housing for nonelderly handicapped persons.

Unlike other legislative proposals presently being considered, this proposal calls for no new funding or duplicative demonstration programs. This legislation is a far more practical and reasonable approach which would improve an existing program for the handicapped and would assist in providing shelter and treatment for mentally ill persons who comprise a significant segment of our homeless population.

I urge my colleagues to incorporate this legislation in the housing authorization bill that is being developed and which I hope the House will adopt. To further acquaint my colleagues with the purpose of my bill I am inserting a summary of the provisions and the bill itself for the RECORD:

SUMMARY OF THE HOUSING FOR THE HANDICAPPED ACT OF 1985

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Act is to improve the direct loan program under Section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 to ensure that the existing program meets the special housing and related service needs of nonelderly handicapped persons.

BACKGROUND

The Section 202 program was first enacted as part of the Housing Act of 1959 to provide direct Federal long-term loans for the construction of housing for the elderly or handicapped. The program was intended to serve elderly persons whose income was above public housing levels but still insufficient to obtain adequate housing in the private market. The Section 202 program was amended by the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to change the method of determining the interest rate (which had been set at a 3 percent statutory maximum in 1965) and to permit the use of Section 8 housing assistance payments for projects constructed or substantially rehabilitated under the program. The original Section 202 program was restricted to elderly persons and families and later expanded to include physically handicapped people. The HCD Act of 1974, deleted the word "physically" from the term "physically handicapped" in response to the urgings of advocacy groups concerned for the eligibility of persons with developmental disabilities. The Housing and Community Development Amendments Act of 1978 provided further expansion of handicapped to include the chronically mentally ill. The 1978 Conference Report required the Secretary to promptly "develop criteria and standards for housing for the chronically mentally ill so that such persons can become active participants in the Section 202 program."

HUD contracted this task out to an independent consulting firm. The consulting firm developed the standards and criteria and HUD has not sanctioned the standards and criteria, but rather has made the document available to sponsors of housing for the handicapped as background information only.

Presently, in addition to serving the special housing needs of the elderly, the Section 202 program serves the developmentally disabled, physically handicapped, and chronically mentally ill. Since the 1974 Act through 1984, over $6 billion has been reserved representing almost 3,000 projects and 166,000 units. Of this amount, approximately 10 percent of the funding goes to the handicapped; primarily those with developmental disabilities.

WHY THERE IS A NEED FOR THIS LEGISLATION

Although projects for the handicapped have been somewhat successful in accessing program funding, once selected projects for the handicapped in comparison with projects for the elderly, have a poor track record of progressing through the HUD processing system up to the point of start of construction. On the average, based on actual program experience, projects for the handicapped take generally 2½ to 3 years to start construction from the time funds are reserved for the project. Projects for the elderly, on the other hand, average a little under the HUD regulatory requirement of 18 months.

The processing problem is aggravated by other procedural difficulties in developing small community-based projects for the handicapped. The other difficulties are primarily attributable to ambiguities in program policy and processing requirements. These ambiguities stem from the fact that Section 202 was originally created as a multifamily rental housing program, not a program to provide small-scale single family type housing for the handicapped.

This fact was the overall finding of the independent consulting firm chosen to evaluate the HUD/HHS Demonstration Program for the chronically mentally ill. Although this demonstration was geared to housing for the chronically mentally ill, the findings are also applicable to the other two disability groups served under the Section 202 program.

WHAT THIS PROPOSAL ACHIEVES THAT OTHER SIMILAR PROPOSALS DO NOT

On May 30, 1984, H.R. 5752 was introduced, entitled "Homeless Persons Housing and Supportive Services Act of 1984". This same bill was included in Section 411 (entitled Second Stage Housing for the Homeless and Displaced) of H.R. 1, the Housing Act of 1985. These provisions provide $100 million in FY 1986 for a Second Stage Housing Demonstration program for the homeless and displaced. The legislation would require HUD to administer a demonstration program to determine the feasibility of assisting nonprofit organzations in providing housing and supportive services for the intended residents. While the Section 411 provision of H.R. 1 does not specifically state it, it appears that this proposal deals with the chronically mentally ill who form a large portion of the homeless population.

In view of the HUD/HHS Demonstration Program, this proposal calling for yet another demonstration is unnecessary and duplicative. The additional $100,000,000 funding is a poor use of scarce federal resources. The information desired from the proposed demonstration has already been derived from the experience of sponsors who are currently operating small group homes for the chronically mentally ill under the 202 Program.

This proposal is better able to improve an existing program for the handicapped and will assist in providing shelter and treatment for mentally ill persons who are homeless.

Testifying on March 7, 1985 before the Housing Subcommittee, the Consortium for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities (CCDD), a group representing a number of major national disability organizations representing persons with handicaps whose housing needs are addressed in part by various federal programs, stated that:

"The time has come to face the situation directly and proceed to design and implement a program based on housing needs of persons with handicaps. The information base that is required to effectively implement such a program exists; *no further studies or demonstration programs are necessary*". (Emphasis added.)

KEY PROVISIONS OF THE LEGISLATION

1. General Provisions: (Housing for Handicapped Families)

A. Not less than 15 percent of such sums appropriated for the Section 202 Program shall be available for loans for the development of housing for handicapped families.

B. In allocating funds and processing applications for housing for handicapped fami-

lies, the Secretary shall adopt such distinct standards and procedures as the Secretary determines appropriate due to differences between housing for handicapped families and housing for the elderly.

C. The Secretary may, in a demonstration, determine the feasibility and desirability of reducing processing time and costs for housing for handicapped families by limiting project design to a small number of prototype design.

2. Revised Subsidy Mechanism

The present fair market rents of the Section 8 program are particularly inappropriate for the development of group homes and other facilities for the handicapped since often there are inadequate market comparables.

It is proposed, therefore, to abandon the Section 8 Program and to provide a rental subsidy that is specifically designed to assist projects for handicapped families that are financed under the Section 202 Program.

The proposed subsidy would be based on HUD's determination of what it would cost to build a specific project, after applying standard HUD cost containment policies with respect to design and amenities. Since only a few thousand units are involved and since HUD as the maker of a 202 loan now looks very closely at costs, the additional fine tuning involved in this proposal should not impose significant additional burdens on HUD. The result should be a subsidy that is more reflective of the actual cost and would not require time-consuming requests for waivers. It would also allow projects to go forward that are presently falling by the wayside.

3. Tenant Rent Contribution: (Fixed Subsidy and Minimum Rent)

Another feature of the Section 8 Program that has encouraged waste is that the subsidy is open-ended while the tenant rent contribution is fixed. Thus rent increases that were not really needed were imposed because the subsidy must expand to meet higher rent levels. The lack of any absolute, predictable ceiling on the rental subsidy over a twenty-year period has been one of the main concerns with Section 8. The bill fixes on aggregate twenty-year limit on the amount of subsidy based solely on the amount of the initial rents. The maximum subsidy would equal 90 percent of the sum of the initial rents times twenty. By contrast, the aggregate subsidy under Section 8 is 100 percent of the sum of the initial rents plus an indefinite amount through amendments of the subsidy contract whenever needed. Many Section 8 projects currently need amendment authority.

In order to provide a specific ceiling to the subsidy, and one that would be lower than prevailing under Section 8, the bill would introduce flexibility in the required tenant rent contribution. Not only would this provision permit a limit to the commitment of federal dollars, but it would encourage restraint in the costs of operating the project over the years. A minimum rent contribution of 25 percent of gross income would be required. Currently, under Section 8, tenants pay exactly 30 percent of adjusted income. In terms of gross income, current tenants pay rents equivalent to a wide range of percentages of income, generally from 20 percent to 29 percent. The administration of various adjustments to income has proven to be burdensome and contentious and can become greatly distorted when applied to many handicapped persons. In view of the gross income standard and the risks of higher than minimum rent contributions that would be imposed by the bill, the minimum percentage is set at 25 percent, rather than at 30 percent. It should be noted also that the minimum rent as a percentage of gross income currently in effect under Section 8 is only 10 percent. The owner would propose and HUD would approve as reasonable all tenant rent contributions.

4. Definitions

A. Housing for handicapped families: housing and related facilities to be occupied by handicapped families who are primarily nonelderly handicapped families.

B. Nonelderly handicapped families: elderly or handicapped families, the head of which (and spouse, if any) is less than 62 years of age at the time of initial occupancy of a project assisted under this program.

5. Exemption: Davis-Bacon Wage Rates

In keeping with the overall goal of enhancing the Section 202 statute to better serve housing for the handicapped on a cost effective basis, this bill would provide an exemption to the application of Davis-Bacon prevailing wage requirements for all nonelderly handicapped projects developed under Section 202. In a 1983 CBO study, CBO found that "Derived by various techniques, estimates of the additional federal costs attributable to Davis-Bacon wage determinations have ranged from $75 million a year to nearly $1 billion.

Presently, the United States Housing Act of 1937, exempts Section 8 projects of fewer than nine (9) units from paying Davis-Bacon wages. The new Housing Development Grant Program contains an exemption for fewer than twelve (12) units. The present Section 202 statute provides no such exemption.

6. Supportive Services for Elderly and Handicapped Families

A. Service Benefit Plan—

This section provides a statutory base to provide incentives for states and local financial resources to support projects developed for handicapped families.

The bill requires applicants proposing housing for handicapped families to submit a "service benefit plan" describing the manner in which such services will be provided and the extent of state and local funds available to assist in the provision of such services.

B. Clarification of Occupancy Policy—

As the Section 202 program has become a dual purpose program (housing for the elderly and housing for the nonelderly handicapped) some advocacy groups argue that any program-eligible person has a right to occupancy in any 202 project, regardless of whether the project offers the supportive services deemed necessary by program requirements for the individual's particular handicap or age category. Clarification of this issue will relieve project sponsors from having to provide housing for individuals whose service requirements are outside the experience training or resources of the sponsor who was selected to serve a different client group.

This bill amends the Section 202 statute to clarify the authority of Section 202 owners to limit occupancy to the client group or groups the project sponsor was selected to serve.

H.R. 1774

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Housing for the Handicapped Act of 1985".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) housing for nonelderly handicapped families is assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 and section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937;

(2) the housing programs under such sections are designed and implemented primarily to assist rental housing for elderly and nonelderly families and are often inappropriate for dealing with the specialized needs of the physically impaired, the developmentally disabled, and the chronically mentally ill;

(3) the development of housing for nonelderly handicapped families under such programs is often more expensive than necessary, thereby reducing the number of such families that can be assisted with available funds;

(4) the program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 can continue to provide direct loans to finance group residences and independent apartments for nonelderly handicapped families, but can be made more efficient and less costly by the adoption of standards and procedures applicable only to housing for such families;

(5) the use of the program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to assist rentals for housing for nonelderly handicapped families is time consuming and unnecessarily costly and, in some areas of the Nation, prevents the development of such housing;

(6) the use of the program under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to assist rentals for housing for nonelderly handicapped families should be replaced by a more appropriate subsidy mechanism;

(7) both elderly and handicapped housing projects assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 will benefit from an increased emphasis on supportive services and a greater use of State and local funds; and

(8) an improved program for nonelderly handicapped families will assist in providing shelter and treatment for mentally ill persons who are homeless.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to improve the direct loan program under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 to ensure that such program meets the special housing and related needs of nonelderly handicapped families.

SEC. 3. HOUSING FOR HANDICAPPED FAMILIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(h) of the Housing Act of 1959 is amended to read as follows:

"(h)(1) Of the amounts made available in appropriation Acts for loans under subsection (a)(4)(C) for any fiscal year commencing after September 30, 1985, not less than 15 percent shall be available for loans for the development of housing for handicapped families.

"(2) The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

"(A) funds made available under this subsection will be used to support innovative methods of meeting the needs primarily of nonelderly handicapped families by providing a variety of housing options, ranging from small group homes to independent living complexes; and

"(B) housing for handicapped families assisted under this subsection will provide families occupying units in such housing with an assured range of services specified

in subsection (f), will provide such families with opportunities for optimal independent living and participation in normal daily activities, and will facilitate access by such families to the community at large and to suitable employment opportunities within such community.

"(3)(A) In allocating funds under this subsection, and in processing applications for loans under this section and assistance payments under paragraph (4), the Secretary shall adopt such distinct standards and procedures as the Secretary determines appropriate due to differences between housing for handicapped families and other housing assisted under this section.

"(B) The Secretary may, on a demonstration basis, determine the feasibility and desirability of reducing processing time and costs for housing for handicapped families by limiting project design to a small number of prototype designs.

"(4)(A) The Secretary shall, to the extent approved in appropriation Acts, enter into contracts with owners of housing for handicapped families receiving loans under, or meeting the requirements of, this section to make monthly payments to cover any part of the costs attributed to units occupied (or, as approved by the Secretary, held for occupancy) by lower income families that is not met from project income. The annual contract amount for any project shall not exceed 90 percent of the sum of the initial annual project rentals for all units and any initial utility and services allowances for such units, as approved by the Secretary. Any contract amounts not used by a project in any year shall remain available to the project until the expiration of the contract. The term of a contract entered into under this subparagraph shall be 240 months.

"(B) The Secretary shall approve initial project rentals for any project assisted under this subsection based on the determination of the Secretary of the total actual necessary and reasonable costs of developing and operating the project, taking into consideration the need to contain costs to the extent practicable and consistent with the purposes of the project and this section.

"(C) The Secretary shall require that, during the term of each contract entered into under subparagraph (A), all units in a project assisted under this subsection shall be made available for occupancy by lower income families, as such term is defined in section 3(b)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937. The rent payment required of a lower income family shall be approved by the Secretary and shall not be less than 25 percent of the gross income of the family, as defined by the Secretary.

"(D) The Secretary shall coordinate the processing of an application for a loan for housing for handicapped families under this section and the processing of an application for assistance payments under this paragraph for such housing.

"(E) The aggregate amount of budget authority that may be obligated for contracts for payments under this paragraph for fiscal year 1986 shall not exceed such sum as may be approved in appropriation Acts.".

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 202(d) of the Housing Act of 1959 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(9) The term 'housing for handicapped families' means housing and related facilities to be occupied by handicapped families who are primarily nonelderly handicapped families.

"(10) The term 'nonelderly handicapped families' means elderly or handicapped families, the head of which (and spouse, if any) is less than 62 years of age at the time of initial occupancy of a project assisted under this section.".

(c) EXEMPTION.—Section 202(c)(3) of the Housing Act of 1959 is amended by inserting ", other than housing for handicapped families," after "section".

SEC. 4. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR ELDERLY AND HANDICAPPED FAMILIES.

Section 202(f) of the Housing Act of 1959 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after the subsection designation; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) Each applicant for a loan under this section for housing and related facilities shall submit with the application a service benefit plan describing—

"(A) the category or categories of families such housing and facilities are intended to serve;

"(B) the range of necessary services to be provided to the families occupying such housing;

"(C) the manner in which such services will be provided to such families; and

"(D) the extent of State and local funds available to assist in the provision of such services.

"(3) The sponsor of housing and related facilities assisted under this section may limit occupancy of such housing and use of such facilities to—

"(A) the category or categories of families described in the service benefit plan submitted under paragraph (2); or

"(B) the category or categories of families described in the application for assistance under this section, in the case of an application submitted before October 1, 1985.".

SEC. 5. TERMINATION OF SECTION 8 ASSISTANCE.

Housing for handicapped families assisted under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 using only authority approved in appropriation Acts for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, shall not receive assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.

"(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of, and amendments made by, this Act shall become effective on October 1, 1985.

"(b) APPLICABILITY.—Unless otherwise provided in this Act, the provisions of, and amendments made by, this Act shall not apply with respect to projects with loans or loan reservations under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 using authority approved in appropriation Acts for fiscal years beginning before October 1, 1985.●

MAJORITY LEADER OFFERS SALUTE TO JOSEPH B. SWANNER FOR LONG, DISTINGUISHED SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today I want to offer a salute to one of the most conscientious and dedicated Federal administrators it has ever been my privilege to know—Mr. Joseph Bailey Swanner of Brownwood and Austin, TX.

A few weeks ago Joe Swanner retired as Regional Director of the Economic Development Administration in Austin, climaxing a 35-year career with the U.S. Government.

To me, Joe Swanner personified all that a top-level Federal administrator should be. He believes devoutly that the Government exists only to serve the people, not the other way around. He likes to use the tools of bureaucracy to get things done, not to keep things from happening.

Over the years Joe Swanner has served our country in many ways. In World War II he was a young seaman in the U.S. merchant marine. Later, in 1950, Joe began his civilian governmental service here as a staff member in the House of Representatives, helping prepare the daily Journal.

From 1953 to 1959 he was a legislative assistant to Congressman O.C. Fisher of Texas, assisting the Congressman's constituents, preparing testimony and statements, and monitoring and evaluating legislation.

From 1960 to 1963 Joe was chief file clerk of the House, and between 1964 and 1966 he was director of the Office of Congressional Relations of the Small Business Administration.

In 1966 he became special assistant to the Administrator of the Economic Development Administration. Two years later he became Deputy Regional Director for the EDA in Austin and then, in 1973, he was promoted to Regional Director. In this position he administered and managed EDA programs in Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, and Oklahoma.

To this job Joe Swanner brought his characteristic vigor and dedication. He never lost sight of the fact that his job was not to shuffle paper but to help people. He scoured Federal regulations for ways to accomplish worthwhile projects, not to find ways to enhance his own career or the fortunes of his agency.

Today thousands of Americans in the Southwest—including many in Fort Worth's revitalized North Side—live better lives because of jobs created by EDA projects promoted and brought to fruition by Joe Swanner.

During his years of dedicated and selfless work, Joe has won many honors and citations, including the prestigeous U.S. Department of Commerce Special Achievement Award.

And now, as Joe B. Swanner leaves the Government he has served so well for so long, his countless friends in the administrative agencies and on Capitol Hill will want to offer him a sincere, "Well done," and to wish him well in all his future endeavors.●

● Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my deepest appreciation to Mr. Joe Swanner, who has been an outstanding public servant for 35 years, and who has earned a most rewarding

retirement from the Federal Government.

It isn't often that one finds such an individual working within the Federal Government who is so dedicated to resolving problems—to ascertaining exactly what the requirements are, and then setting about determining not if, but how the problem can best be resolved or the program can best be implemented.

It was always a good feeling to know that if a problem arose under the jurisdiction of the EDA, I could pick up the phone and call Joe Swanner with the knowledge that my request would receive fullest and prompt attention.

Through his retirement, the Federal Government has lost a valued employee and Members of Congress from Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas have lost a trusted friend, who was always there to help their constituencies whenever he could.

I wish Joe Swanner every continued success in whatever way he chooses to spend his retirement. He has my warmest regards and sincere best wishes for a rewarding future.●

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate a big, gregarious Texan named Joe Swanner on the occasion of his retirement from Federal service. Joe was a fixture in this House for years, both as an employee on the floor as well as an aide to Congressman O.C. Fisher.

Joe has proved that you can overcome Potomac fever because he has gone home again, back to his beloved Texas after a total of 35 years of Federal service.

I remember Joe well, and recall his doggedness in always trying to find a way to get the job done. His work in the fifties on the Journal and later, as the chief file clerk for the House is typical of so many of the unsung people who labor long and hard in the background to make our jobs easier.

I wish Joe all the best in his retirement.

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, every now and then we find an employee of the Federal Government who is more than just a name in an agency. We find an individual who not only performs his or her tasks, but performs them with gusto. Joseph Bailey Swanner, is just such a person.

Mr. Swanner, after 35 years of Federal executive service, has retired. For the last 12 years, he was regional director of the Economic Development Administration's southwest region with offices in Austin, TX. Few Members of Congress in Texas—especially me—will ever forget the million helping hands Joe gave us in his attempt to aid our constituents.

Mr. Swanner was deputy regional director for EDA from 1968 through 1973 before assuming the regional directorship. From 1966 to 1968, he was special assistant to the Administrator of the EDA. With great pride, Joe recounts his beginning career steps in the U.S. House on the staff of Representative O.C. Fisher of Texas during the 1950's. His career in Government is long and brilliant.

This man gave new meaning to the word "commitment." We hear so much about the negative qualities of some Federal employees—but surely the detractors don't have Joe in mind. This gentleman was responsible for some stunning developments in my south Texas area—economic improvements that are still contributing to the lifeblood of our south Texas economy.

It was with Joe Swanner's help that the Military Highway Water Supply Corp. was born—and it is now pumping water to thousands of people who had never enjoyed indoor plumbing until Joe saw to it that EDA would lend a hand. The McAllen, TX, Foreign Trade Zone bears the hand and mark of Joe Swanner. This FTZ has been one of the single greatest boons to Hidalgo County in many a decade. The Port of Brownsville, the shrimp turning basin, U.S. Highway 281—all these projects would still be drawn in chalk on a blackboard if Joe Swanner had not been in his chair.

Always I found myself sitting with great pride before the Committee on Public Works to tell my colleagues that EDA in Texas not only worked, it succeeded. Joe Swanner's stewardship of EDA's southwestern region enabled my south Texas area to enjoy the building of a infrastructure that still holds the economy together—still vibrant and still contributing.

After so many years a fellow becomes accustomed to working with people who are truly committed to their jobs: A phone call from me to Joe Swanner always had one guarantee to it: no matter what the problem or question, I could count on 1,000 percent from Joe. He is the kind of man who lends pride and dignity to public service—he was genuinely a civil partner and he will be sorely missed. We wish him the best that the world can bring him in retirement. He's gone from the EDA—but his many works remain as a testament to his leadership.●

● Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader is to be commended for calling to our attention the retirement of our dear friend, Joe Swanner. I want to be first in line to join this well-deserved tribute to a gentleman of the first order.

Joe Swanner just retired from the Federal Government with his last assignment as regional director of the Economic Development Administration for the southwestern region. He enjoyed a long and successful career both as a congressional assistant and a key administrator in the Federal service.

I know how proud Joe Swanner is of his staff days here in the House. He can trace his House work all the way back to 1950, and his respect and admiration for the House is very strong. That's why Joe Swanner was a successful Federal employee. He understood the relationship of Congress to the executive branch, and rather than playing an adversarial role, he sought a strong working relationship between the two branches.

Joe Swanner was present at the beginning of EDA. He helped create it, and he helped to develop it into one of the most successful and productive Government programs ever written for the purpose of providing jobs for the American people. The Economic Development Administration is his legacy, and it is truly an outstanding legacy.

I know for a fact that Joe Swanner eyed every request for EDA assistance under his jurisdiction as a request for money out of his own pocket. If a project didn't appear to have merit, Joe Swanner wouldn't cut corners. In short, he always had the courage and conviction to say "no" to anyone if he felt an EDA project would not give maximum bang for the buck. We need a lot more public employees like Joe Swanner.

Of course, the Office of Management and Budget has slated EDA for termination. I hope this doesn't take place. For 20 years this small agency has helped to revitalize rural America, and it's done it with a modest budget and a small, dedicated staff. A major reason for its success is Joe Swanner.

So, Mr. Speaker, I salute Joe Swanner on his retirement. It's well deserved. He is a great Texan and a patriotic American, and I'm proud of him.●

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I add my name to the list of those standing today to express their thanks to a fellow Texan, Joseph B. Swanner, for his 35 years in the service of the U.S. Government.

The more senior of my colleagues have been aware of Joe's dedication since he first began working on the floor of the House of Representatives in 1950. Most Members—both past and present—from Southwestern States have had the pleasure of working with Joe on EDA projects since he began his career there in the late 1960's.

Our wishes for a pleasurable retirement and for continued success in whatever challenges he may encounter go hand in hand with our congratulations on a job well done.●

INTRODUCTION OF NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the National Infrastructure Act, a bill that I consider vital to maintaining and improving the quality of life in this country for the rest of the century.

As in the last Congress, I am again joining with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, in introducing this legislation. It was Mr. HAMILTON's work in the JEC that laid the groundwork for this bill and has formed the structure for this debate.

The Joint Economic Committee's study, "Hard Choices: A Report on the Increasing Gap Between America's Infrastructure Needs and Our Ability To Pay for Them," estimated a $1 trillion bill for highways, roads, mass transit systems, water supply, and wastewater treatment systems for the rest of the century. But the study also found that we will be $450 billion short of meeting that goal based on current funding.

There should be no doubt that there is a pressing need for action on the Nation's infrastructure. The reports of need come from the older, deteriorating urban areas, from the newer suburban areas and from the parts of the Nation that are in the midst of growth.

There are numerous examples of the enormous need for additional funds:

The Environmental Protection Agency has submitted a 1984 needs survey estimating the need for funds for construction of sewage treatment plants in the rest of the century at more than $108 billion.

The County and Municipal Government Study Commission in New Jersey estimates the annual unmet capital investment needs at $264 million.

The Federal Highway System estimates that it will cost $495.7 billion to remove all deficiencies in the Nation's highway system.

The city of New York is on a 200-year cycle in repairing its streets but that looks good compared to the 800-year cycle in Elizabeth, NJ.

These are needs that cannot be tolerated. There is no question the American people must pay for these necessary repairs in one form or another unless we are prepared for commerce and industry to come to a complete halt in the not-too-distant future. The demands of leadership require that we in the Federal Government must play a major role in finding a solution to this problem.

There will not be one solution that takes care of the entire problem. However, we must begin the debate now on how we can effectively deal with the infrastructure problem. Every day waste increases the job ahead of us and simply increases our total cost.

For that reason, I hope to make the 99th Congress the Congress of the infrastructure. I had introduced the National Infrastructure Act in the last Congress for discussion purposes and I hope the dialog will be intensified this year.

We are faced with a problem of huge scale that cannot be approached through the traditional Federal grant mechanism. It is time for us to develop new, innovative approaches that minimize the role of the Federal bureaucracy and do not intrude the Federal Government into State and local decisionmaking.

The National Infrastructure Act, with a simple mechanism that requires no Federal strings and emphasizes local decisionmaking, provides one answer to the problem. It is a new approach that would enable us to close almost one-fourth of the funding gap that has been estimated for the rest of the century.

The act creates a National Infrastructure Fund in the Department of the Treasury that will distribute funds to the States on the basis of population. It does not require any complex formula that could pit States against each other.

The Fund will receive $3 billion annually through an advance entitlement for a period of 10 years. It will then be distributed to the States which must establish revolving loan funds. The States are required to distribute a minimum of 30 percent of the money to local governments.

The States and the local governments will have the authority to decide whether the money will be spent on roads, bridges, mass transit systems, wastewater treatment or water supply systems. They will also have the option of deciding whether the funds will be used for construction or for rehabilitation.

The money is to be repaid to a sinking fund within the National Infrastructure Fund over a 20-year period at no interest. At the end of the 30-year period, States will have an additional $25 billion to continue their infrastructure efforts.

This approach limits the cost to the Federal Government, it allows local decisionmaking and it provides funds for our infrastructure work. It is the type of program that this Congress must consider if Government is going to continue to provide the basic necessities.

I have been extremely gratified by the response that has been received from both public officials and the private sector since I introduced the bill. It is my intention that hearings be held in all parts of this Nation to receive input on the bill in the coming months. We have tentatively scheduled the first hearing for next month in Fort Worth, TX.

I am also pleased to have the support of all six subcommittee chairmen on the Committee on Public Works and Transportation as cosponsors of this legislation. I look forward to working with them as well as all the members of the committee in developing legislation that meets the needs of this Nation.

It is important that we take action on this pressing problem, possibly later in the year.

Without action, we will be faced with an ever increasing problem that will not go away. We must not allow our infrastructure to deteriorate when we have the means to prevent it.

NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE ACT—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

Section 1 provides that this Act may be cited as the "National Infrastructure Act".

SECTION 2. FINDINGS AND POLICY

This section addresses the findings and policies regarding the Nation's infrastructure.

Subsection (a) states that the Congress finds that—

(1) by the year 2000, the gap between anticipated revenues and infrastructure needs will be $450 billion;

(2) public capital investment at all levels of government have declined in recent years by more than 50%;

(3) infrastructure needs affect all regions of the country;

(4) delay in meeting infrastructure needs further compounds the costs; and

(5) a sound infrastructure system is essential to a healthy national economy.

Subsection (b) states the policy of the United States that—

(1) the declining trend in public capital investment should be reversed;

(2) infrastructure investment should be based on a long-range and sustained plan; managing infrastructure projects; and

(4) a Federal instruction program should be established to assist state and local governments.

SECTION 3. NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

Subsections (a), (b), (c). These subsections establish a National Infrastructure Fund [NIF] within the Treasury of the United States to provide funds for interest-free repayable grants to states. Guaranteed appropriations to the Fund will be made at a rate of $3 billion per fiscal year for ten years beginning in fiscal year 1986.

Subsection (d) establishes as part of the NIF a separate account to be known as the "Sinking Fund Account," to receive funds repaid by the states. Repayment will begin in the second year of each loan and will be completed at the end of twenty years. The Secretary of the Treasury will invest these funds in interest-bearing obligations of the United States. Rate of repayment will be determined by the Secretary considering the interest to be earned on such obligations. The Secretary shall report to the Congress at the end of each fiscal year on the financial condition of the Account, and on its expected condition during the succeeding five fiscal years.

SECTION 4. REPAYABLE GRANTS

Subsection (a). This section provides the criteria under which the $3 billion will be distributed to the qualifying states. Funds

will be allocated using the same ratio as the state population bears to the total population of the states for each fiscal year.

Subsection (b). Provides that funds will be available to each state on October 1 of each fiscal year.

Subsection (c). Grants shall be repaid as instructed under subsections (d) and (e) of this section.

Subsection (d). States shall make annual payments in the amounts determined by the Secretary to repay the grants by the end of a 20-year period. This determination will consider interest income earned on the obligations secured for the Sinking Fund Account under section 3(d) of this Act.

Subsection (e). Adjustments will be made in the payment schedule to ensure that the aggregate amount of payments received and the interest earned is equal to the amount of each grant. Any deficit in the amount will be paid by the states, and any excess will be returned to the states. Upon completion of repayment of each twenty-year loan, the Secretary shall transfer the funds to the general funds of the Treasury.

SECTION 5. QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR REPAYABLE GRANTS

This section defines the qualifications of the states for repayable grants. This Act requires that there be an agreement between the Secretary of the Treasury and the states that includes the following provisions:

(1) The states must establish an infrastructure revolving fund within the Treasury of the states;

(2) The infrastructure funds will be used by the states within a reasonable period, as deemed acceptable by the Secretary, to make interest-free loans to state and local government departments, agencies and instrumentalities;

(3) These loans will be made in accordance with state laws and procedures regulating loans to governmental entities from state funds. These loans will be repaid in annual payments starting in the second year of each loan with final payment as soon as practicable, but within the life of the project or the end of the 20-year period beginning when the loan is made, whichever is sooner. These loans will be used only for construction and improvement of highways, streets, bridges, and water supply and distribution systems; and acquisition, construction and improvement of mass transportation facilities and equipment; and wastewater treatment facilities. Loans are only for projects which otherwise would not be carried out within a 24-month period initiated at the time of the loan. Loans may not be utilized to provide the non-Federal share of the cost of any project carried out under any other provision of Federal law, nor will they be used to pay the cost of operation and maintenance of any project. Loans will be repaid with user fees and dedicated taxes to the extent practicable.

(4) The state will not use amounts from the infrastructure revolving fund to repay loans made under paragraph 2 of section 5 of this Act.

(5) At least 30% of the funds allocated to a state will be used to make interest-free loans to local government departments, agencies and instrumentalities.

(6) Repayment of the grant by the states will be in accordance with section 4 of this Act.

(7) The states shall adhere to accounting, audit and fiscal procedures guidelines designated by the Secretary after consulting with the Comptroller General of the United States.

(8) After reasonable notice, the state shall make available to the Secretary and the Comptroller General such records necessary to review compliance and operation under this Act.

(9) The state will comply with the requirements of sections 6 and 7 of this Act.

SECTION 6. AUDITS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND REVIEWS

Subsection (a). This section provides that each state shall have an annual independent audit of the financial statements of the state to ensure compliance with this Act under the government auditing standards as issued by the Comptroller General.

Subsection (b) allows that audits being performed in compliance with other laws of the United States may be substituted for the required audit under this Act for a fiscal year.

Subsection (c). A state may submit a written waiver of the audit requirement if the financial statements of the state are annually audited by independent auditors under state law and if the state certifies that the audit adheres to the government auditing standards, and that the audit applies to the fiscal year of the waiver.

Subsection (d). The Secretary may waive these auditing requirements for a state for a fiscal year under the following provisions, when the state demonstrates progress in complying with these regulations, and:

(1) the financial statements are not auditable; or

(2) the audit is conducted, but is not independent or does not adhere to the issued auditing standards.

Subsection (e). An opinion on an audit shall be provided to the Secretary as required and the audit will be made available by the state within 30 days for public inspection.

Subsection (f). The Secretary will set specific time limits to perform audits and reviews, or investigations of possible violations of this Act.

Subsection (g). The Comptroller General shall review the activities of the Secretary and the states necessary for Congress to evaluate compliance and operations under this Act.

SECTION 7. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Subsection (a). This section requires that the states hold at least one public hearing prior to issuing an interest-free loan under this Act. This hearing shall encourage public participation providing opportunities for written and oral questioning relative to the proposed loan.

Subsection (b). Adequate notice shall be provided by the state of all hearings relative to this Act, including, but not limited to newspaper notice.

SECTION 8. REPORTS

Subsection (a). Before June 2 of each fiscal year the Secretary is directed to report to Congress on:

(1) the status and operation of the fund during the prior fiscal year; and

(2) the administration of this Act, including a report on the distribution of funds to the states and any legislative recommendations for improving the program.

Subsection (b). Each state government receiving funding shall submit a report at the end of each fiscal year as prescribed by the Secretary. This report shall state an account of the funds received in terms of the amounts and purposes, and the differences between the planned and actual budget.

SECTION 9. BUDGET TREATMENT

This section provides that the amount of repayable grants made to the states under this Act shall not be included in the budget of the U.S. Government and shall be exempt from statutes governing budget outlays.

SECTION 10. POPULATION INFORMATION

This section establishes the criteria for determining the state populations to be used in this Act. The Secretary of Commerce shall provide adjusted population figures based on the 1980 census, to more accurately reflect current populations.

SECTION 11. DEFINITIONS

This section provides the definitions for the terms "construction" and "state", as used in this Act.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, one useful byproduct of our national economic afflictions has been increased attention to the issue of productivity. Unfortunately, the discussion has not focused upon one important component of economic efficiency: The condition of our infrastructure.

While we have stressed the development of a fifth generation of computers, we have neglected the preservation of the current generation's transportation and water systems. Years of declining investment in our basic life-support systems have undermined—and will continue to increasingly undermine—our Nation's productive and commercial capacity. Between 1971 and 1981, spending by all levels of government on highways, bridges, mass transit, water, and sewer dropped from 1.5 percent of GNP to 0.78 percent.

The longer we delay restoring our transportation and water systems, the harder and more expensive the task will become. But the issue is larger than paying for public works projects. The ability to move people and goods quickly and to provide an adequate supply of clean water is essential for future economic growth.

Fearing that we could face a crisis of growing proportions, the Joint Economic Committee commissioned an advisory panel under the direction of its former chairman, Henry Reuss, to study the condition of our infrastructure and to make recommendations on how to finance its repair and construction. The study was based on a survey of 23 States, and its conclusions represent the best available data.

The advisory panel discovered a severe problem. Although the country's regions have differing requirements, all have widespread needs. While the Northeast and Midwest encounter growing deterioration of facilities built decades ago, the South and West cannot keep up with new demands for expansion.

The advisory panel estimated that to meet tomorrow's demands, the United States must increase planned spending by $450 billion through the year 2000. It is estimated that to finance repair and reconstruction of highways and

bridges, we will need $720 billion through the end of the century. Of that, only $455 billion will be available under existing programs, leaving a shortfall of $265 billion. For water supply and distribution, the spending gap is $41 billion; for wastewater collection and treatment, $49 billion; and for mass transit, $88 billion.

The advisory panel found that, while the financial requirements are large, they are also manageable. Although the $450 billion needed for infrastructure spending in the next decade and a half is a large sum, it is within our means. The Joint Economic Committee's estimates are less alarming than some, which have put the cost of needed investment in the trillions.

We cannot ignore these needs. If we do, we will endanger the health of our economy. The public takes its transportation and water systems for granted. We had better not.

What can we do? The Joint Economic Committee has made several recommendations. These include establishing a capital budget to help define our resources and needs, reviewing obsolete technical standards which impair intelligent investment, and, where appropriate, granting the States greater latitude to determine how to spend scarce Federal infrastructure dollars.

But, most important, Congress, we believe, should establish a national infrastructure fund, which would help the States address the deterioration the JEC advisory committee, as well as others, have so conclusively documented.

That is why I am pleased to join Congressman HOWARD and other members of the Public Works and Transportation Committee in introducing the National Infrastructure Act to create such a fund. This bill, which Senator HART will also introduce, rests on five assumptions.

First, infrastructure renewal and development is of clear national importance. Each State, as our study has shown, will have unmet needs in the next 15 years.

Second, because of the budget crisis, the Federal Government is unable to respond to the emergency by simply increasing spending, as it has done in the past.

Third, we must establish a new long-term, sustained commitment to building and repairing public works which recognizes the advantages of our federal system of government.

Fourth, infrastructure renewal represents an investment in the future. It is not wasted money, particularly when, as we are proposing, Federal loans are repaid.

Finally, as I have already noted, a competitive national economy depends upon a sound infrastructure.

The national infrastructure fund, which we are proposing, would be financed by the U.S. Treasury at the rate of $3 billion a year for 10 years. It will be a small office in the Treasury Department, whose sole function would be to make 20-year, interest-free loans available to the States and to make certain that they are repaid. It will allocate funds to the States according to a formula based on population, though that could be modified.

The States, in turn, will set up infrastructure banks or revolving funds which will lend the money to finance infrastructure construction and repair. This money will be paid back to the State fund through taxes and/or user fees in equal, annual increments, thereby permitting the original Federal loan to finance more infrastructure construction and/or repair. We have calculated that $30 billion in loans will create about $76 billion in new infrastructure spending over the 30-year period the program lasts.

The States will be required to spend the loans only on roads, bridges, mass transit, water supply and distribution systems, and sewerage systems. These, we consider, the core, life-support systems of our economy. Each State will determine how to allocate its Federal funds. Obviously, New Mexico's priorities will differ from New York's, but each will decide separately how to invest its capital. The States will be required, however, to set aside at least 30 percent of its loans for municipal and county governments to invest.

The States will not be permitted to substitute the funds for projects which otherwise would have been carried out. Nor will they be permitted to provide the non-Federal share of the cost of any project from the loan. The national infrastructure fund is designed to supplement existing programs.

After 1 year, the States will be required to pay a percentage of their loan, determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, into a "sinking fund" in the national infrastructure fund. There, the deposits will earn enough interest to repay the original "repayable grant." This will limit the impact of the program somewhat, but it will ensure repayment. At current interest rates, we estimate those combined payments will average $65 million per year.

After the States have completed repaying their last loan, 30 years after the program begins, a permanent pool of infrastructure capital equal to the interest income earned by the sinking fund will remain. We calculate that that will be around $26 billion. This money will continue to be recycled to finance additional infrastructure projects.

The Comptroller General and the Secretary of the Treasury will be empowered to review compliance, conduct audits, and to issue reports to Congress on the status and operation of the program.

As I noted earlier, we regard infrastructure expenditures as an investment in the future. The projects funded will have a real and tangible value. They should not, therefore, be regarded as operating expenses. Rather, they represent an investment for which, as any good business recognizes, it is proper to borrow. We have consequently proposed that the moneys appropriated for the national infrastructure fund, which will be repaid, be considered off-budget in a separate capital account.

This proposal has three overriding attractions. It provides a steady, dependable stream of capital to the States so that managers can plan for future needs. It leaves selection and direction of projects with State and local governments, though the projects would be restricted to infrastructure needs whose impact on the national economy is greatest: Roads, bridges, mass transit, sewerage, and water supply and distribution systems. Finally, because the funds would be repaid, the cost to the Treasury will be contained.

In conclusion, I want to address a question we have been asked many times since we first introduced the National Infrastructure Act last June. How, when the Federal budget deficit is so large, can we propose that Washington undertake a new spending program, no matter how necessary, meritorious, or fiscally prudent?

The answer, I believe, is clear. We must increase our investment in infrastructure because failure to do so will hurt us in the future. Without a sound infrastructure, economic growth becomes more difficult. Without strong growth, all our other social and economic goals, including a balanced budget, will be harder to achieve.

In short, the cost of continuing to neglect our national infrastructure needs is truly something we cannot afford.

Others have asked if it would not be more appropriate for the States to meet the challenge of revitalizing our infrastructure, rather than the Federal Government. They note that, after all, most States have budget surpluses and that infrastructure spending has historically been a State responsibility. They also point out that the State share of total spending on public works has declined from 70 percent in 1959 to 52 percent in 1983.

Unfortunately, the nationwide task of infrastructure renewal is too large and too important to leave to the States alone. So great are the needs for repair and expansion that all levels of government must participate in order to keep our national economy strong.

Our proposal will raise only a fraction—about one-sixth—of the total revenue the Joint Economic Committee study indicated we will need by the year 2000. The States, and the cities, therefore, will have no choice but to increase spending, though today, unfortunately, too few have concrete plans to do so.

By requiring the States to establish infrastructure banks, or revolving funds, our bill in fact creates a catalyst which will stimulate the process of infrastructure renewal. It recognizes that Washington cannot today simply increase its grants for development. Rather, we wish to utilize the virtues of our federalist system of government, with its shared responsibility for the tasks of government. By creating cooperation between Washington and the States, the proposal addressed the problem in what, I believe, is a new and potentially very productive way. At the same time, the bill underlines the Federal Government's two century commitment to the building and security of this Nation.

We must increase investment in infrastructure. Because our economy depends on it, we have no alternative. Failure to increase essential public works spending will only crimp our economy's competitiveness in the future, something we cannot afford.●

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND OUR DOMESTIC ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to address the House on the issue of trade.

I would first say that I think every Member of Congress and every American needs to recognize that from this year forward, and possibly a few years before this, no longer can we talk about addressing the domestic deficit, our $200 billion annual deficit, our $1.4 trillion national debt, without talking about our problems in the world and the international trade deficit.

For years I have been talking around my district in my State about the fact that this is becoming a global and, indeed, when we are facing a $200 billion deficit, now we are talking about $100 billion deficit with regard to international trade and the two will have to be addressed together, not one or the other, but the two together. I think that is going to take a change in attitude in this Nation, in the very fibers of our bureaucratic system.

Approaches and concerns that we have as Americans are going to have to change somewhat or we will not be able to compete and we will not be able to solve these problems. Let me give some examples. In recent studies, some time ago when I visited Japan, I noticed that the Japanese bureaucy, the Japanese Government, considered themselves not as antagonists of their businessmen but as an entity there to help their business people.

I was told by many businessmen in Japan when they go to talk to their government agency the attitude is not that "We have laws on the books to stop you from doing this or prevent you from doing that," but, in essence, to say, "Here are our laws and here is your approach. How can we work together to solve this so that you can have an appropriate business, create jobs, export, if you will, and therefore help your nation?" We do not have a good deal of that attitude in this Nation today, and we do not have the attitude that this is a global economy. We have been working for some 18 months in this body on the Export Administration Act simply saying that we would like to make it easier for American businessmen to export their products overseas.

Many of our laws, when it comes to international laws, are antiquated. We have the example of the Embassy official who bought a little "talk speak and spell," a little toy computer that talked and spells words, and he was told he could not take it out of the country, just a few years ago, because it was militarily critical, because it had an imbedded microprocessor.

Then we have the situation where the quartz watches that most of us wear, that electronic watch, was on the restricted list in this Nation for years, for years because our laws were outdated to the point where it said that we could not ship that watch because it had a chip in it and that chip was on a special list that was restricted. Never mind the fact that almost every industrialized nation on the face of the Earth was shipping and making those chips, our laws were such that we could not ship that. It took an Executive order of the President.

These are the kinds of approaches that I think are going to have to change and our laws will have to be changed in order to put us in a competitive position in the world market.

I might also add that we have representatives, by way of our embassies, all over the world acting on behalf of the United States who could help and assist us in our international trade problems.

□ 1710

I would tell the story that happened to me just a few weeks ago in my home district. A businessman indicated to me that he had gone to a country to seek a contract with two other nationals. Each agreed to visit their own embassy in the morning, meet for lunch and then call on their principal to see if they could sell this product. A three-nation agreement trying to sell a product.

He went to the American Embassy and said he was treated rather rudely, told that they did not have the time and was sent on his way. His two colleagues, each from other nations, were given reams of information, calls were made to be helpful; they were given all kinds of assistance—one embassy even offered to send personnel to help introduce.

His comment to me was he was embarrassed to even tell his colleagues the treatment he had, let alone the situation. We have tried to address that just yesterday in the State Department authorization bill, saying in effect that our Embassies and our Embassy personnel should be directed by the Secretary of State to do everything they can to assist American business interests.

What we are talking about essentially is the loss of tens of thousands of American jobs; a multibillion-dollar trade deficit that as I said when I started out, must be solved in conjunction with the solution to our domestic deficit.

If we do not solve the international trade imbalance, we will not solve the domestic deficit problem, and I think the same is true in reverse. Both have to be attacked; they have to be attacked on all fronts. Bureaucratic thinking, governmental thinking, congressional approaches, legislative approaches, Executive orders from the White House, changes in all of our laws and our attitudes around the world.

I think finally we have to enforce some of the antidumping laws we have on the books. One need only mention the Houdillie case, where millions of dollars were spent by a private company to prove that there was indeed infractions on our laws, and eventually nothing was done about it.

So the point is we do have some laws on the books; they also need to be enforced, we just want to compete, as the saying goes, "on a level playing field." It is important not only to me and my colleagues here, but literally to every single American, because everytime another country gets a contract or makes a sale that American businessmen or businesswomen could make, it is a job in this country.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1239

Mr. WHITTEN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1239) making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, for emergency famine relief and recovery in Africa, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 99-29)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1239) "making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, for emergency famine relief and recovery in Africa, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 5, 7, 10, and 12.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$400,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, and 14.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DAVID R. OBEY,
BOB TRAXLER,
MATTHEW F. MCHUGH,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
JACK F. KEMP,
VIRGINIA SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
BOB KASTEN,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1239) making urgent supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1985, for emergency famine relief and recovery if Africa, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommeded in the accompanying conference report.

The conference agreement has not included H.R. 1189 as an amendment. The conferees do expect H.R. 1189 to be considered during April 1985, and the Department of Agriculture, in the meantime, is to proceed with applications and actions to be ready to use the existing guarantee authority during the month of April.

TITLE I

CHAPTER I

AFRICAN FAMINE RELIEF

PUBLIC LAW 480

Amendment No. 1: Provides $400,000,000 for title II of Public Law 480 instead of $600,000,000 as proposed by the House and $285,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

of which $384,000,000 is hereby appropriated to be available through December 31, 1985, and $16,000,000 shall be derived from unobligated balances in the Commodity Credit Corporation

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates $384,000,000 for title II of Public Law 480 to remain available through December 31, 1985, and provides for the use of $16,000,000 in unobligated Commodity Credit Corporation balances. The House bill provided for an appropriation of $480,000,000 and the Senate amendment provided for an appropriation of $269,000,000 and a transfer of $16,000,000 in unobligated balances.

It is the intention of the conferees that the commodities provided in this Act be delivered to Africa no later than December 31, 1985.

Amendment No. 3: Deletes House language providing $120,000,000 (of which $90,000,000 was made available by Public Law 98-332) for competitive sales to Africa from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

Amendment No. 4: Deletes Senate language and restores House language which provides that not to exceed $100,000,000 is available for inland transportation under certain terms and conditions.

CHAPTER II

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

International disaster assistance

Amendment No. 5: The Conferees agreed to delete language proposed by the Senate. This language indicated that "such sums as may be necessary" were available and established a ceiling at the House appropriated amount. The conferees felt that funds should be available through a specific appropriation, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

, to be available only for such purpose and to remain available until March 31, 1986: Provided, That the Committee on Appropriations of each House of Congress is notified five days in advance of the obligation of any funds made available under this paragraph, unless the emergency is life threatening and immediate action is necessary

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees agreed to inclusion of the Senate language which requires a five day notification to the Committee on Appropriations before funds being provided for International Disaster Assistance may be obligated. This action is not to be taken as a precedent for future action on the regular International Disaster Assistance account. The conferees included this language because the authorization legislation has expanded the purposes for which these funds may be used, in essence creating an account which is part disaster assistance, part development assistance, and part Economic Support Fund.

The conferees have recommended additional language which will allow a waiver of this requirement if the situation is life threatening and requires an immediate response. The conferees expect that this waiver provision will be used only when absolutely necessary. In addition, the administration must immediately report to the Committee on Appropriations of each House of Congress if the five day notification is waived. This report shall contain the justification for waiving the notification requirement and a detailed report on the use of such funds.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

UNITED STATES EMERGENCY REFUGEE AND MIGRATION ASSISTANCE FUND

Amendment No. 7: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which required a five day notification prior to using emergency refugee and migration assistance funds. The purposes and scope of this particular account, unlike the International Disaster Assistance account, have not changed, and, therefore, the conferees agree that additional notification requirements are unnecessary.

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

Amendment No. 8: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

notwithstanding any other provision of law,

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees agreed to delete language proposed by the Senate. This language indicated that "such sums as may be necessary" were available and established a ceiling at the House appropriated amount. The conferees felt that funds should be available through a specific appropriation, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

, to be available only for such purpose and to remain available until March 31, 1986

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees have agreed to delete the Senate language requiring a five day notification prior to obligation of funds under this account. The conferees are aware that these funds will be subject to the normal notification process.

TITLE II

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

EMERGENCY RESERVE FOR AFRICAN FAMINE RELIEF

Amendment No. 10: Deletes Senate language which provided that funds under the Emergency Reserve would be available only to the extent an official budget request is transmitted to the Congress.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 11: Inserts technical center head change as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Restores House language and deletes Senate language waiving sections 10 and 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act. The conferees agree that since the authorization for this bill has

been passed, the proposed Senate waiver is no longer required.

Amendment No. 13: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which inserts language providing that the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall have responsibility for determining the emergency food and disaster assistance needs for funds appropriated in this Act.

The conferees expect that the amendment will in no way alter the way the Public Law 480 program is currently administered by the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development.

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

DISPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES UNDER SECTION 416 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

To prevent the waste of commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make available, through Private Voluntary Organizations for donation to African nations requiring emergency food assistance, for calendar year 1985, not more than two hundred thousand metric tons of agricultural commodites: Provided, That 50 percentum of the commodities made available under this sentence shall be in the form of wheat or wheat products: Provided further, That none of the commodities made available for donation under this sentence shall be made available until the Secretary of Agriculture has certified to the appropriate committees of the Congress that the commodities shall not be distributed through or otherwise be allowed to come under the possession or control of the Government of Ethiopia. The Corporation shall pay, with respect to the commodities donated under the foregoing sentence, transporting, handling, and other charges, including the cost of overseas delivery. Such donations shall be in addition to the level of assistance programmed under any other authority.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for the distribution of equal amounts of wheat and dairy products. The conferees will expect the Department to distribute 200,000 metric tons of commodities under this agreement during calendar year 1985.

The conferees agree that the language in the second proviso should not raise any obstacle to the rapid and effective distribution of commodities made available to the people of Ethiopia. The language of the conference agreement will prevent the Government of Ethiopia from gaining control of donated foodstuffs through seizure of commodities donated by the American people.

The conference agreement further supports the Senate floor debate on the amendment. The legislative history established by that debate would allow the participation of the Ethiopian government, in cooperation with UN agencies and United States Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs), in the transportation and distribution of commodities provided under the amendment.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1985 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1985 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1985 follow:

Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1985	$235,000,000
House bill, fiscal year 1985	880,000,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1985	669,000,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1985	784,000,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1985	+549,000,000
House bill, fiscal year 1985	−96,000,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1985	+115,000,000

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DAVID R. OBEY,
BOB TRAXLER,
MATTHEW F. MCHUGH,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
JACK F. KEMP,
VIRGINIA SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
BOB KASTEN,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HENRY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MOORE, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MADIGAN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. MCKINNEY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BOULTER, for 5 minutes, March 28.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKELTON) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHARP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WRIGHT, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOWARD, for 30 minutes, today.

Mrs. KENNELLY, for 5 minutes, March 28.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HUTTO) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LELAND, for 60 minutes, April 3.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unamimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. FRANK, to include extraneous material in debate on House Joint Resolution 181 in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, to include extraneous material while in the Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HENRY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. JOHNSON.
Mr. FAWELL.
Mr. GREEN.
Mr. HILLIS.
Mr. WEBER.
Mr. PARRIS.
Mr. YOUNG of Alaska in two instances.
Mr. KRAMER.
Mr. KASICH.
Mr. PURSELL.
Mrs. SCHNEIDER in two instances.
Mr. O'BRIEN.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
Mr. DORNAN of California in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKELTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KOLTER in two instances.
Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota in two instances.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. FLORIO.
Mr. NOWAK.
Mr. MRAZEK.
Mr. UDALL in two instances.
Mr. MAZZOLI.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. DYMALLY.
Mr. STARK.
Ms. MIKULSKI.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. SAM B. HALL, JR.
Mrs. BOXER.
Mr. FEIGHAN.
Ms. OAKAR.
Mr. NICHOLS.
Mr. ASPIN.
Mr. GORDON.
Mr. FASCELL in two instances.
Mr. WRIGHT.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.
Mr. RANGEL in three instances.
Mr. GAYDOS.
Mr. SOLARZ in two instances.
Mr. LANTOS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until to-

morrow, Thursday, March 28, 1985, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

887. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the proposed sale of defense articles in excess of $50 million to Saudi Arabia, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

888. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notice of the proposed sale of defense articles in excess of $50 million to Pakistan, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 133b (96 Stat. 1288); to the Committee on Armed Services.

889. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a notice of intent to offer to sell certain defense articles and services to Pakistan, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

890. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a notice of intent to offer to sell certain defense articles and services to Saudi Arabia, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

891. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report of political contributions by Vernon A. Walters to be Ambassador to the United Nations, pursuant to Public Law 96-465, section 304(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

892. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of State, transmitting a report of the results of the confidential audit of the Department's emergency expenditures, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2671(c) (the act of Aug. 1, 1956, chapter 841, section 4(c) (97 Stat. 1024)); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

893. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, transmitting a report on the leasing and production of coal lands under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act, and the Attorney General's report on competition in the coal and energy industries, pursuant to the act of February 25, 1920, chapter 85, section 8B (90 Stat. 1089); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

894. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on the state of domestic mining, minerals, and mineral reclamation industries, including a statement of the trend in utilization and depletion of these resources, pursuant to Public Law 91-631, section 2; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

895. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

896. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to eliminate the requirement for decennial census of drainage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

897. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Environmental Protection Agency's legislative proposal for reauthorization of the Clean Water Act; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

898. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report on the disposition of cases granted relief from administrative error, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 210(c)(3)(B); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

899. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Energy, transmitting the 1985 annual report on the high-level radioactive waste management demonstration project at the Western New York Service Center, West Valley, NY, pursuant to Public Law 96-368, section 4; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Science and Technology.

900. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report entitled: "State Rather Than Federal Policies Provided The Framework for Managing Block Grants"; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 1239 (Rept. No. 99-29). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES (for himself, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1759. A bill to provide that the polls in the continental United States for Presidential general elections shall close at 10:30 p.m., eastern standard time; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 1760. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Act regarding the export of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. BOXER:

H.R. 1761. A bill to permit persons who will be 18 years of age on the date of a Federal election to vote in the related primary election; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 1762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt bonds for solid waste disposal facilities from the volume limitation on the issuance of private activity bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COURTER:

H.R. 1763. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to add the minority leader of the House of Representatives to the list of those who can provide authorization for Members and staff of the House to obtain local currency for foreign travel expenses; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H.R. 1764. A bill to provide that pay for certain types of Federal civilian powerplant employees be determined in the same manner as that in which pay is determined for employees of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers performing similar functions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. ATKINS):

H.R. 1765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow contributions to tax-exempt social welfare organizations to be deducted for gift and estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.R. 1766. A bill to promote the export agricultural commodities owned or acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation by facilitating the use of barter for materials produced in foreign countries, to develop markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, to protect the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DYSON (for himself, Mrs. BYRON, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. BLILEY, and Mrs. BENTLEY):

H.R. 1767. A bill to amend the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 to provide that an amendment made by such act relating to Federal guarantees of industrial development bonds shall not apply to obligations issued for certain solid waste disposal facilities for which substantial sums and effort have already been expended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. MICA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. GILMAN):

H.R. 1768. A bill relating to international narcotics control; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. CHAPPIE):

H.R. 1769. A bill to amend section 705 of the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for a 2-year moratorium on the encryption of satellite cable programming to allow for the development of marketing systems under the recent amendments made to such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. MATSUI, and Mrs. HOLT):

H.R. 1770. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide incentives for the establishment of statewide insurance pools to provide health insurance to high-risk individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRAMER (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. STRANG):

H.R. 1771. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to develop a comprehensive plan for the cleanup of contaminated sites, structures, equipment, and natural resources at or near the Rocky Mountain Arsenal near Denver, CO; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

H.R. 1772. A bill to limit the use of foreign icebreakers in U.S. waters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LUNGREN:

H.R. 1773. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to issue a portion of certain Treasury obligations in the form of obligations indexed for inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKINNEY:

H.R. 1774. A bill to amend section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 to ensure that the direct loan program under such section meets the special housing and related needs of nonelderly handicapped families; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 1775. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to revise and extend the taxes used to finance the Superfund Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ROE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. MOODY, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. WISE Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 1776. A bill to establish a national infrastructure fund to provide funds for interest-free loans to State and local governments for construction and improvement of highways, bridges, water supply and distribution systems, mass transportation facilities and equipment, and wastewater treatment facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 1777. A bill entitled: the "Farmland Conservation Acreage Reserve Act of 1985"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALGREN:

H.R. 1778. A bill to suspend for 3 years the duty on 1,5 naphthalene diisocyanate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALGREN (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. KOLTER, and Mr. DIOGUARDI):

H.R. 1779. A bill to clarify the application of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 to encourage cogeneration activities by registered gas utility holding companies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MADIGAN (for himself, and Mr. BROYHILL):

H.R. 1780. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Childhood Vaccine-Injury Compensation Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEJDENSON:

H.J. Res. 216. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate the third week of June 1985 as "National Veterans' Health Care Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROE:

H.J. Res. 217. Joint resolution designating April 26, 1985, as "National Nursing Home Residents Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 115. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to restrict the consideration of supplemental appropriation bills by the Committee on Appropriations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. SCHNEIDER (for herself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOSCO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. JOHNSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. McKINNEY, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REID, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROTH, Mr. RUDD, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WEAVER, and Mr. ZSCHAU):

H. Res. 116. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to an exchange of travel between leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

54. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, relative to grain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

55. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to taxation of aircraft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLEMAN of Texas:

H.R. 1781. A bill for the relief of Lori Annette Burr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY of Illinois:

H.R. 1782. A bill for the relief of Madhav Prasad Sharma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTTO:

H.R. 1783. A bill for the relief of Mary E. Stokes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 43: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.

H.R. 50: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 281: Mr. BATES, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. ROE, and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 360: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 587: Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DAUB, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. COELHO, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. RUDD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GROTBERG, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. PORTER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. McKINNEY, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HENDON, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GREEN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WHEAT, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CROCKETT, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. DYSON, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. YATRON, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. WEBER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HOWARD, Mrs. SHARP, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SISISKY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. FUSTER, and Mr. WEAVER.

H.R. 600: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 709: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 749: Mr. COELHO and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 951: Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii and Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1000: Mr. EVANS of Iowa and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 1068: Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1082: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 1142: Mr. SILJANDER.

H.R. 1190: Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. WILSON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BENTLEY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. STOKES.

H.R. 1195: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. OLIN, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BATES, and Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 1245: Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. McCOLLUM, Mr. ADDABBO, and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 1319: Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GUARINI, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 1335: Mr. WIRTH, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. COLLINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1338: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. JEFFORDS.

H.R. 1359: Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 1361: Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COATS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. HILER.

H.R. 1371: Mrs. SCHROEDER and Mr. LEHMAN of California.

H.R. 1399: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MOODY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. DYSON, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. WHEAT, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. SLATTERY, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. BONIOR of Michigan.

H.R. 1421: Mr. PERKINS and Mr. MCMILLAN.

H.R. 1550: Mr. HEFNER.

H.R. 1613: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HENDON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. FAUNTROY.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. PACKARD.

H.J. Res. 58: Mr. CHAPPELL.

H.J. Res. 146: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. FISH, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WILSON, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 183: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. LELAND, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. SABO, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. ROE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DYSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. BARNES, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. CROCKETT, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. FROST, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.J. Res. 188: Mr. HENDON, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. STRANG, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Ms. KENNELLY, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. CONTE, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. LUNDINE.

H. Con. Res. 32: Mr. BROWN of Colorado and Mr. WEBER.

H. Con. Res. 64: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. DURBIN.

H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. FISH.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. DIOGUARDI, and Mr. WOLPE.

H. Con. Res. 99: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LELAND, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ROE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mr. MATSUI.

H. Res. 42: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. HENRY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. KOLBE.

H. Res. 82: Mr. CROCKETT and Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

H. Res. 91: Mr. LUJAN, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. Dowdy of Mississippi, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. HENRY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. WEISS, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. GROTBERG, Mr. GARCIA, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. ROE, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. DANIEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FISH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. SCHEUER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 885: Mr. SIKORSKI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

70. The SPEAKER presented a petition of A. Hamilton, Melbourne, Australia, relative to trade; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

51-059 O-86-26 (Pt. 5)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FAIR TREATMENT FOR U.S. ETHANOL INDUSTRY

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, today my distinguished colleagues from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], and from Iowa, [Mr. BEDELL], and I introduced legislation that will provide fair treatment of the U.S. ethanol industry and close egregious tariff loopholes that permit certain ethyl alcohol marketers and traders to evade a 60-cent duty on their product.

The domestic fuel ethanol industry has been nurtured since 1978 through a variety of Federal economic incentive programs, including the imposition of a duty on the importation of foreign fuel ethanol. These incentive programs were initiated out of a recognition of the value of a strong domestic ethanol industry. Multifold benefits include greater energy independence, a growing market for U.S. feedgrains—particularly corn—and an economically viable and environmentally sound replacement for lead as an octane enhancer in gasoline.

The recent strides made by the domestic ethanol industry are threatened today by practices of certain ethyl alcohol marketers and traders designed to circumvent the 60-cent per gallon duty that is imposed by statute on the importation of fuel ethanol. At present, there are at least three methods employed to avoid payment of duties: One, importation of ethanol mixed with gasoline; two, importation of fuel grade ethanol as industrial ethanol; and three, importation of fuel grade ethanol under the terms of the Caribbean Basin Initiative Act. Our legislation addresses all three of these problems in a just and effective fashion.

Ethanol imported as a fuel or for fuel purposes is not only subject to duty under item 427.50 of the Tariff Schedule of the United States [TSUS], but also to an added duty of 60 cents a gallon under item 901.50 TSUS. However, ethanol imported as a mixture with gasoline is not subject to this additional duty. Thus a legal loophole exists for importers to bring in fuel ethanol in imported gasoline stocks on which they need only pay a duty of 1.25 cents per gallon. Our measure would close this loophole by requiring the additional duty to apply to mixtures.

Furthermore, in contrast to ethanol intended for use as a motor fuel, alcohol which is to be used industrially is not subject to the 60 cents per gallon duty. As it now stands, marketers and traders can import a shipment of ethanol for industrial purposes—avoiding the duty—and have up to 3 years to redeclare its use if in fact it is used for fuel rather than for industrial purposes as originally declared, without paying any interest or penalty. This translates into a 3-year interest free loan to ethanol traders. More unscrupulous traders have been known to set up dummy corporations that import ethanol ostensibly for industrial use, thus avoiding the 60-cent duty. They then go out of business just before the 3-year end use reporting and duty deadline. Our measure would require that all imported ethyl alcohol be subject to the 60-cent import duty at the point of entry into the United States. However, this duty would be refunded upon proof that such product was not used and can no longer be made suitable for use as fuel ethanol.

Finally, this bill would clarify the eligibility criteria for duty free importation of ethanol under the Caribbean Basin Initiative statute. Under the current interpretation of this statute, ethyl alcohol and ethyl alcohol mixtures which originate in non-CBI countries can be upgraded in CBI countries to fuel ethanol quality, then imported into the United States duty-free. This practice of transshipping subverts the intent of the CBI statute. The purpose of the CBI Act is to encourage indigenous projects which would promote long-term economic development, not to establish laundering operations to avoid payment of legitimate import duties.

It is high time that these loopholes be closed to afford the ethanol industry the full protection Congress intended when it established the duties on imported fuel ethanol. Strengthening the Tariff Schedule of the United States is the least we can do to ensure the steady growth of such a valuable domestic industry.

H.R. 1720

A bill to ensure payment of the regular duties imposed on imported ethyl alcohol and payment of the additional duty imposed on ethyl alcohol when imported for use in producing a mixture of gasoline and alcohol or used otherwise as fuel

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

SECTION 1. CLASSIFICATION OF ETHYL ALCOHOL.

(a) The item description for item 901.50 of the Appendix to the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended to read as follows: "Ethyl alcohol (provided for in item 427.88, part 2D, schedule 4) or any mixture containing such ethyl alcohol if such ethyl alcohol or mixture is suitable, or can be made suitable, for use as a fuel or for use in producing a mixture of gasoline and alcohol or a mixture of a special fuel and alcohol for use as a fuel".

(b)(1) The amount of any duty pro[illegible]d for under item 901.50 of the Appendi[illegible]o the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) which is paid with respect to any ethyl alcohol or mixture containing ethyl alcohol shall be refunded by the Secretary of the Treasury upon proof that that ethyl alcohol or mixture was not used and can no longer be used or be made suitable for use—

(A) as a fuel,

(B) in the production of—

(i) a mixture of gasoline and alcohol, or

(ii) a mixture of special fuel and alcohol, which can be used as a fuel.

(2) Allowance of a refund under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be subject to compliance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, which may include, but need not be limited to—

(A) fixing of a time limit within which claims for refund under any of the provisions of this subsection shall be filed and completed;

(B) establishing the method of and documentation necessary for the required proof; and

(C) the designation of the person to whom any refund shall be made.

SEC. 2. CARIBBEAN BASIN ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT.

Section 213(a) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) No ethyl alcohol provided for in item 427.88 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, and no mixture containing such ethyl alcohol, shall be considered to be—

"(A) an article that is wholly the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary country;

"(B) a new or different article of commerce which has been grown, produced, or manufactured in a beneficiary country;

"(C) a material produced in a beneficiary country; or

"(D) otherwise eligible for duty free treatment under this Act;

merely by virtue of having been subjected to—

"(i) distillation, dehydration by molecular sieve, or other similar process (including azeotropic distillation or dehydration to anhydrous ethyl alcohol);

"(ii) denaturing; or

"(iii) blending with other ethyl alcohol which is then subjected to the processes described in clause (i) or (ii);

within a beneficiary country."

SEC. 3. CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO THE GENERAL HEADNOTES OF THE TARIFF SCHEDULES.

General headnote 3(a) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

1202) is amended by adding at the end thereof, the following new subdivision

"(iv) No ethyl alcohol provided for in item 427.88, and no mixture containing any such ethyl alcohol, shall be considered to be—

"(A) the growth or product of an insular possession;

"(B) manufactured or produced in an insular possession from materials which are growth, product, or manufacture of any such possession; or

"(C) otherwise eligible for exemption from duty under this headnote;

merely by virtue of having been subjected to—

"(I) distillation, dehydration by molecular sieve, or other similar process (including azeotropic distillation or dehydration to anhydrous ethyl alcohol); or

"(II) denaturing; or

"(III) blending with other ethyl alcohol which is then subjected to the processes described in subclause (I) or (II);

within an insular possession."

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendment made by this Act, and subsection (b) of the first section of this Act, shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.●

WHY CAN'T THE PRESIDENT TAKE AGRICULTURE'S PROBLEM SERIOUSLY

HON. JIM ROSS LIGHTFOOT

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I picked up the Washington Post. In a story about the Gridiron Club, President Reagan was quoted as falling on his face, with an attempted joke, the punch line being "I think we should keep the grain and export the farmers." If this was intended to be funny, it was a guffaw of monumental proportions. A spokesman for the White House has said the remark was made as a joke.

Mr. President, there is nothing funny about going out of business. There is no humor in watching a lifetime of effort and sacrifice be washed away in a tide of high interest rates and low commodity prices. The farm problems are not a laughing matter and I am offended and angered by those remarks. There is a time and a place for humor. What we need is action to correct the farm debt situation.●

VILLANOVA ADVANCES TO FINAL FOUR

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I had the distinct pleasure of watching Villanova University's basketball team advance to the final four of the NCAA basketball tournament. It was a moment made all the more special because of the seniors on the team who had come so close twice before. Ed Pinkney, Gary McLain, and Dwayne McClain were freshmen on the Cinderella team that lost to North Carolina in the 1982 regional finals. The 1983 Villanova Cinderella team left the ball early again, this time at the hands of the University of Houston.

These three seniors met at a Five-Star Basketball Camp the summer after their junior year in high school. There they became fast friends and eventually Gary McLain and Dwayne McClain convinced Ed Pinkney to leave the Bronx for Villanova University in Pennsylvania's Seventh District, which I am proud to represent in Congress. For 3 years these young men played some fine basketball but always ended up a little short. Finally they made a pact to do a little better this year, to reach the final four.

This Sunday, these same three players carried Coach Rollie Massimino to his first final four appearance. Although Villanova has reached the final four in the past, it has been through a long dry spell. I extend my heartiest congratulations to Coach Massimino and his whole Villanova team as they enjoy a level of success that most basketball teams can only dream about. Now that the Wildcats have reached the final four, I wish them well in their next two games.●

STOP HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSE IN TURKEY

HON. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the beginning of April, the Prime Minister of Turkey, Turgut Ozal, will be visiting the United States. Although I believe we can all support his efforts to address Turkey's human rights problems, the people of that country continue to live under harsh conditions. Prime Minister Ozal's visit gives us the opportunity to urge him to take further steps to ameliorate prison conditions, end the practice of torture, release those persons imprisoned for their political beliefs, ease the repression of religious freedom for the Greek minority, and lift restrictions on political participation.

The State Department's Country Reports for 1984 details continued human rights problems in Turkey, including hundreds of claims of torture throughout the year. The report cites "the trial of 56 signatories of a petition on human rights and democracy in Turkey; the opening of a second peace association trial; slow progress in overcoming poor prison conditions and dealing with continued reports of torture; a series of large-scale hunger strikes by inmates; and the continuation of martial law in 34 provinces, including the most populous."

We welcome the Turkish Government's public condemnation of torture and mistreatment of prisoners. But these efforts should be enhanced by taking steps such as eliminating the 45-day period of incommunicado detention during which time many detainees report being tortured; granting access to places of detention by an amnesty for those prisoners incarcerated for the nonviolent expression of their political views.

Of great concern as well is Turkey's treatment of its Greek minority. The Eastern Orthodox Church's most important seminary was forced to close following restrictions placed on its enrollment allowing only Turkish citizens. Turkish citizens who are Greek Orthodox have been greatly reduced—120,000 in Istanbul in 1955 to 4,500 today—as a result of continued Turkish repression. The Turkish constitution and the Treaty of Lausanne both guarantee minority rights and provide for the maintenance of separate schools for religious minorities. This commitment should be honored by giving permission for the reopening of the Eastern Orthodox Church's theological seminary, closed since 1971.

Prime Minister Ozal, who was elected in November 1983, has made some attempts to begin addressing Turkey's pervasive human rights problems, including the appointment of a parliamentary commission to investigate prison conditions. Unfortunately, however, the military retains complete authority on human rights matters and the Turkish parliament has not been able to address effectively the questions of amnesty for political prisoners, torture and poor prison conditions, restrictions on the press, or continuing political trials. In light of the hunger strikes to protest conditions in the prisons, the Prime Minister might at least reconvene the commission of inquiry into prison conditions and grant it access to places of detention on a regular basis.

The House will soon be considering the Foreign Aid Authorization bill, which includes a sizable allotment for Turkey. As with all countries which receive significant foreign aid, we have a responsibility to urge that those funds are spent in support of that nation's people. Prime Minister Ozal's vigilance toward addressing the human rights problems affecting his country would strengthen the friendship that already exists between our two nations, and assure the Congress that our foreign aid dollars are being used in the pursuit of peace.●

THE MURDER OF MAJOR NICHOLSON: SOVIET BRUTALITY IN ACTION

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the senseless murder of Maj. Arthur Nicholson is a clear case of Soviet brutality in action. While the Kremlin leaders call for cooperation and understanding, their actions around the world reveal their real intentions. Beneath their peace-loving image is an aggressive and confrontational state which ignores agreements and resorts to brute force to attain their needs.

According to recent reports, Major Nicholson was performing routine surveillance in Soviet-dominated East Germany when he was shot by a Soviet guard. Major Nicholson was unarmed and was performing his duties in accordance with operating procedures which date back to 1947. The agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union allow liaison and surveillance duty and provide for an exchange of such missions in East and West Germany. Major Nicholson was clearly following the agreement when he was senselessly shot down without warning in East Germany by a Soviet soldier. Available evidence reveals that he was shot well outside a permanently restricted area that is off limits to U.S. liaison teams.

Major Nicholson was reportedly hit in the chest and was denied medical treatment for a long period of time. An American officer accompanying the major was prevented from administering first aid.

To add insult to injury, the Soviets fabricated a false story describing the incident. Even if Major Nicholson had accidentally strayed into a restricted zone, accepted rules dictate that he be detained and then returned to his unit. Brute force should never be used in such a situation. Once again, the civilized world is disgusted to see another example of how the Soviets shoot first and ask questions later. Who can forget Korean Air Line flight 007, and the incredible slaughter of hundreds of innocent people?

This terrible tragedy comes at a time when both the United States and the Soviet Union are trying to come to an agreement to reduce the weapons of mass destruction. It comes at a time when both sides are trying to establish mutual trust and closer relations with each other. While I support the administration's efforts to better our ties with the Soviets, this sad incident deeply troubles me and leads me to question whether the Kremlin is really sincere about wanting peace and understanding in the world.

If they are willing to break agreements regarding simple military liaison efforts, what might they do with a high-level arms reduction accord?

My heart goes out to Major Nicholson's widow and family. I am certain that they know he died in the service of his country while performing a mission that the free world must continue to perform. I know that my colleagues join me in sending our deepest sympathy to the Nicholson family during this moment of supreme sadness.●

IN SUPPORT OF JOBS CORPS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the House Education and Labor Committee, and a cosponsor of House Resolution 72, I rise to express my strong and unqualified support for this program.

As a representative from a large, industrial State, I am well aware of the large number of unemployed, disadvantaged youth who remain discouraged and unable to locate work. Unemployment statistics are distressingly high—over 20 percent and are nearly double that rate for minority youth.

The Jobs Corps Program has proven to be one of the most effective means of training and educating youth for professional and service-oriented job opportunities, both full and part time. This program has proven its ability to place willing and capable youth, who are ready to work. In New York, there are 8 centers, 2 of which are located in my home city of New York, serving 2,358 enrollees and a total of 5,000 statewide.

Training under this program lasts from 8 months to 2 years and involves an open-ended schedule, devised according to individual ability. Enrollees are placed in a number of job areas, including clerical and business positions, automotive and building trades as well as cosmetology and food services.

The program is also cost-effective. The thousands of youth who have participated in the program have repayed the program 145 percent of its costs in taxes. This resolution, reaffirms the importance of continuation of this program and recognizes its role in helping young men and women hold—and keep jobs.

The President's proposals to eliminate this important program were rejected last week when the Committee on Education and Labor presented its report to the House Budget Committee. The report recommends rejection of the administration's budget for fiscal year 1986 and proposes freezing all programs under the committee's jurisdiction at last year's levels.

In the words of the committee report, this proposal represents a cut—because you can't freeze inflation. However, I believe that it represents a far better alternative than that of the administration.

I pledge my own efforts to work to assure that the Job Corps Program remains alive and well in the year ahead.●

FACTS CONCERNING MILITARY RETIREMENT

HON. JOSEPH J. DioGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. DioGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, Office of Management and Budget Director David Stockman testified concerning the subject of military pensions. The service to our country rendered by our military—Active, Reserve, and National Guard—is a unique service, essential to national security. It has seemed to some that the tone of Mr. Stockman's remarks suggest that he might not properly appreciate the sacrifices of the men and women who saved the world from Adolph Hitler and have defended the free world ever since. What is appreciated, however, is the need for fiscal responsibility at all levels of Government. The matter of military pensions does, in fact, deserve a look, but it must not be the proverbial cold eye of the accountant alone, for military retirement is a very complex subject necessarily tied to personnel management and promotion/retention policies as well as being a very human question involving men and women who, even in peacetime, make great sacrifices for their country.

The Reserve Officers Association of the United States has recently promulgated some important facts concerning military retirement which must be taken under consideration in any study of the military retirement system. I cite these facts here for the information of this House:

The average annual gross retired pay for a full career nondisability military retiree is $13,716.

Nondisability military retired pay is fully taxable.

The median rank for all military retirees is sergeant—or chief petty officer—that is, pay grade E-7.

Only 13 percent of those who enter military service remain long enough to earn retired pay.

Military personnel do not retire with 20 years service at 50 percent of their compensation. The actual amount is 35 percent for 20 years of service or 58 percent for 30 years service.

Changes implemented in the military retirement system since 1980

alone have already reduced the lifetime retirement pay by approximately 20 percent for those fully affected.●

TRIBUTE TO GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Greek Independence. On March 25 in the year 1821 freedom returned to its ancient homeland. After nearly 500 years of Ottoman oppression, Alexander Ypsilanti and his fellow Greek patriots rose in open revolt against their Turkish rulers. To win their goal of Greek independence, the partisans struggled for 11 cruel years, but courage and perseverence have ever been the hallmark of Greek culture. On May 7, 1983, their victory was ratified by the Treaty of London.

The Olympian torch of freedom reignited that day has burned brightly ever since. It lit the way for the entire Balkan independence movement that followed the Greek example. It survived despite the devastation of two world wars. And even Hitler's occupation forces could enshroud the torch but not extinguish its flame.

As citizens of an established democracy we owe our legacy of freedom and self-government to the ancient Greek traditions that were reaffirmed on this date. As legislators—and that very word is of Greek derivation—we are doubly indebted. We are responsible for preserving the equality and fairness that Aristotle taught were the fruits of independence. Our history has been forged in the effort to apply and perfect these principles. So long as we uphold the responsibility the torch of Greek freedom and independence will continue to prosper.

But this is only part of the significance of Greek independence. Oppressed people the world over struggling for self-government can take heart in the victory won by a tiny nation against a great and powerful oppressor. The Greek's courage and perseverence that prevailed against the Ottoman empire in 1821 has been passed to the island of Cyprus, where Greek Cypriot partisans continue to struggle against the modern Turkish invader.

I trust that the Greek Cypriots, in time, will prevail in their campaign for freedom. And I consider it part of the responsibilities of every deomcracy to support them and people everywhere, from Afghanistan to Central America, who are fighting to be free.

Freedom and equality, the gifts of ancient Greece, were returned to their homeland on March 25, 1821. As the beneficiaries and stewards of these gifts, it is fitting that we commemorate this date.●

USA FOR AFRICA

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1985, recording artists from across the Nation and from every branch of the music industry joined together as "USA for Africa" to raise desperately needed funds for relief of the spreading famine in Africa, and to respond to the growing problems of hungry and homeless people in America. It is conservatively estimated that the efforts of the United States Support of Artists for Africa, along with the generous support of fans and charitable people throughout the country, will raise at least $50 million. All of the proceeds from the recording will be channeled through existing relief agencies. Already sales of "We Are the World" have exceeded the most optimistic hopes of its producers and performers.

Although governments from around the world have responded generously to relieve the suffering of famine-stricken Africa, the proportions of this prolonged disaster have overwhelmed normal governmental channels and private relief efforts. The call is to each of us to help the people of Africa and the hungry in America in the realization that "We Are the World." Through the initiative and talents of this group which came together with a common purpose, a common concern, and a common commitment, "USA for Africa" has given each of us the chance and, I hope, the inspiration to save a life in this truly critical time.

Today I am introducing a resolution commending the participants in "USA for Africa" for their individual and collective initiative and generosity. They have given each of us the opportunity to make a difference and I invite my colleagues to join me by cosponsoring this resolution.

We are the ones who make a brighter day. So let's start giving.●

NICARAGUA'S GOVERNMENT

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, the following brief news item appeared in the April 1, 1985, issue of U.S. News & World Report, and I am taking this opportunity to share it with my colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD.

It is the Contras' great misfortune that they do not have the financial resources to employ high-priced public relations and law firms to present their side of the issue to the American people. That may be one of the reasons we in the Congress are so reluctant to provide aid to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua.

Nicaragua's government is pulling out all the stops to halt U.S. support of the contra guerrillas. Besides a fierce public-relations campaign, the Sandinistas are encouraging mothers of Nicaraguan soldiers to write members of the U.S. Congress, urging them to vote against continued funding of the rebels.●

UNION LOCAL HONORED FOR 60 YEARS OF COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 728 in Hollywood, FL. This union local has served Broward County well, playing an active role in the community's charitable and volunteer activities in addition to protecting the interests of its members.

A particular tribute must be paid to Edward P. Harvey, who was elected financial secretary of the union in July 1964 and retired some 20 years later, having served the union with exceptional dedication, hard work, and personal integrity. Edward Harvey worked tirelessly for our community over the years and deserves our highest praise and greatest thanks for his devotion.

Another key figure in this local's successful history is James H. Gilbert, who served as business manager from 1925 to 1948. Gilbert was the guiding spirit and pioneer behind local 728, a staunch trade unionist who truly dedicated his life to the advancement of his brothers and sisters.

IBEW Local 728 has played a prominent role in voluntary labor efforts on behalf of the city of Hollywood. Projects to which union members have selflessly devoted their time and energies include building community playgrounds and ballparks, rewiring facilities for charitable organizations, and general volunteer labor for needy causes. This union local also operates one of the largest blood banks in our city, donating several thousand pints of blood to area hospitals each year.

Working in concert with the Broward County Building Construction & Trade Council, this local union always has fought to obtain and promote the best possible standards for its workers. Local 728, under the able

leadership of business manager James Weldon, continues today its important tradition of providing support and assistance to the electrical workers of our area and participating in activities to make the city of Hollywood a better place for all of its residents.

I am proud to salute local 728 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and its members who have made it a most remarkable thread in the fabric of our community.●

MX MISSILE

HON. STAN LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, this week we will be deciding whether to release money for procurement of MX missiles. A decision to spend $1.5 billion is not to be taken lightly in these times of fiscal constraint but this decision has even more far-reaching implications than that. At this point in the multiyear MX program, we have paid only one-third of the eventual $41 billion price tag. Thus, I feel that we have an excellent opportunity to save $27 billion if the MX cannot withstand a logical and critical assessment of its value to national security.

The MX is absolutely deficient from this point of view. First, the basing mode proposed for this missile is not sensible. Even with hardening of the silos, I believe that survivability of the system is questionable. Noted defense expert William W. Kaufmann of the Brookings Institution has stated that survivability of our land-based ICBM force after a Soviet attack could fall from 20 percent to 5 percent within a decade. Why deploy 100 MX missiles with 1,000 warheads if no more than 5 missiles and 50 warheads could be expected to survive an enemy attack?

Moreover, we should not merely imitate the Soviets by procuring the MX missile in response to their buildup in large, land-based missiles. The Soviets have emphasized these weapons in their strategic forces because it suits their particular geographic situation. America has always maintained a more balanced and flexible triad of strategic forces that is better suited to our defense needs.

To maintain this desirable balance in our forces, we have selected new aircraft with Stealth technology for one leg of our triad; new, more accurate, submarine-launched Trident II missiles for the second leg; and smaller, more mobile, land-based Midgetman missiles for the third leg. All of these are less vulnerable to attack than MX missiles in existing Minuteman silos. In fact, the MX makes us weaker rather than stronger if it diverts resources from timely procurement of these less vulnerable weapons systems.

Mr. Speaker, my decision to vote against the MX is based upon this rational assessment of the value of the weapon for national security and I resent any implications that MX opponents are "weak on defense." I am a strident proponent of national security, which requires both a strong national defense and a strong national economy. I believe that we will achieve both of these by allocating our finite resources wisely and not by automatically approving the purchase of every proposed weapons system. I have supported acquisition of the Trident II and Midgetman missiles and I have supported the President on deployment of intermediate-range nuclear forces in Europe. These are sensible weapons systems that enhance our national security. The MX is not.

I do not accept that the MX is necessary as a "bargaining chip" for our negotiators in Geneva. I fully support the President's initiative in restarting the arms control and I am as hopeful as any American that these negotiations will lead to mutual and verifiable reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the two superpowers. To be a valuable "bargaining chip," the MX would have to pose a credible threat to the Soviet Union. In the absence of a survivable basing mode for the missiles, the MX does not meet this criterion.

Furthermore, I do not believe that we will be willing to bargain away the MX if we continue to sink money into it. I propose that we delay any further funding for the project for 1 year. At that time, we can decide to fund the MX for fiscal year 1987 if reasonable progress is not being made toward arms control in Geneva. This threat to renew MX funding next year is as credible a "bargaining chip" as the missile itself and it is far less expensive in the interim.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting against continued funding for the MX. Acquisition of this expensive weapons system is not in the best interest of our national security.●

HELPING FIND MISSING CHILDREN

HON. DAN COATS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. COATS. Mr. Speaker, Mobil Oil Corp. has recently announced that it will work with WTTG/Channel 5 and the Acacia Group to begin a year long effort to help locate missing children and to increase public awareness of the scope of the problem.

The campaign begins with the showing of three 1 hour specials starting tonight, March 26. Daily missing children reports and hundreds of informational messages will be brought to the attention of Washington area television viewers in this year long campaign. Photos of missing children will be posted in Mobil stations, schools, and libraries, and some Mobil dealers are appearing in television spots discussing various aspects of the campaign.

The purpose of the campaign is threefold: To increase public awareness of this national tragedy; to provide the WTTG audience and consumers with solid, useful advice; and to help locate missing children and return them to their homes.

Approximately 1.8 million children are missing from their homes each year. Many of these children are never returned home. The problems and sometimes tragic consequences surrounding the plight of missing children is a real concern that deserves attention.

I applaud the efforts of Mobil Oil Corp., WTTG/Channel 5, and the Acacia Group for making missing children a focus of national attention. It is a timely and much needed public service.●

THE CASE FOR VOA MODERNIZATION

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America is our way of telling America's story abroad. As the appropriations request for VOA came under our consideration, I would ask my colleagues to keep in mind the unquestionable value of telling that story. In many places, it is the only corrective for the fables and lies told by some others.

I recommend to the House the appraisal James Reston makes in the New York Times of March 20, 1985, of the Voice of America's technical and financial requirements:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 20, 1985]

A SHORTWAVE RADIO BATTLE FOR MINDS

MARRAKESH, MOROCCO. The Voice of America is heard every morning in Morocco as clearly and regularly as the crowing of the roosters at sunrise. "This is the news from Washington," it says, as if the Atlas Mountains outside your window were as close as the Blue Ridge of Virginia.

With a careful touch on the radio dial, you hear the conflicting babble of the world: the Moscow radio on more channels than anybody else, loud and accusative; the less frequent voices of the West from West Germany, France and the Netherlands, and the quiet cadences from London: Here is the news, read by so and so in the World Service of the BBC.

These government shortwave stations are indeed a "world service," neglected because they are not heard in their own countries, but they are bringing the news to hear Africa as never before, and reminding at least a remnant of leaders and listeners of what's going on beyond their borders.

Charles Z. Wick, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, was here the other day to note the beginning of a new Voice of America shortwave relay station in Morocco. Others are in the process of negotiation in Israel, and under construction in Sri Lanka and Thailand. Agreements have been reached for new medium-wave transmitters in Costa Rica and Belize to extend the reach of the V.O.A. into Central America.

For while the Voice of America's signal comes clear into Morocco, it is weak in many parts of the Middle East and the eastern provinces of the Soviet Union, where shortwave radio is the main source of information.

What is going on now is not only an argument about "Star Wars" but a different star war, not about missiles but about news and ideas, carried by radio into the remotest valleys of the world.

The balance of radio power between the United States and the Soviet Union is much more favorable to Moscow than the balance of military power. But the Voice of America and its partners, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, still do fairly well.

Broadcasting in 42 languages, they estimate that they reach 110 million listeners, many of whom never hear the news in any other way.

But in this other star war, as in the military war, technology changes the balance, and money makes a difference. For example:

More than 80 percent of the V.O.A.'s 108 transmitters are 15 years old, and more than 35 percent of them are 30 years old.

The V.O.A. broadcasts 989 hours a week in 42 languages, while the Moscow radio broadcasts 2,175 hours a week in 81 languages.

Among the other nations in this other star war game, the United States ranks fifth in hours of broadcasting here in Africa, fifth in hours to Latin America and the Caribbean, and sixth in hours to Eastern Europe and East Asia.

This need not be a worrying thing, for if you listen to the broadcasts in Morocco from the Moscow radio and also from the V.O.A., the BBC and from West Germany, France and the Netherlands, the contrast between Moscow's vicious propaganda and the West's objective reporting of the news—even news the Western countries don't like—is startling.

Nevertheless, there are many areas of Africa, Asia and even Latin America where the reach of the Moscow radio is longer than the reach of the V.O.A. or the BBC. Hence Mr. Wick's travels around the world trying to negotiate new shortwave facilities; in addition, he will be spending the next few months appealing to Congress for money to extend his reach.

His main problem is that the modernization of the V.O.A. cannot be done effectively on a yearly basis but requires at least a five-year building program, which he estimates at a cost of $1.3 to 1.6 billion.

On Capitol Hill, where lawmakers are trying to cut the Federal budget deficit and are even rejecting President Reagan's military budget, getting appropriations for this other propaganda star war won't be easy. But fortunately it's the main war we have these days, and deserves more attention from Congress than it's getting.

The Senate has approved the President's MX missile program by a 55-to-45 vote at a cost of $1.5 billion, which is about the suggested cost of the V.O.A. over the next five years.

Maybe this will have a more powerful influence on the Russians than five years of effective broadcasting by the Voice of America. But in Morocco and in Geneva, the power of the word and the daily sound of America's voice may be more important.●

RECOGNITION FOR EDWARD A. KELLY, JR.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the hard work and dedication to his community demonstrated by one of my constitutents, and good friend, Edward A. Kelly, Jr., of Burlington County, NJ.

Mr. Speaker, Ed Kelly is a servant to the public in the fullest sense of the word, having served the community of Willingboro and Burlington County in a myriad of ways. Currently in his fourth 5-year term as Burlington County clerk, Mr. Kelly has also served on the school board and as mayor of Willingboro.

The list of Ed. Kelly's involvement in community and professional activities causes one to wonder how he has found the hours in a day to fulfill so many obligations. But fulfill them he has, Mr. Speaker, in a cheerful, professional and unselfish manner.

Ed Kelly, is a longtime member of the Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Church, where he dedicated long hours to the drive to build a new church and school. He continues to devote time and energy to the parish as a lector, usher, and carnival worker.

Ed, Mr. Speaker is a member of 10 community service clubs, including the Willingboro Chamber of Commerce where he was elected president. He is a member of the Willingboro Rotary Club, a life member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Ed has served as director of the Burlington County American Red Cross.

A member of the Knights of Columbus since 1945, Ed was twice selected as Knight of the Month in 1974 and 1981. In 1967, his accomplishments led to his selection as an "Outstanding Civic Leader of America" and he has received awards from the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, the Jaycees, the Rotary Club of Willingboro, and the Boy Scouts of America.

Ed has been blessed with a marvelous, supportive companion for all of his endeavors in the person of his wife, Mildred. For the past 35 years, she has worked side by side with Ed, an invaluable source of encouragement and assistance to him.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, one would have to search long and hard to find a more self-sacrificing, generous member of his community. At home, at work, at church, through his involvement in dozens of community projects, Ed Kelly has distinguished himself as a model public servant. I doubt that many have equaled the depth—and breadth—of commitment he has demonstrated over the years.

I congratulate Ed Kelly for a distinguished career of true service to the public. Through his efforts, the lives of senior citizens, young adults, the handicapped, indeed all of the citizens of Burlington County have been greatly enriched.

Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues will want to join me in congratulating Ed Kelly for his tremendous accomplishments and in expressing our gratitude to Americans like him who are willing to give so tirelessly of themselves.●

DEFICIT REDUCTION

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Congress is once again struggling with the very serious task of deficit reduction, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial that recently appeared in the Chicago Tribune:

The nation's governors, Republicans and Democrats alike, showed more sense in their new deficit-reduction proposals than have most of their colleagues in the White House and in Congress. Maybe that's because the governors don't have to take the heat by voting on them.

The governors want everything on the table when the carving begins. The Reagan administration is aiming its knives at federal subsidies for state and local government services and a few forms of middle-income aid, but the governors would go further. At their annual winter meeting in Washington, they asked for a similarly tough-minded approach to the defense budget and to Social Security, Medicare and veterans' pensions. Changes in that rapidly growing trio of entitlement programs are necessary now, the governors said, so that their costs can be controlled in the future.

They're right. President Reagan is not going to make much of an impact on the deficit by continuing to squeeze the small portion of the federal budget that goes to domestic aid while the rest balloons much faster than the inflation rate, year after year. The governors were smart, too, in deciding to concentrate on bringing down the deficit rather than complaining about proposed cuts that will affect their own treasuries. In the long run, an out-of-control federal debt will hurt their governments and their constituents more than the losses the President is asking them to absorb.

If Congress could take a secret ballot, probably most members would endorse the governors' proposals. But since they're the

ones who ultimately have to stand up against the President and against the powerful interest groups that oppose entitlement cuts, they should ask the governors for some help. Will the state executives simply go home and keep quiet now that they've approved their resolution, or will they lobby for the measures they've proposed?

A number of the governors hanker for a tax increase to trim the deficit, but at least their resolution has its priorities in the right order: After the cuts are in place, they said, it "may be necessary" to go after the remaining deficit by increasing revenues. Cut first. Worry about tax increases later. Otherwise the race will be on to use the extra money to restore trims in popular programs.

And, since the governors are taking a long-range view, they should realize that it's in their interest to keep a lid on federal taxes even if that means cuts in state aid. The less money their states send to Washington, the more leeway they have to raise their own revenue and manage their own programs—without the burden of restrictive and costly federal mandates.●

THE CORONA-EAST ELMHURST BRANCH OF THE NAACP HONORS HARRY STEWART

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise now to pay tribute to a visionary and courageous man, Harry Stewart, who is being honored this Saturday by the Corona-East Elmhurst chapter of the NAACP in Queens County, NY.

Harry Stewart has been fighting the senselessness of bigotry all of his life. He took a stand against racial discrimination in 1949, when he took the 25 people then belonging to the Corona branch of the NAACP and built a coalition of justice and brotherhood in the community. Mr. Stewart triumphed in this challenge, as he has throughout his illustrious career. He was elected president of the Corona branch, and served in that capacity for 7 years. Under his leadership, the nucleus of 25 people grew to a stronghold of 500.

In 1956, he left the NAACP to join a labor union to help break down the color barrier there. He later renewed his service in the organization's community branch, and in 1980, he again became president of the chapter, the position which he now holds.

Mr. Speaker, we all know what a force for peace and truth the NAACP has been in this Nation. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is the oldest civil rights organization in the United States. It launched the attack against bigotry long before many other Americans so actively shared that vision.

The Corona-East Elmhurst branch has served the Queens community for 35 years. During that time, our Nation has seen factions at war with each other, divided by prejudice and hatred. We have seen blatant, brutal bigotry that takes the form of violence or intimidation. Many also have experienced subtler forms of discrimination, as they were ignored by neighbors or isolated by the community.

But through organizations like the NAACP, tangible progress has been made in the United States. We are closer to our goals, nearer to our ideals. The Corona-East Elmhurst branch has brought this message to us, in times of upheaval and in times of peace. Its fine officers and others dedicated to its cause have given this community strength and rightness of purpose.

Mr. Speaker, we in Queens owe Harry Stewart a debt of gratitude for his courage. I would also like to commend the dedicated officers of the Corona-East Elmhurst branch for their service: Jeanne Ratteray, first vice president; Robert Majors, second vice president; James Bullard, third vice president; Carolyn Riddick, recording secretary; Maria Atterbury, corresponding Secretary; Edgar Mandeville, treasurer; Helen Wolfe, financial secretary; and Charlotte Braxton, advisor-youth council.

These people have enriched our community, and have enabled some residents in Queens to clasp hands for the first time without fear or hate. Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join with me now in honoring Harry Stewart and the officers of the Corona-East Elmhurst branch of the NAACP.●

THE CIVIL RIGHTS RESTORATION ACT OF 1985 AND THE RIGHTS OF THE HANDICAPPED

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the education and Labor Committee is holding a series of hearings on the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1985, which will soon be taken up by the full House. This is the major piece of civil rights legislation in this decade. I think it is important to discuss fully this legislation, particularly in the face of distortions about what it would do. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education, I am also particularly concerned about the restoration of the rights of the handicapped people under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and want to draw attention to the important role that H.R. 700 plays in restoring those rights.

The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1985 is necessary to restore fully the basic civil rights laws which have governed this country for 20 years and which have extended the fundamental rights of this democratic experiment to all of our citizens independent of race, sex, age, or handicapped condition. The 1984 Supreme Court ruling in Grove City College versus Bell seriously narrowed the coverage of existing civil rights laws, reversing year of enforcement. Both Republican and Democratic administrations have in the past fairly said that tax dollars paid by all Americans should not be used to subsidize discrimination against some. The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1985 recognizes the intention of the law that institutions which receive Federal money cannot discriminate and removes the artificial and discriminatory distinction established by the courts in the Grove City decision.

Often when the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1985 is discussed, its impact on title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 or title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is highlighted. Today, I would like to draw attention to the impact that this legislation will have on section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Section 504 is the major civil rights legislation for disabled individuals. It prohibits recipients of Federal funds from discriminating against disabled people. It prohibits discrimination in employment, education, housing transportation, health services, or any other federally aided programs.

Roughly, one out of six Americans or 37 million people are disabled. Disabled people because of a condition of birth or accident are more often poor or minorities, and thus they suffer from double discrimination and reduced opportunities. According to a 1983 report of the Civil Rights Commission our public education system consistently underserves and undereducates handicapped people—half of whom do not receive an appropriate education.

Rates of unemployment for handicapped workers range from 45 percent to 75 percent despite the fact that most disabled people are willing and able to work. This represents a loss of $1 billion annually in earnings for disabled people because of employment discrimination. We have a long way to go in ensuring full equality for our disabled citizens.

The Grove City court decision represented a major step backward in the fight for equality for disabled Americans. After the decision the Department of Education stopped work on 60 discrimination cases—a fourth of which involve section 504 cases. These included, for example, the case of a deaf women enrolled at West Georgia College who was working to obtain certification as a teacher of disabled students. The college denied her a sign

language interpreter and she filed a complaint with the Office of Civil Rights which found that the college had violated section 504. The case was dropped after Grove City because the specific program in which she had enrolled did not receive Federal funds, although the college does receive almost $2 million in Federal aid, including ironically a $40,000 grant under the Education for all Handicapped Children Act.

Full enforcement of section 504 is the mainstay of providing truly equal opportunity to disabled Americans and integrating them with dignity as full productive citizens in our country. This kind of case makes a cruel mockery of our commitment to the equality of all people in this country.

We have made it a top priority of the 99th Congress to restore the full enforcement of our civil rights legislation including section 504. I commend all of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate and all of the organizations who have joined in this effort.●

SUBMINIMUM WAGE

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much false rhetoric concerning a subminimum wage for youth, it is good to receive a thoughtful, analytical approach on the subject. I am pleased to share with you attorney Donaly Grant's comments on the proposed subminimum wage:

DEAR SIR: The Wednesday, March 13, 1984 edition of the New York Times reports that the National Council of Black Mayors, among others, have endorsed the Reagan Administration's proposal to establish a "subminimum wage" of $2.50 per hour for workers age 16 to 19. The Times also reports that the U.S. Labor Department claims that reducing the minimum wage for teenagers would "induce" businesses to create as many as 400,000 jobs. Given historical realities, I am unable to understand how the proposed bill would redound in any way to the alleviation of unemployment among Black teenagers. My concerns are several and I am convinced that they are not only valid but rooted in the acts of this administration.

First, Labor Department statistics for February 1985 indicate that the unemployment rate for the nation remained "steady." The statistics also indicate that several hundred thousand more people were at work than previously reported. However, as William Raspberry eloquently observed in the Washington Post on March 13, 1985, the jobless rate for blacks "increased" by a statistically significant 1.4 percentage points. Most of which increase is reported to have affected black males.

Second, I am constrained to say that I strongly disagree with the "free enterprise" myth that businesses are anxiously waiting to hire young blacks if they are not required to pay the present minimum wage of $3.35 per hour. My reason is that, as I understand it, the growth in jobs is limited generally to service jobs which require little or no training and allow the easy replacement of workers. There is no empirical evidence that I know of that supports the administration's proposition.

Third, if black male teenagers are not being hired at minimum wages, in a "growing" service economy, what evidence is there that they would be hired merely because the wage was a few cents lower? The Administration's proposition requires us to believe that whites are being hired in increasing numbers at minimum wage and that blacks will only be hired in the same market at lower wages. The implications of that proposition are frightening.

I am opposed to the bill for a far more basic reason. It creates, in my mind, a class of person whose labor is without value. It establishes a class which society has no stake in educating, and the legislation, whether it says so or not, is race specific, as well as segregative in effect, if not purpose. I am sympathetic to the plight of the mayors who support this bill, no doubt in desperation. Of course crime, delinquency and moral problems abound in our cities, however, they will not be eliminated by consigning black youth to this indignity. The problems will not be eliminated in this fashion. It cannot be that these astute men and women are oblivious to the inherent dangers in this legislation. Education is the key to economic and social liberation, not some faulty notion that "slave" labor whose only effect will be to minimally (if at all), reduce the unemployment rates, all without concomitant benefit to the very people who require our best efforts.

In this climate of "Reconstruction politics" it is not too surprising that blacks are willing to acquiesce in the passage of such a law since their condition may be likened to the plantation mentality wherein the "slave" constantly accommodated himself to the pressures of an authoritarian society. The history of this country and others teaches that laws which are segregative and diminutive of the psyche of a specific class or race are destructive and must be resisted. Revanchists, particularly those who lead this country and who seek daily to turn progressive civil rights laws on their head, attempt by this bill to legitimize what is presently a prejudicial and racist system.

I urge you to act in visible opposition to the bill and like attempts to establish sophisticated "black codes."●

UNITED STATES STRATEGIC INTERESTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, a persuasive and important statement was made by Mr. Thomas A. Dine of AIPAC during the course of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East. I want to share a summary of his testimony with my colleagues:

TESTIMONY OF THOMAS A. DINE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF AIPAC, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE AND THE MIDDLE EAST, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, MARCH 7, 1985

The United States has a strategic interest in Israel. Israel is the only country of the Middle East with meaningful free elections, a robust free press, checks and balances to prevent and correct abuses of authority, extensive protections for the rights of individuals and minorities, basic equality for women, and other safeguards and rights that are typical of a free society. It stands in sharp contrast to the other countries of the region, which include feudal monarchies like Saudi Arabia, where all power is permanently concentrated in the hands of a few wealthy princes and where average citizens are under constant surveillance by the religious police and internal security forces; dictatorships like Syria, where the government slaughtered 10,000 of its own citizens three years ago; or radical fundamentalist regimes like Iran, which terrorizes its minorities, suppresses its middle class, and ships off its youth to be slaughtered in a meaningless war.

The American people have long felt an affinity with Israel because of our shared democratic traditions and values. Precisely because of these moral and political ties, the United States has developed a strategic interest in Israel's well-being. As President Reagan has noted, Israel and the United States are "partners in the defense of freedom." Israel, like the United States, is a fighting democracy. The people of Israel, from the ordinary citizen to the leaders of all significant political parties, conceive of their interests in the same way as we do. They stand ready and able to help the United States defend the Free World. In this sense, Israel is an "organic ally." It will be there when we need it. In the vitally important part of the world that Israel inhabits, this is a rare phenomenon indeed. Israel is our only permanent ally in the Middle East and one of only two in the eastern Mediterranean.

This is not to suggest that the United States has no other friends in the region. But it is to suggest that the good relations we enjoy with those other countries are based on understandings with unelected ruling elites in societies where the ordinary person has no special love for the United States or the Western world. As we learned in Iran, such alliances with autocratic and unstable elites can be ended by the next coup or revolution. Moreover, as we are witnessing today, the increasing attraction of anti-Western, Islamic fundamentalism to the Arab masses is already forcing these elites to distance themselves from the United States. The refusal of the Gulf Arabs to grant the United States access rights, Egypt's unwillingness to live up to its strategic commitments at Ras Banas, and Morocco's alliance with Libya, are some of the more egregious examples of the unreliability of most states in the region.

By contrast, the bond between the people of the United States and Israel gives them more than a common sense of purpose. It means that Israel will be allied with the United States over the long term, long after these erstwhile allies of convenience are gone. That Israel is indeed a strategic ally of the United States has been formally recognized in the President's November 1983 announcement of strategic cooperation between the two countries. Since then, over a

14 month period, Israel has demonstrated on multiple occasions its strategic value to the United States. Israel has:

Undertaken military planning with the United States to meet threats to mutual interests in the Middle East and the eastern Mediterranean.

Participated in a joint naval exercise with the Sixth Fleet designed to strengthen U.S. anti-submarine warfare capabilities in the eastern Mediterranean.

Provided access to its ports for regular ship visits by the Sixth Fleet.

Made facilities available for the storage and maintenance of U.S. matrial for American use in a conflict.

Provided twelve of its KFIR fighter aircraft to the U.S. Navy's "aggressor" squadron to help train American fighter pilots.

Engaged in military training exchanges with the United States Marines.

Entered into formal arrangements to provide access to its sophisticated hospital facilities for U.S. military casualties in a conflict. (These facilities have been tested in two joint medical exercises and have already been used to treat U.S. personnel injured in the bombing of the U.S. Embassy annex in east Beirut).

Shared with the U.S. the lessons of its combat experience in Lebanon where Israel successfully used American equipment against Soviet weapons.

Undertaken joint research and development projects with the Pentagon to build on the technological expertise acquired from decades of conflict.

Stepped up its cooperation with the United States to combat international terrorism.

These undertakings have considerable strategic significance for the deterrent posture of the United States in the Middle East and eastern Mediterranean. They provide tangible evidence to the Soviet Union and its clients that U.S. capabilities are supported by Israel. Although, of course, Israel is a small nation, the Soviet Union understands better than some in the West just what this means:

Israel's knowledge and experience with Soviet equipment have for many years helped the United States develop more effective weapons, counter-measures and tactics.

Israel's naval and air forces are sufficiently strong to challenge Soviet naval forces in the eastern Mediterranean and therefore make a significant difference to the Soviet calculus of the balance of power in that area when added to American force deployments.

Israel has demonstrated the vulnerability of Soviet SAMs and MIGs in Lebanon, forcing the Soviet Union to divert expenditures from force expansion to force renovation, and discrediting the weapons on which much Soviet influence depends. This experience deters Soviet trouble making in the region and provides Moscow with a powerful incentive to discourage adventurism in its regional clients.

Nevertheless, strategic cooperation between the United States and Israel is only the most recent visible sign of Israel's vital role as a strategic ally of the United States. Long before the United States entered into these formal strategic arrangements, Israel was playing a critical role in the promotion and protection of U.S. strategic interests in the Middle East. For example:

Israel's relinquishment of the Sinai, at great economic cost and strategic risk, helped to consolidate U.S. ties with Egypt and wean this largest and most powerful Arab state away from the Soviet Union, while stabilizing the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Israel's willingness to mobilize its forces against the Syrians has helped to protect Jordan and maintain the pro-Western regime there on more than one occasion—and the threat of Israeli action remains the only effective deterrent to Syrian designs on Jordan.

Israel's war against the PLO in Lebanon dealt a vital blow to international terrorism and eliminated its global headquarters.

Moreover, Israel's role as an ally of the United States goes well beyond the confines of military cooperation in the Middle East region.

At the United Nations, Israel voted with the United States on more than 93 percent of the General Assembly resolutions introduced in the 38th Session, the highest rate of cooperation of any country in the world. This contrasts with 40.5 percent for Turkey and 26.8 percent for Greece—America's NATO allies in the eastern Mediterranean; it also contrasts with 23.4 percent for Egypt, 19.3 percent for Saudi Arabia and 17.2 percent for Jordan—America's "friends" in the Arab world.

In the Third World, Israel is using its expertise and experience to provide technical assistance to pro-Western developing countries in coordination with the United States. Similarly, Israel is providing security advice and assistance to pro-western governments in other parts of the world.

In the information war, Israel has agreed to install a Voice of America transmitter on its territory to enhance American broadcasts to Soviet Central Asia and Afghanistan, despite the inherent risk of worsening the plight of Soviet Jews. By contrast, America's NATO allies, Greece and Turkey, both refused to host the VOA transmitter because of their unwillingness to endanger their relations with Moscow; reportedly, Oman has also turned the U.S. down.

In short, the people of Israel have demonstrated time and again that they are more than willing to live up to and enrich the ideals and values that we share, and that they are more than able to help defend them in an alien and hostile part of the world. Moreover, in the process of acting together, Israel has demonstrated that it is a capable and reliable partner—a country that we need on our side and a country that we can safely expect to be on our side. Accordingly, the United States has both a serious moral commitment and a vital strategic interest in Israel.

Israel is also a country laboring against great odds, and it is a friend of America whose burdens have, at this moment, accumulated to pose a considerable challenge.

Israel needs America's help now, if its plan for reconstruction and recovery is to succeed. U.S. assistance at this time is essential for several reasons: (1) to ensure that cuts undertaken to strengthen the economy do not weaken Israel's defense and undermine its deterrent; (2) to help manage the debt burden and reserves so that the recovery plan is not capsized by financial disturbances; and (3) to offer the people of Israel a ray of hope for the future, to help them accept the sacrifices that are necessary today.

The sums that the United States spends on aid to Israel are substantial in an absolute sense, but in comparative perspective aid to Israel is one of the least expensive and most effective national security expenditures our country makes.

In FY 1985 for example, we are spending $2.6 billion on aid to Israel, but U.S. expenditures in support of European security are estimated by the New York Times to be $129 billion, and our expenditures for the security of Japan and the countries of East Asia are $47 billion. In this perspective, we spend 50 times as much on Europe, and 18 times as much on Japan and Korea, as we do on Israel.

Put another way, contained in the U.S. defense budget is an average of $10 billion to support the security of each of the 13 European members of NATO, and $8 billion to support the security of each of our six allies in East Asia. While it is difficult exactly to compare expenditures in the foreign aid programs with those that happen to fall within the defense budget, these broad comparisons suggest that our assistance to Israel is actually less than a third as costly as the average amount we spend on other allies. Israel has never asked that American soldiers participate in its defense.

Israel is a democracy, and our one reliable ally in the Middle East. It is a willing partner in the peace process, and a country that shares many of the goals and values that are important to Americans. It is also an ally in trouble, a friend asking for our help.

Israel has a plan to get back on its feet, but needs a special effort on our part during the transitional period. Israel's economy is the foundation of its defense capability, and for this reason the United States has a vital interest in extending the assistance needed to keep our ally strong.●

AMENDING THE HOBBS ACT TO ADDRESS LABOR VIOLENCE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to eliminate the exemption of union officials from Federal prosecution under the Hobbs Act.

The language of this bill states:

> Conduct that occurs in or associated with a labor dispute is wrongful if such conduct would be wrongful in the absence of a labor dispute, and the purpose of such conduct, even if legitimate when furthered by other means, does not make such conduct less wrongful.

The inclusion of the word "wrongful" is the key to continuing problems with decisions regarding union violence. In 1946 Congressman Hobbs defined "extortion" to include the obtaining of property from another, with his consent, induced by wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear.

In 1973 the Supreme Court decided in U.S. versus Enmons, that this law would not apply where a legitimate union objective was the goal of the extortionate behavior. The Court felt that the word "wrongful" would not have been included in the definition of extortion if the Hobbs Act had been meant to apply to all labor violence. However, the Enmons decision

reached by the Supreme Court is in error, because the insertion of the word "wrongful" was to assure opponents that the Hobbs Act was not meant to restrict legitimate activity. Today, it is unfortunately all too evident that this unintended loophole actually encourages the intimidating lawlessness and destruction wrought by unions that is sometimes the mark of labor-management disputes.

My bill will amend the Hobbs Act to restore equity, making sure that labor violence is treated no differently than any other violence falling within the Federal realm. It will eliminate the special exemption now enjoyed by labor, clarifying congressional intent so that the law cannot be again misinterpreted by the courts.●

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO HON. ANTHONY PASQUARIELLO OF PATERSON, NJ, DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN, COMMUNITY LEADER, AND GREAT AMERICAN

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 30 residents of the city of Paterson, my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join together in testimony to a distinguished citizen, community leader, and good friend—Hon. Anthony Pasquariello of Paterson, NJ—whose lifetime of good works and standards of excellence in his daily pursuits have truly enriched our community, State and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our deepest appreciation to Anthony Pasquariello for all of his good deeds and share great pride in the success of his achievements with his good wife Anne, their children, daughter Marlene and husband Ronald Neal, daughter Toni Ann, son Robert and wife Julie, and nine grandchildren.

Anthony Pasquariello is an outstanding individual who throughout his lifetime has earned the respect and esteem of all of us who have had the good fortune to know him. This is particularly manifested in the strong support and depth of friendship that he enjoys among his colleagues who organized the friendship dinner on March 30 in his honor. His personal commitment to the economic, social and cultural enhancement of our community has been a way of life for him.

For four terms Mr. Pasquariello was an alderman in the ninth ward of the city of Paterson. He was also alcoholic beverage commissioner for 12 years and served as clerk to the board of aldermen. He was appointed to the Passaic Valley Water Commission for three terms, served as president and is currently serving as secretary of the commission. He was appointed to the board of elections as a field representative and in 1979 was appointed to his current office of public trust as superintendent of elections.

Mr. Pasquariello has been a staunch supporter and active participant in many civic and community improvement programs. He is also to be commended for his outstanding dedication and sincerity of purpose in seeking to improve the standards of living for our working men and working women and their families as former vice president of United Auto Workers Union—UAW No. 669. He is a member of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks No. 2111, the Knights of Columbus No. 6805, and St. Anthony's Church, Paterson, NJ.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much that can be said of the friendship and goodwill that Anthony Pasquariello has so willingly and abundantly given over these many years that mean so much to the lives of many, many people. As we join together on March 30 in testimony to a good friend and distinguished citizen, we extend the appreciation of the Congress to Anthony for his outstanding contribution to the quality of life and way of life here in America. We do, indeed, salute a great American, Hon. Anthony Pasquariello of Paterson, NJ.●

INTRODUCTION OF THE SUMMER YOUTH EDUCATIONAL ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. EDGAR], the Summer Youth Educational Enhancement Program. This bill would enhance the current Summer Youth Employment and Training Program (title IIB of the Job Training Partnership Act) by adding an educational component to the current work program in which up to 800,000 youths participate each summer.

Over the course of the last few years, the role of education in our society and economy has received much justified attention. The ensuing drive for excellence in education has prompted many needed reforms in Federal, State, and local governmental approaches to education.

Our Nation's greatest resource is its young people and I applaud the many efforts underway in the States to improve our educational system. I am growing increasingly concerned, however, that the reforms being implemented are unlikely to help the most severely disadvantaged young people in our education system. Recent reforms most often take the form of more—more demanding course requirements, more frequent exams and more hours spent in the classroom. For disadvantaged youth, many who have serious educational deficiencies, new and different approaches are needed.

In the past decade we have invested many billions of dollars to test and develop the most effective aproaches for youth employability. What is clear is that disadvantaged youths, given the chance to work, are eager to do so. However, research by employers reveals that a frequent lack of job readiness as well as deficiencies in basic reading and computations skills greatly lessen the productivity of youth and hamper their efforts to find jobs.

The legislation we are proposing—the Summer Youth Educational Enhancement Program—would address these concerns and target aid to those youths most at risk. In addition, the program would attempt to directly address a concern raised by recent research by the Ford Foundation which revealed that a significant difference exists in the experiences of advantaged and disadvantaged youths during the summer months. During the summer, advantaged youths maintain and even improve upon learning gains. Disadvantaged youth, however, may actually lose ground. Each year these youths fall further and further behind, increasing their in-school frustrations, causing many of them to eventually drop out of school.

In brief the legislation:

Would complement the current activities of the summer jobs programs and provide more comprehensive services to program participants.

Channels funds through chapter I of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. For years, the Congress has sought through various mechanisms to improve coordination between the education systems and the employment and training community. The fact is that coordination occurs only sporadically.

Our bill differs from the previous set-aside approach to coordination, in that the incentives and mandates for cooperation between the systems exist equally of both sides. Coordination between the local education agency and the employment community would keep duplication of services at a minimum as well as provide more comprehensive assistance to disadvantaged youths; and

Avoids the need to amend the Job Training Partnership Act or alter any current chapter I program.

This legislation was developed during a series of field hearings held

by the Northeast-Midwest Institute. Two hearings, which I had the privilege of chairing, were devoted to examining how youths can improve their educational skills level and employability. Particular attention was paid to the special problems and needs of disadvantaged youth.

In times of growing Federal deficits I have thought very carefully before introducing this bill which authorizes $100 million to carry out these activities. What prompted me to introduce this legislation is the serious and growing problem facing disadvantaged youth which necessitates prompt Federal action. Second, I would emphasize that we are very flexible on the funding issue and have been exploring ways to fund this program while not losing sight of our serious Federal debt problem. In our search for funding sources we propose one possible way to provide the needed funds for this program while not increasing funding above last year's levels.

In each of the last sessions, we appropriated an additional $100 million for the 1984 and 1985 summer jobs programs in order to correct a problem created inadvertently by a formula change in the transition from CETA to the Job Training Partnership Act. In the transition, many central cities would have lost substantial program funds without this supplemental which brings those areas most adversely affected by the new formula back up to 90 percent of the previous year's levels.

A correction in the formula would allow the $100 million that would have been needed in the absence of a formula change to be used to fund the legislation we are proposing. In this way the Federal Government would be responding to the urgent need to addressing this Nation's serious youth unemployment problem while not raising the funding level of the chapter I and Job Training Partnership Act above last year's levels.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is timely and appropriate. I request that a copy of my complete remarks as well as a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

H.R. 1722

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

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Summer Youth Educational Enhancement Act".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(1) there exist serious deficiencies in basic educational attainment among many youth, particularly among those youth who are economically disadvantaged;

(2) findings from research show that these deficiencies are aggravated during the summer months when disadvantaged youth actually regress in educational attainment compared to their more advantaged peers; and

(3) Congress has previously stated its interest in enhancing basic educational attainment in both chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act and part B of title II of the Job Training Partnership Act (summer youth employment and training programs).

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 3. It is the purpose of this Act—

(1) to reaffirm the Congress intention that the summer youth employment and training programs include a component for remediation of basic educational deficiencies; and

(2) to provide additional incentives, beginning in the summer of 1985, to encourage State and local authorities to prepare disadvantaged youth for sustained academic achievement and entry into the workforce.

AUTHORIZATION AND ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 4. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Education for fiscal year 1985 and each of the three succeeding fiscal years $100,000,000 to carry out this Act.

(b) Funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall be allocated among State education agencies in proportion to their allocations for the preceding fiscal year under chapter 1 of the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981.

(c) Section 594 of such Act (relating to the availability of appropriations) shall apply to funds appropriated to carry out activities under this Act.

USE OF FUNDS; AGREEMENTS AND APPLICATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) Funds allocated to a State educational agency pursuant to section 4(b) for any fiscal year shall be made available by such agency to local educational agencies within that State for expenditure for programs that—

(1) provide basic and remedial education to participants in the summer youth employment and training programs operated under part B of title II of the Job Training Partnership Act; and

(2) are operated in conjunction with such employment and training programs.

(b) In order to receive funds under this Act from a State educational agency, a local educational agency shall enter into an agreement with the administrative entity (under the Job Training Partnership Act) for the appropriate service delivery area. Such agreement shall provide for the operation of programs under this Act in accordance with the requirements of subsection (a).

(c) The State educational agency may approve an application by a local educational agency for a grant from funds under this Act if the application—

(1) contains or is accompanied by the agreement required by subsection (b); and

(2) provides assurances satisfactory to the State educational agency that the programs described are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting the special educational needs of the youth being served.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 6. As used in this Act—

(1) the terms "State educational agency" and "local educational agency" have the meanings provided in section 595(a) of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act;

(2) the term "administrative entity" has the meaning provided in section 4 of the Job Training Partnership Act; and

(3) the term "service delivery area" means a service delivery area established under section 101 of such Act.●

THE PURSUIT OF FREEDOM AND UNITY FOR IRELAND ENCOMPASSES MOST OF THE 20TH CENTURY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the bipartisan Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs, I have been actively involved in urging a more positive U.S. role in the pursuit of a political solution to the ongoing problems in Northern Ireland.

One of the most commonly discussed future political solutions is a united Ireland. If one goes back to the Proclamation of Easter 1916, it is spelled out in the context of the Irish people's fundamental constitutional rights to sovereignty, independence, and unity. Subsequent statutes, including the Constitution of Ireland of July 1, 1937, the Republic of Ireland Act of 1948, and the unanimous Declaration of Dail Eireann of May 10, 1949, reiterated these principles.

On May 2 we observe the first anniversary of the final report of the New Ireland Forum, an important and constructive group which reiterated many of these principles as part of their recommendations. Yet almost 1 year later we continue to see intransigence and resistance on the part of the British Government to even consider these recommendations in the context of a political solution. One hopes that this shortsightedness can be remedied in the very near future and progress can go forward and the path to peace is a forward-moving one.

In an effort to place this issue in its proper historical context, I wish to place two items in the RECORD at this point. One is a document entitled, "Ireland's Right to Sovereignty, Independence, and Unity Is Inalienable and Indefeasible," which includes a foreword by Hon. Sean MacBride, S.C., a former Nobel Peace Prize winner. The article will be preceded with an introduction by Father Sean McManus, National Director of the Irish National Caucus, an organization which has been in the forefront of work in America on behalf of peace and justice for all of Ireland.

INTRODUCTION BY: FATHER SEAN MCMANUS

The purpose of the Irish National Caucus is to get the United States to recognize that Ireland, too, has the right to be One Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

One of our most esteemed advisors in Ireland is the Honorable Sean MacBride, Nobel Peace Prize and American Medal of Justice Winner.

Mr. MacBride is one of the greatest Irishmen of this Century. Throughout his illustrious life he has championed Ireland's cause. He has provided a very practical and timely service by producing "Ireland's Right to Sovereignty, Independence, and Unity Is Inalienable and Indefeasible."

I urge all Members of Congress to use it as a basic guideline on the Irish issue.

IRELAND'S RIGHT TO SOVEREIGNTY, INDEPENDENCE, AND UNITY IS INALIENABLE AND INDEFEASIBLE

(The Irish People's fundamental Constitutional Rights to Sovereignty, Independence and Unity in this Century are set forth in the Proclamation of Easter 1916, the Declaration of Independence of 21 January 1919, the Constitution of Ireland of 1 July 1937, the Republic of Ireland Act 1948, and the unanimous Declaration of Dail Eireann of 10 May 1949 transmitted to all the Parliaments of the world)

FOREWORD BY SEAN MAC BRIDE, S.C.

For centuries, Britain has sought to conquer, dominate and rule Ireland. For centuries, the Irish People have sought to free Ireland from British rule. Britain, a large, powerful and ruthless colonial power, was able to defeat the numerous and sustained efforts of the Irish People to liberate themselves. In the course of the 19th century, as a result of British oppression and famine, the population of Ireland was halved.

It was only in the course of this century, following upon the Rising of Easter 1916, that Britain in 1921 had to relinquish her military and political occupation of the greater part of the island of Ireland. However, concurrently, she was able to impose under threat of "immediate and terrible war" the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1922 whereby Britain was enabled to continue to occupy six of the nine counties of the province of Ulster. The imposition of the Treaty of 1922, of the partition of Ireland and of the Constitution of the Irish Free State led to a bitter Civil War in Ireland, the political effects of which have continued to the present date. It is thus that the partition of Ireland was imposed on Ireland against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of the people of Ireland.

It should be noted that neither the Treaty of 1922 nor the Constitution of 1922 were ever submitted to the Irish People. Indeed, the Constitution of 1937 which was adopted by the Irish People by referendum, abrogated both the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1922 and the Constitution of the Irish Free State of 1922, insofar as these ever had any validity.

Centuries of English misrule in Ireland have led to oppression and famine which have caused many millions of Irish to die. British interference in Ireland led to the Civil War which has disrupted the life of the country for several decades. The imposition of partition has led to a permanent insurrectionary situation in the six North Eastern counties of Ireland which, since 1969, has caused over 2,300 deaths and the maiming of some 24,000 people. In the past 14 years there have been over 43,000 separate incidents of shootings and bombings. In the North, unarmed Republican suspects are shot at sight by British forces; many sectarian and political assassinations have been carried out either directly by British forces or have been instigated by British secret service agents. British appointed judges have justified the operations of police and military assassination squads in the North.

Persons employed by the British secret service have carried out criminal activities, including bank robberies and assassinations, within the territory of the Republic in order to promote greater destabilisation. British secret service moles have on occasion infiltrated the security services of the Republic in order to create confusion and dissension. The spillover of the insurrectionary situation in the North has caused many problems in the Republic and a departure from the normal and proper application of the Rule of Law. British and Irish jails are bursting at the seams with Irish Republican political prisoners. many of these prisoners have been illtreated and subjected to degrading and inhuman treatment.

In order to impose her conquest of Ireland, British expropriated the lands of the Catholic population of Ireland and gave them to settlers from Britain. While the majority of these became absorbed in the Irish population, a number of them were encouraged by Britain to maintain their allegiance to Britain instead of Ireland. This was done by political patronage and financial inducements; it is this minority of the Irish people, who with the encouragement and support of the British Government, opposed the reunification of Ireland. The partition of Ireland only exists today by virtue of the vast financial and military resources which Britain uses to maintain it.

The British Government like to pretend that they are merely playing the role of the "honest broker" between that minority of the British settlers and the Irish people and that they are prepared to withdraw from Ireland if they are asked to do so by that minority. However, this is not borne out by the confidential minutes of the British Cabinet which have been released recently and which state categorically:

"So far as can be foreseen, it will *never* be to Great Britain's advantage that Northern Ireland should form part of a territory outside. His Majesty's jurisdiction. Indeed, it seems unlikely that Great Britain would *ever* be able to agree to this *even if the people of Northern Ireland desired it.*" (Public Records Office, London: Cabinet Papers 49(4).)

Ireland's right to sovereignty, independence and unity are inalienable and indefensible. It is for the Irish people as a whole to determine the future status of Ireland. Neither Britain nor a small minority selected by Britain has any right to partition the ancient island of Ireland, nor to determine its future as a sovereign nation. The precept laid down by President Abraham Lincoln on 18 February 1861 is as applicable to Ireland as it was applicable to the United States when it was fighting for its independence and unity:

"On what rightful principle may a state, being not more than one-fifth part of the Nation in soil and population, break up the nation and then cause a proportionately larger sub-division of itself in a most arbitrary way?"

The Anglican Bishop of Salisbury, Most Reverend Dr. John Austin Baker, a leading Church of England theologian, who was Chaplain to the British House of Commons, made the truest and most concise analysis of British policy towards Ireland in 1980 during the Long Kesh hunger strike:

"No British Government ought ever to forget that this perilous moment, like many before it, is the outworking of a history for which our country is primarily responsible. England seized Ireland for its own military benefit. It planted Protestant settlers there to make it strategically secure. It humiliated and penalised the native Irish and their Catholic religion; and then, when it could no longer hold on to the whole island, it kept back part to be a home for the settlers' descendants, a non-viable solution from which Protestants have suffered as much as anyone.

"Our injustice created the situation; and by constantly repeating that we will maintain it so long as the majority wish it, we actively inhibit Protestant and Catholic from working out a new future together. This is the root of violence, and the reason why the protesters think of themselves as political offenders."

The historic constitutional documents reproduced hereunder represent the Charter of Liberty of the Irish People.

THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT OF THE IRISH REPUBLIC

TO THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND

Irishmen and Irishwomen: In the name of God and of the dead generations from which she receives her old tradition of nationhood, Ireland, through us, summons her children to her flag and strikes for her freedom.

Having organised and trained her manhood through her secret revolutionary organisation, the Irish Republican Brotherhood, and through her open military organisations, the Irish Volunteers and the Irish Citizen Army, having patiently perfected her discipline, having resolutely waited for the right moment to reveal itself, she now seizes that moment, and, supported by her exiled children in America and by gallant allies in Europe, but relying in the first on her own strength, she strikes in full confidence of victory.

We declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, to be sovereign and indefeasible. The long usurpation of that right by a foreign people and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished except by the destruction of the Irish people. In every generation the Irish people have asserted their right to national freedom and sovereignty: six times during the past three hundred years they have asserted it in arms. Standing on that fundamental right and again asserting it in arms in the face of the world, we hereby proclaim the Irish Republic as a Sovereign Independent State, and we pledge our lives and the lives of our comrades-in-arms to the cause of its freedom of its welfare, and of its exaltation among the nations.

The Irish Republic is entitled to, and hereby claims, the allegiance of every Irishman and Irishwoman. the Republic guarantees religious and civil liberty, equal rights and equal opportunities to all its citizens, and declares its resolve to pursue the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and of all its parts, cherishing all the children of the nation equally, and obvious of the differences carefully fostered by an alien government, which have divided a minority from the majority in the past.

Until our arms have brought the opportune moment for the establishment of a permanent National Government, representative of the whole people of Ireland and elected by the suffrages of all her men and women, the Provisional Government,

hereby constituted, will administer the civil and military affairs of the Republic in trust for the people.

We place the cause of the Irish Republic under the protection of the Most High God. Whose blessing we invoke upon our arms, and we pray that no one who serves that cause will dishonour it by cowardice, inhumanity, or rapine. In this supreme hour the Irish nation must, by its valour and discipline and by the readiness of its children to sacrifice themselves for the common good, prove itself worthy of the august destiny to which it is called.

Signed on Behalf of the Provisional Government,

THOMAS J. CLARKE.
SEAN MAC DIARMADA.
P. H. PEARSE.
JAMES CONNOLLY.
THOMAS MACDONAGH.
EAMONN CEANNT.
JOSEPH PLUNKETT.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

21st January 1919, First Dail Eireann, Enacted by the Parliament of the Republic of Ireland

Whereas the Irish People is by right a free people:

And whereas for seven hundred years the Irish People has never ceased to repudiate and has repeatedly protested in arms against foreign usurpation:

And whereas English rule in this country is, and always has been, based upon force and fraud and maintained by military occupation against the declared will of the people:

And whereas the Irish Republic was proclaimed in Dublin on Easter Monday, 1916, by the Irish Republican Army, acting on behalf of the Irish People:

And whereas the Irish People is resolved to secure and maintain its complete independence in order to promote the common weal, to re-establish justice, to provide for future defense, to ensure peace at home and good will with all nations, and to constitute a national policy based upon the people's will with equal right and equal opportunity for every citizen:

And whereas the threshold of a new era in history the Irish electorate has in the General Election of December, 1918, seized the first occasion to declare by an overwhelming majority its firm allegiance to the Irish Republic:

Now, therefore, we, the elected Representatives of the ancient Irish People in National Parliament assembled, do, in the name of the Irish Nation, ratify the establishment of the Irish Republic and pledge ourselves and our people to make this declaration effective by every means at our command:

We ordain that the elected Representatives of the Irish People alone have power to make laws binding on the people of Ireland, and that the Irish Parliament is the only Parliament to which that people will give its allegiance:

We solemnly declare foreign government in Ireland to be an invasion of our national right which we will never tolerate, and we demand the evacuation of our country by the English Garrison:

We claim for our national independence the recognition and support of every free nation in the world, and we proclaim that independence to be a condition precedent to international peace hereafter:

In the name of the Irish People we humbly commit our destiny to Almighty God. Who gave our fathers the courage and determination to presevere through long centuries of a ruthless tyranny, and strong in the justice of the cause which they have handed down to us, we ask His Divine blessing on this the last stage of the struggle we have pledged ourselves to carry through to freedom.

(Dail Eireann: Minutes of the Proceedings of the First Parliament of the Republic of Ireland, 21st January 1919.)

THE CONSTITUTION OF IRELAND

(Enacted by the People on 1st July 1937)

In the Name of the Most Holy Trinity, from Whom is all authority and to Whom, as our final end, all actions both of men and States must be referred,

We, the people of Eire,

Humbly acknowledging all our obligations to our Divine Lord Jesus Christ, Who sustained our fathers through centuries of trial,

Gratefully remembering their heroic and unremitting struggle to regain the rightful independence of our Nation,

And seeking to promote the common good, with due observance of Prudence, Justice and Charity, so that the dignity and freedom of the individual may be assured, true social order attained, the unity of our country restored, and concord established with other nations,

Do hereby adopt, enact, and give to ourselves this Constitution.

THE NATION

ARTICLE 1. The Irish nation hereby affirms its inalienable, indefeasible and sovereign right to choose its own form of Government, to determine its relations with other nations, and to develop its life, political economic and cultural, in accordance with its own genius and traditions.

ARTICLE 2. The national territory consists of the whole island of Ireland, its islands and the territorial seas.

ARTICLE 3. Pending the re-integration of the national territory, and without prejudice to the right of the Parliament and Government established by this Constitution to exercise jurisdiction over the whole of that territory, the laws enacted by that Parliament shall have the like area and extent of application as the laws of Saorstát Eireann and the like extra-territorial effect.

THE STATE

ARTICLE 4. The name of the State is Eire, or in the English language, Ireland.

ARTICLE 5. Ireland is a sovereign, independent, democratic state.

EIRE

Number 22 of 1948.

THE REPUBLIC OF IRELAND ACT, 1948

An Act to repeal the Executive Authority (External Relations) Act, 1936, to declare that the description of the State shall be the Republic of Ireland, and to enable the President to exercise the executive power or any executive function of the State in or in connection with its external relations.

[21st December, 1948.]

Be it enacted by the Oireachtas as follows:

1.—The Executive Authority (External Relations) Act, 1936 (No. 58 of 1936), is hereby repealed.

2.—It is hereby declared that the description of the State shall be the Republic of Ireland.

3.—The President, on the authority and on the advice of the Government, may exercise the executive power or any executive function of the State in or in connection with its external relations.

4.—This Act shall come into operation on such day as the Government may by order appoint.

5.—This Act may be cited as The Republic of Ireland Act, 1948.

UNANIMOUS DECLARATION OF DAIL EIREANN ADOPTED ON THE JOINT PROPOSITION OF: AN TAOISEACH: JOHN A. COSTELLO AND LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION EAMON DE VALERA ON 10TH MAY, 1949

"Dail Eireann,

"Solemnly re-asserting the indefeasible right of the Irish Nation to the unity and integrity of the national territory,

"Re-affirming the sovereign right of the people of Ireland to choose its own form of Government and, through its democratic institutions, to decide all questions of national policy, free from outside interference,

"Repudiating the claim of the British Parliament to enact legislation affecting Ireland's territorial integrity in violation of those rights, and

"Pledging the determination of the Irish people to continue the struggle against the unjust and unnatural partition of our country until it is brought to a successful conclusion;

"Places on record its indignant protest against the introduction in the British Parliament of legislation purporting to endorse and continue the existing Partition of Ireland, and

"Calls upon the British Government and people to end the present occupation of our Six North Eastern Counties, and thereby enable the unity of Ireland to be restored and the age-long differences between the two nations brought to an end."

On the same date Dail Eireann directed that the above Declaration be transmitted to the Governments and the Parliaments of all countries with whom Ireland had diplomatic relations.

(The foregoing Resolution of Dail Eireann represents the only Declaration of Policy in regard to Partition adopted by Dail Eireann since the Constitution of Ireland was enacted by the People on the 1st July 1937.)

"THE ANGLO-IRISH TREATY 1922" AND THE IRISH FREE STATE CONSTITUTION

The present Constitutional status of Ireland is set forth and defined in the Constitutional instruments that are included in the foregoing pages. It is noteworthy that insofar as the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 6th December 1921 and the Constitution of the Irish Free State of 1922 are concerned, these were never submitted to, or adopted by, the Irish People; insofar as any validity was claimed for them, it is clear that the Constitution of Ireland, 1937, and the Republic of Ireland Act, 1948, had the effect of repealing both the Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921, and the Constitution of the Irish Free State of 1922.

THE NEW IRELAND FORUM

The New Ireland Forum, composed of representatives of the Fianna Fail Party, the Fine Gael Party, the Labour Party, and the Social Democratic Labour Party, met in Dublin on 30th May 1983 and produced its Final Report on 2nd May 1984. The proceedings of the New Ireland Forum were constructive and the research work undertaken under its supervision was valuable. Its Report is somewhat discursive but in Chapter Five, Paragraph 7, it concludes:

"The particular structure of political unity which the Forum would wish to see

established is a unitary state, achieved by agreement and consent, embracing the whole island of Ireland and providing irrevocable guarantees for the protection and preservation of both the Unionist and Nationalist identities."

Some of the other options canvassed in the course of the New Ireland Forum Report appear to envisage a limitation on the right of the Irish people to exercise sovereignty over "the whole island of Ireland, its islands and the territorial seas". Such options would be manifestly unconstitutional and divisive.

However, no solution will be viable unless the British Government can be persuaded to recognize that Ireland's right to sovereignty, unity and neutrality are inalienable and that Britain must refrain from interfering directly, or indirectly, by overt or by covert means, in the affairs of Ireland North or South.●

NATIONAL CORRECT POSTURE WEEK

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would designate May 1-7, 1985, as "National Correct Posture Week."

For many years, the American Chiropractic Association has sponsored a National Correct Posture Week on May 1-7. Throughout the country during this observance each year, professional and community groups, public officials, and perhaps most importantly, public and private schools have been encouraged by the chiropractic profession to focus attention on correct posture's contribution to overall health and physical appearance. The chiropractic profession's efforts to augment the fine purpose of the President's Council on Physical Fitness deserves our support.

The chiropractic profession in particular has researched and studied the spine for nearly 100 years. Chiropractors are health care specialists in knowledge of the spine and its effect on general body health.

The tenet that correct posture is one of the most important paths to good, general health is not exclusive to chiropractic practitioners, but is one shared by medical and chiropractic authorities alike, public health officials, nurses, psychiatrists, the armed services, pediatricians, and industrial relations specialists to name a few. There is general unanimity within the healing arts that good posture and good health are inseparable.

It is, then entirely appropriate that the Congress join in this effort this year, in promoting correct posture and in encouraging the President to involve every American, through Presidential proclamation, in getting back to basics in personal health care.

The United States has some of the highest standards of health, sanitation and general well-being of any country in the world. All too often, however, we have failed to take as seriously as we should the familiar, but all too easily dismissed, exhortation of every mother, father, grandparent, and aunt and uncle: "sit up—mind your posture!"

Of course, in any campaign for good posture, our focus must be on our youth. The business of a strong body is not something obtained overnight. You have to start early and work at it. If we are to be the strong, growth-oriented, vigorous Nation that we have always been, it requires a healthy, robust, and self-confident citizenry—qualities that must carry over from correct posture learned as a child and good physical development.

In a time when so many Americans are concerned about physical fitness and health, the discipline of good posture is possibly the easiest means toward better health and personal appearance.

Since President Kennedy, this Nation has dedicated itself to national fitness. I urge my colleagues to join me in this resolution to highlight one of the simplest approaches to fitness and health.●

HOUSE PASSED NEW GI BILL

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 26, 1985

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for a bill passed by the House yesterday, H.R. 752, "New GI Bill Amendments of 1985." This legislation, introduced by the distinguished Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, SONNY MONTGOMERY, was reported unanimously by our Committee as well as by the Armed Services Committee, to which the bill was jointly referred.

By way of background, the Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 1985, title VII of the fiscal year 1985 Defense Authorization Act, Public Law 98-525, established a new educational assistance program for those individuals who initially enter active duty on or after July 1, 1985. A similar program was established for those in the selected reserve. A major purpose of this new GI bill is to assist in the recruitment and retention of high quality personnel for the Nation's Armed Forces.

As passed by the House last year, the new GI bill would have had an effective date of October 1, 1984. Because the other body insisted in Conference that the effective date be July 1, 1985, the House conferees were forced to reluctantly accept this provision. As expected, the services soon contacted this committee, telling us that the delayed effective date of the new program would cause serious recruitment problems for them. They feared that the bright young people the program is designed to attract would delay enlisting in the Armed Forces until the first of July so that they would qualify for the new GI bill. This surge of new entrants would disrupt and overburden military training programs which are geared to an orderly flow of new recruits.

Additionally, the House-passed GI bill would have extended educational assistance benefits to those on active duty as of October 1, 1984, who continued on active duty for the required period of time. At the insistence of the other body, the conferees were forced to accept a provision limiting benefits to those who first enter on active duty on or after July 1, 1985. The effect of this provision is to prohibit those individuals with prior service who choose to reenter the military from establishing entitlement to the GI bill benefits. Prior service personnel are particularly attractive recruits because they require little training and often reenter the military with high tech skills that are needed in today's sophisticated Armed Forces. To refuse to provide the armed services with a tool they need to attract these experienced personnel is shortsighted and poor management.

H.R. 752, which addresses both of the above-mentioned concerns, would do two things. First, it would move back the effective date of the new GI bill to the date of enactment of H.R. 752, thus enabling the armed services to avoid major disruptions of their training schedules and possible recruiting shortfalls. Second, it would extend eligibility for the active duty GI bill benefits to prior service personnel who return to active duty after a break in service, thereby providing the services with an attractive incentive to bring these people back into the military.

H.R. 752 is a good bill, and I commend our chairman, SONNY MONTGOMERY, for introducing this legislation and facilitating its rapid passage. I also want to commend JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, the ranking minority member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, for his cooperation and support. Finally, I want to express my thanks to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, LES ASPIN. I appreciate his efforts on behalf of H.R. 752, and I know he will be working with us in the future to see that the new GI bill is as efficient and effective as possible.●

THE SHIFTING TIDE OF TAXES

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal about tax reform.

It may take a surge of public sentiment to bring about an overhaul of the Federal Tax Code—as this article suggests—but such a overhaul will be well worth the effort.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 22, 1985]

THE TIDE SHIFTS TOWARD TAX REFORM

(By Albert R. Hunt)

Oscar Wilde once noted that "a man cannot be too careful in the choice of his enemies." That probably occurred to Jim Baker at his recent confirmation hearings before the Senate Finance Committee.

The incoming Treasury secretary was greeted warmly, but the department's tax-simplification plan—which would lower individual and corporate tax rates and broaden the base by eliminating most write-offs—picked up almost as many enemies as there were senators there.

Committee Chairman Bob Packwood (R., Ore.) criticized proposed taxes on fringe benefits; New York Democrat Daniel P. Moynihan complained about not permitting deductions for state and local taxes; David Boren, Oklahoma Democrat, warned that the measure would hurt the oil and gas industry, endangering National Security; Steve Symms, Idaho Republican, complained about the effects on the life-insurance industry; and Sen. Spark Matsunaga, Hawaii Democrat, warned that under such a plan the macadamia nut industry never would have flourished.

With so many enemies, the conventional wisdom—on Wall Street as well as in Washington—is that any tax-overhaul scheme won't fly.

Don't bet on it. Actually, the odds are improving for some combination of a revised Treasury plan with the Democratic Bradley-Gephardt and GOP Kemp-Kasten bills. Despite the vehement protest from affected interests, public support is there for these concepts.

PUBLIC DESIRE FOR CHANGE

"There clearly is a public desire for tax change," says Republican poll taker Bob Teeter, "and the fundamental idea of less deductions and lower rates is gaining acceptance. Public opinion is moving very fast the last couple of weeks. This is an idea whose time is coming."

Mr. Teeter's Democratic counterpart, Peter Hart, agrees. "The public thinks the current tax system is unfair, doesn't work very well and is too complicated," he says. The Treasury and congressional tax-simplification schemes "fit in the broader theme of reducing special privileges, which has a huge amount of popular support, whether it's getting welfare queens or big boys ripping off the tax system."

Both agree that the keys are Mr. Reagan's active support for a tax measure and its proponents' ability to capitalize on the fairness issue. "The strongest desire here isn't for simplification, but for fairer taxes," says Mr. Teeter. "Much of the public feels, not so much that they are paying too much, but that a lot of people get away without paying their fair share."

The public resentment is illustrated by some of the exaggerations and distortions paraded forth by tax-overhaul critics in recent weeks. A major theme is that any plan would cause cataclysmic dislocations. Sen. Bill Bradley of New Jersey, the main Democratic proponent of tax change, responds simply: "You don't find all the people who're going to get tax cuts complaining about dislocation."

A quick glance at the critics underscores this point. The National Association of Manufacturers, for example, recently released a study on the effects of the Treasury plan, using a model prepared by Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates. The study concluded that by curbing accelerated depreciation and other tax breaks, the proposal would cause a substantial reduction in business investment.

But this study gave the back of its hand to an economically attractive feature of the proposal: Its neutral treatment of different sorts of income, which should channel some capital out of tax-sheltered enterprises and into more productive ones. Moreover, models such as Wharton's "are designed only to look at short-run effects," says Harvey Galper, an economist at the Brookings Institution. "They are not designed to capture structural changes such as the Treasury plan."

To be sure, even some champions of tax simplification acknowledge that some investment could be stifled. So, they say, some adjustments are necessary. But as long as major companies like General Electric, General Dynamics and W.R. Grace haven't been paying federal income taxes—whatever the economic justifications—the average taxpayer will think the system is unfair.

The NAM's criticism pales next to the rhetoric of the National Association of Realtors. The Realtors claim that in embracing the tax-simplification proposal, then Treasury Secretary Donald Regan "was reneging on President Reagan's commitment . . . to preserve the home mortgage interest deduction.

Mr. Regan's egregious offense here wasn't that he touched the basic home mortgage interest deduction, which the Treasury would leave intact. What upset the Realtors is the proposal to limit this write-off for second or vacation homes. Now, my wife and I recently bought a weekend home, which we expect to enjoy immensely. But to expect taxpayers to underwrite this enjoyment is ludicrous. The Treasury should eliminate, not just modify, this $700 million annual subsidy of vacation homes.

Some critics also express concern at taking away the deductions for state and local taxes, especially in high tax states such as New York. Gov. Mario Cuomo denounces this proposal as unfair to his state's poor working citizens.

The governor overlooks some facts. In 1986, according to Treasury calculations, the median family income in New York State will be $35,160. Under the current code, the average Empire State citizen would pay $3,205 taxes on that income; under the Treasury proposal—even without deductions for state and local taxes—this average taxpayer would pay $3,182, or $23 less. The marginal tax rate of this average New Yorker would drop to 15% from 22%. Moreover, Gov. Cuomo usually neglects to point out that 60% of New Yorkers don't itemize state and local deductions, and thus those he champions so fervently are predominantly upper-income taxpayers. (Nationally, two-thirds of all taxpayers don't itemize.)

Critics also distort public opinion. Recently, a group called the Committee for a Responsible Tax Policy released a survey by New York pollsters Penn & Schoen concluding that "when given the outlines of the proposed Treasury tax revision, U.S. voters reject the plan by a wide margin"—better than 2 to 1 against.

Consider, though, the question: "The Treasury Department has proposed changing the tax system. Three tax brackets would be created but most current deductions from income would be eliminated. Non-federal income taxes and property taxes would not be deductible, and many deductions would be limited. Do you favor or oppose this proposal?" There's no mention that rates would be cut sharply or that personal exemption would double. The only surprise is that 27% of the respondents actually supported the position as stated.

Pollsters Teeter and Hart say that public opinion decidedly favors any proposal that cuts rates, broadens the tax base and reduces the number of tax brackets from 15 to three.

Still, there are big hurdles. Mr. Reagan must make this a top priority; his abysmal ignorance of the Treasury proposal in a recent interview with this newspaper wasn't an auspicious sign. And if Jim Baker, a superb politician with a penchant for compromise, is perceived to be taking care of groups like his Texas oil buddies, public support "could bleed from a thousand cuts," warns Mr. Hart.

Nevertheless, the more these proposals are aired, the more support they pick up. This is evident in a small, but growing, segment of the business community that is impressed by the idea of simplicity and by the cut in the corporate tax rate from 46% (the effective rate paid now is only about half that) to 30% or 35% under various proposals.

Two weeks ago the four principal congressional sponsors—Sens. Bill Bradley and Robert Kasten and Congressmen Jack Kemp and Richard Gephardt—trotted out endorsements from more than a dozen executives for the concept of lowering rates and broadening the base. There was impressive diversity, ranging from the chief executive officers of such major companies as IBM and Singer to J. McDonald Williams, managing partner of Trammell Crow Co., the huge Dallas-based real-estate concern.

Real-estate write-offs supposedly are clobbered by tax simplification, but Mr. Williams offered a cogent case for his support. "The real-estate industry has too much tax-driven investments, and that's resulting in overbuilding and a series of problems, he said. Under tax simplification, If there is a fair comparison of returns in real estate vs. other investments, then we can pay more taxes. . . . In the long run, that will be healthier for our industry, although in the short run it's difficult and means higher taxes."

FAVORABLE POLITICAL WINDS

David McLaughlin, president of Dartmouth College, took a similarly long-range view on the issue of limiting charitable contributions. "In the short run, undoubtedly, there are effects . . . that would have some negative consequences to an institution like Dartmouth," he said. But, he argued, "tax simplification and tax revision make a

stronger economy," which in the long run will help such institutions.

There are favorable political winds, too, especially in House Ways and Means Chairman Dan Rostenkowski's enthusiasm for passing a tax measure this year. Privately, more and more Democrats lament the disastrous blunder Walter F. Mondale made last year when he flatly rejected making the Bradley-Gephardt bill a centerpiece of his campaign.

Finally, the similarities between the Treasury proposal and the two major congressional initiatives are far more striking than are the differences. That will facilitate any compromise. "The thrust in all three is the same," says Ronald A. Pearlman, acting assistant treasury secretary for tax policy. "Everyone wants rates down and the base broadened."

A few months ago, optimists were saying that tax simplification was an idea whose time was coming. A few months from now, it may have arrived.●

VOTING RECORD

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has become my practice from time to time to list my votes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I strongly believe that the people of the Second District of Arizona have a right to know where I stand on the issues decided by this body, and I have found that printing my record here is the best way to provide that information.

This is not an all inclusive list. I have omitted noncontroversial votes such as quorum calls, motions to resolve into the Committee of the Whole House, and motions to approve the Journal of the previous day.

The descriptions are necessarily somewhat short, and I am sure that some of my constituents will have additional questions about the issues described here. So I invite them to write me for more specifics.

The votes are described as follows:

KEY

1. Rollcall Number;
2. Number of the bill or resolution;
3. Title of the bill or resolution;
4. A description of the vote;
5. The date of the vote;
6. My vote, in the form Y=yes, N=no, and NV=not voting;
7. The vote of the entire Arizona delegation in the form (yes-no-not voting);
8. An indication of whether the motion or amendment was approved or rejected; and
9. The vote total.

101. H.J. Res. 537. Edwin B. Forsythe Refuge. Breaux, D-La., motion to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution to designate the Brigantine and Barnegat units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, located in New Jersey, as the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge, in honor of the late Rep. Forsythe, R-N.J. (1970-84), who died March 29. Motion agreed to 416-0: Y(5-0-0), May 1, 1984.

102. H.R. 5050. Fisheries Loan Fund. Breaux, D-La., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to extend for two more years, until Oct. 1, 1986, the authorization for a fisheries loan fund established under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956. Motion agreed to 309-104: Y(2-3-0), May 1, 1984.

103. H.R. 5076. Pennsylvania Wilderness Act. Seiberling, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to designate certain areas in the Allegheny National Forest as wilderness and recreation areas. Motion agreed to 387-28: Y(3-2-0), May 1, 1984.

104. H.R. 4263. Tennessee Wilderness Act. Seiberling, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to designate certain lands in the Cherokee National Forest in Tennessee as wilderness areas, and to allow management of certain lands for uses other than wilderness. Motion agreed to 404-12: Y(4-1-0), May 1, 1984.

105. H.R. 4596. Women's Rights Historical Park. Seiberling, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to permit the Interior Department to acquire McClintock House in Waterloo, N.Y., as part of the Women's Rights National Historic Park. Motion agreed to 404-13: Y(4-1-0), May 1, 1984.

106. H.R. 3787. California and Pony Express Trails. Seiberling, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize the Interior Department to study the Pony Express Trail and the California Trail for possible inclusion in the national historic trails system, and to designate the Daniel Boone Heritage Trail. Motion agreed to 401-14: Y(4-1-0), May 1, 1984.

107. H.R. 5100. Holocaust Memorial Council Authorization. Seiberling, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize $2,051,000 in fiscal 1985 and $2,151,000 in fiscal 1986 for activities of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council. Motion agreed to 410-5: Y(5-0-0), May 1, 1984.

108. H.R. 3472. Lamprey Eel Control. Seiberling, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to permit control of the lamprey eel in the Pere Marquette River. Motion agreed to 410-5: Y(4-1-0), May 1, 1984.

109. H.R. 4952. Indian MX Assistance. Nichols, D-Ala., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize assistance to certain Indian tribes, similar to that already provided state and local governments, for community planning related to the planned deployment of MX missiles. Motion agreed to 402-11: Y(5-0-0), May 1, 1984.

111. H.J. Res. 492. Department of Agriculture, Fiscal 1984 Urgent Supplemental Appropriations. Conte, R-Mass., motion to instruct House conferees on the bill to meet with Senate conferees. Motion rejected 159-245: N(3-2-0), May 2, 1984.

112. S. 64. Irish Wilderness Act. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to establish as federal wilderness and protect from development the Irish Wilderness Area of about 16,500 acres in the Mark Twain National Forest, Missouri. Adopted 254-142: Y(2-3-0), May 2, 1984.

114. H.R. 4275. Hoover Dam Power Allocation. Boxer, D-Calif., amendment to require the energy secretary to auction hydroelectric power from Hoover Dam and award it to the highest bidder or bidders. Rejected 176-214: N(0-5-0), May 3, 1984.

115. H.R. 4275. Hoover Dam Power Allocation. Passage of the bill to authorize the interior secretary to increase the generating capacity of existing equipment at the Hoover Dam and Powerplant, and renewing contracts for allocation of hydroelectric power generated from Hoover Dam. Passed 279-95: Y(4-0-1), May 3, 1984.

116. H.R. 5121. Virginia Wilderness. Seiberling, D-Ohio, motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to designate as federal wilderness approximately 59,000 acres in the Jefferson and George Washington National Forests, Virginia. Motion agreed to 376-20: Y(3-2-0), May 8, 1984.

117. S 1129. Domestic Volunteer Service Act. Adoption of the conference report on the bill to authorize $158.4 million in fiscal 1984, $166.1 million in fiscal 1985 and $175.2 million in fiscal 1986 for volunteer progams administered by ACTION. Adopted 369-25: Y(3-2-0), May 8, 1984.

119. H.R. 5119. Foreign Assistance Authorization. Feighan, D-Ohio, amendment to set a $670 million limit on military aid to Turkey and authorize $250 million in additional assistance to Cyprus if the president certifies that an agreement has been reached between Greek and Turkish Cypriots that makes substantial progress toward settlement of the Cyprus dispute. Adopted 376-27: Y(4-1-0), May 9, 1984.

120. H.R. 5119. Foreign Assistance Authorization. Hall D-Ohio, amendment to eliminate the $25 million in grant military assistance to the Philippines. Rejected 149-259: N(0-5-0), May 9, 1984.

121. H.R. 5119. Foreign Assistance Authorization. Rahall, D-W. Va., amendment to prohibit the use of foreign military sales funds by foreign countries to develop their own weapons systems outside the United States. Rejected 40-379: N(1-4-0), May 9, 1984.

122. H.R. 5119. Foreign Assistance Authorization. Dorgan, D-N.D., amendment to freeze the military assistance program grants to non-Central American countries at the fiscal year 1984 appropriations level of $422.5 million. Rejected 207-208: Y(2-3-0), May 9, 1984.

124. H.R. 5119. Foreign Assistance Authorization. Studds, D-Mass., amendment to prohibit any military aid to El Salvador in fiscal year 1985 unless the president had certified to Congress that the Salvadoran government had achieved three objectives: removing from the security forces individuals responsible for or associated with "death squads" and establishing effective control over the security forces; complying with international agreements on the protection of civilians in civil wars; and participating in good faith negotiations with all parties to the Salvadoran civil war. Rejected 128-287: Y(1-4-0), May 10, 1984.

125. H.R. 5119. Foreign Assistance Authorization. Broomfield, R-Mich., amendment to authorize President Reagan's requests for military, economic and development aid for Central American countries in fiscal 1984-1985, and to allow military aid for El Salvador in fiscal 1985 if the president certified to Congress that the government had made "demonstrated progress" on human rights and other issues. Adopted 212-208: N(3-2-0), May 10, 1984.

126. H.R. 5119. Foreign Assistance Authorization. Broomfield, R-Mich., amendment to authorize President Reagan's requests for military, economic and development aid for Central American countries in fiscal 1984-1985, and to allow military aid for El Salvador in fiscal 1985 if the president certified to Congress that the government had made "demonstrated progress" on human rights and other issues. Adopted 211-208: N(3-2-0), May 10, 1984.

127. H.R. 5119. Foreign Aid Authorization. Passage of the bill to make $361 million in supplemental authorizations for foreign aid programs in fiscal 1984 and $10.95 billion in

authorizations for fiscal 1985. Passed 211-206: Y(4-1-0), May 10, 1984.

129. H.R. 5345. Equal Access Act. Perkins, D-Ky., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to allow student religious groups to meet in public secondary schools during non-class hours if other groups do so. Motion rejected 270-151: N(2-3-0), May 15, 1984.

130. H.R. 89. Puerto Rico Passenger Service. Biaggi, D-N.Y., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to permit foreign-flag vessels to transport passengers between Puerto Rico and other U.S. ports when U.S.-flag ships are not available. Motion agreed to 390-25: Y(4-1-0), May 15, 1984.

131. H.R. 5505. War Risk Insurance. Biaggi, D-N.Y., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to extend through fiscal 1989 the authority of the government to provide war risk and certain other insurance to cover U.S. merchant marine vessels, cargoes and crew in an emergency. Motion agreed to 413-0: Y(5-0-0), May 16, 1984.

133. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Mavroules, D-Mass., amendment to the Bennett, D-Fla., amendment, to bar procurement of MX missiles in fiscal 1985. Rejected 212-218: Y(2-3-0), May 16, 1984.

134. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Dickinson, R-Ala., amendment to the Mavroules, D-Mass., substitute to the Bennett, D-Fla., amendment, to allow the production of 15 MX missiles subject to certain conditions. Adopted 229-199: N(3-2-0), May 16, 1984.

135. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Bethune, R-Ark., amendment to bar the production of binary chemical munitions. Adopted 247-179: Y(2-3-0), May 17, 1984.

136. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Weiss, D-N.Y., amendment to delete funds for production of the Trident II missile. Rejected 93-319: N(0-5-0), May 17, 1984.

137. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Smith, D-Fla., amendment to bar the use of funds to purchase Sergeant York anti-aircraft guns (also called DIVADs) until certain test results have been reported to Congress. Rejected 157-229: N(1-3-1), May 17, 1984.

138. H.R. 4280. Retirement Equity Act. Rostenkowski, D-Ill., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to amend the 1974 Employee Retirement Income Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code to strengthen the pension rights of workers who interrupt their careers to raise a family and of homemakers who depend on the pensions of their working spouses. Motion agreed to 413-0: Y(5-0-0), May 22, 1984.

139. H. Con. Res. 310. New Ireland Forum. Fascell, D-Fla., motion to suspend the rules and adopt the concurrent resolution to commend the New Ireland Forum and urging the British and Irish governments and all parties in Northern Ireland to consider the forum's recommendations. Composed of Irish political leaders, the forum issued a report on May 2, 1984, suggesting options for resolving the troubles of Northern Ireland. Motion agreed to 417-0: Y(5-0-0), May 22, 1984.

140. H.R. 4145. State Justice Institute Act. Kastenmeier, D-Wis., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to create a state justice institute to make grants to state courts to help them improve their operations. Motion rejected 243-176: Y(2-3-0), May 22, 1984.

141. H.R. 4249. U.S. Marshals and Witness Security Reform. Kastenmeier, D-Wis., motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to tighten controls on a Justice Department program that gives witnesses in federal criminal cases new identities in exchange for their testimony. Motion agreed to 376-41: Y(3-2-0), May 22, 1984.

142. H.R. 5665. Public Debt Limit. Passage of the bill to increase the federal debt ceiling by $30 billion from $1.49 trillion to $1.52 trillion to keep the government financed through June 22, 1984. Rejected 150-263: Y(3-2-0), May 22, 1984.

143. H.R. 5653. Energy and Water Development Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Adoption of the resolution (H. Res. 501) waiving certain points of order against consideration of the bill to appropriate $15,470,725,000 for energy and water development for fiscal 1985 or any other fiscal 1985 general appropriation bill reported by the Appropriations Committee. Adopted 246-166: Y(3-2-0), May 22, 1984.

144. H.R. 5653. Energy and Water Development Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Ottinger, D-N.Y., amendment to delete $43.1 million from breeder reactor research and add $33.1 million to solar energy research, demonstration projects for extended burnup of nuclear fuel and university research reactors. Rejected 171-229: N(0-5-0), May 22, 1984.

145. H.R. 5653. Energy and Water Development Appropriations, Fiscal 1985. Passage of the bill to appropriate $15,470,725,000 for energy and water development for fiscal 1985. Passed 349-46: Y(5-0-0), May 22, 1984.

147. H.R 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Lowry, D-Wash., amendment to bar the purchase of additional Pershing II missiles until April 1, 1985, allowing such purchases after that date only if the president certified to Congress that the Soviet Union showed no willingness to limit such weapons and if the Congress thereafter approved resumption of Pershing II purchases by joint resolution. Rejected 122-294: Y(2-3-0), May 23, 1984.

148. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Dellums, D-Calif., amendment to delete $7.1 billion for procurement of 34 B-1 bombers. Rejected 163-254: Y(2-3-0), May 23, 1984.

149. H.R. 5167. Department of Defense Authorization. Schroeder, D-Colo., amendment to limit appropriations for procurement in fiscal 1985 to 106.5 percent of the amount appropriated for procurement in fiscal 1984. Rejected 173-250: Y(1-4-0), May 23, 1984.

150. H.R. 4170. Deficit Reduction Act. Vander Jagt, R-Mich., motion to order the previous question (thus ending debate and the possibility of amendment) on the Vander Jagt motion to instruct House conferees on the deficit-reduction bill not to agree to the Senate amendment to lengthen the depreciation period for real estate and to reduce tax credits available for the rehabilitation of old buildings. Motion agreed to 296-128: N(0-5-0), May 23, 1984.●

LET'S NOT PUNISH OUR VETERANS

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring my colleagues' attention to a critical problem—namely, President Reagan's attempt to severely cut veterans' benefits.

The Treasury Department's tax-simplification plans calls for a tax on compensation received by veterans with service-connected disabilities beginning in January 1987. This proposal violates historical precedent by abandoning a longstanding commitment to those Americans who have given to their country. It is also clearly an example of Government giving with one hand and taking with the other.

In addition, the President's 1986 budget proposes a means test for veterans 65 years and over and those with nonservice-related disabilities to determine if they are eligible for compensation. If the test determines that their present incomes are sufficient, aid will be withheld. Denying this health care is not only inhumane, but inefficient as well. The Veterans' Administration provides quality health care at costs between 10 to 15 percent below those supplied by private facilities and often paid for by other Federal assistance programs. Moreover, for most 10th CD veterans and their families, these benefits are not a luxury but a necessity just to make ends meet.

Beyond the economic impact of a benefits cut, there's the moral question of whether or not the U.S. Government is honoring its obligation to those men and women who have served, fought, and sacrificed to keep our country safe. Veterans and their families have already contributed more than their fair share and should not now be asked to sacrifice again. That is why I will vigorously oppose any effort to cut important benefits received by veterans.●

REFORMING JOBLESS BENEFITS

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the excellent editorial of the Washington Post of March 25 entitled "Reforming Jobless Benefits."

The ideas mentioned in the editorial—using UI more creatively to help provide retraining and short-time compensation—are almost all included in a series of bills I have introduced and which I invite my colleagues to join in sponsoring. These bills, H.R. 758, 759, and 1143, would transform the 50-year-old, tired UI Program into a major tool for worker retraining and adjustment.

The editorial follows:

REFORMING JOBLESS BENEFITS

Even before last week's press conference at which President Reagan announced his firm opposition to continuing federal sup-

plemental unemployment benefits, chances were small that Congress would continue the program when it expires at the end of this month. Unemployment is still very high in many states, and hundreds of thousands of workers who have run through their state entitlements will no longer be helped. But Congress is reluctant to continue the program partly because of the already imposing federal deficit, and also because of a growing concern that the unemployment insurance system needs a substantial overhaul.

One worry is that a simple extension of cash benefits for the long-term unemployed may hinder—or at least not help—their efforts to find new jobs. Responding to this concern, state governments have been trying to use unemployment funds to help workers find new jobs, acquire needed skills or even create new jobs. A conference sponsored last week by the Boston Federal Reserve Bank and the Kennedy School at Harvard suggested considerable agreement among state officials, business leaders and academics—and, to a more limited degree, labor officials—that programs such as these can help some workers adjust to a rapidly changing economy and can rebuild public support for the unemployment insurance program.

Almost all states have been strengthening links among private employers, job training programs and state-run employment services. California and Delaware have gone farther to earmark part of the unemployment benefit tax on employers for programs for retraining workers permanently displaced from their jobs. Canada—following the example of California—is using unemployment funds to pay workers who have agreed to reduce their days of work so that other workers won't be laid off. In Great Britain and France, where small-business ventures are much rarer than in this country, some unemployed workers are receiving lump-sum benefit payments to help them get new businesses off the ground.

A major barrier to the extension of these efforts is the fact that unemployment insurance in this country is funded by a payroll tax that is itself a considerable discouragement for employment. Even if new types of jobless help ultimately pay off, higher payroll taxes will simply aggravate the already large bias in the tax system toward substituting machines for people. The problem is compounded by the requirement that each state fund its own program, so that states with the most severe unemployment problems are least willing and able to pay for innovative kinds of help.

Unfortunately, coming up with a better and fairer way to finance jobless benefits would require addressing the unpleasent subject of the inadequacy of federal revenues to cover necessary national expenses. That's why Congress isn't likely to do anything about reforming unemployment insurance in the foreseeable future.●

TRIBUTE TO MARIE KERBESHIAN

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to express my congratulations to Marie Kerbeshian of Grand Forks, ND. Marie was the North Dakota winner of the VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program. I am proud to share Marie's "Pledge to America" with my colleagues:

MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA

(By Marie C. Kerbeshian)

In 1620, a group of refugees set foot on Cape Cod, looking for a new beginning. All that greeted them was a cold, empty shore; but a promise of freedom from religious persecution and a hope for a bright future also awaited them. They were willing to sacrifice their comfortable homes, their jobs, their friends and relatives, and even their lives to create the foundation of the nation that we know today as the United States of America.

In 1913, my great grandfather set foot on Ellis Island. Just like the Pilgrims, he was looking for a new life, a life free from religious, political, and economic persecution. Just like the Pilgrims, he believed in the promise of freedom and prosperity that America offered him, and he was willing to work just as hard as they had to achieve a better life. Yet unlike the Pilgrims, there was someone waiting there to greet him; a proud, yet compassionate Lady who assured him that America was willing to welcome "your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breath free."

In 1984, the Statue of Liberty, a victim of age and neglect, sits outside of New York covered in scaffolding and lacking the torch that used to proclaim America as the beacon of freedom and democracy. Many Americans seem to feel that the United States is in the same condition as the Statue of Liberty. They complain that the government is too big, or too small, or that it ignores the people. They complain that their taxes are too high or that the state is not spending enough on highways, or schools, or hospitals. They complain that big business tramples "the little guy", or that there are too many bureaucratic laws restricting free enterprise. They complain. And strangely enough, that is all they seem to do. Why is it that the same people who spend hours griping about America's shortcomings can't even spend 30 minutes to vote, or five minutes to write a letter to their congressman, or even two seconds to sign a petition? America is no more and no less than the people who live here. Too often we take our Constitution for granted, expecting that everything will be handed to us on a silver platter.

Maybe we can take a cue from those who came to this country expecting to work for their freedom. America is a lot like the Statue of Liberty, so taken for granted that we forget nothing is infallible and that everything needs to be repaired. But the Statue of Liberty is being repaired and restored to her former glory, so can America, if we realize that it is we who are responsible for the well-being of the country, and not some far off stranger in Washington. Once this is understood, my pledge to America becomes quite clear. Never will I blame someone else for something that I can fix, nor will I assume that it is someone elses responsibility, for I soon will possess three of the most powerful tools in a democracy, the pen, the vote, and the willingness to use them to improve America.

When the Statue of Liberty receives the finishing touches on its repairs in 1986, it will be ready to face another 100 years of representing freedom and democracy; America, however, will never be finished growing, changing, or improving. I pledge myself to this continuous job of making a better life for myself and my country. Today, America, is quite different from the rough wilderness that greeted the Pilgrims in 1620, and I am sure that America will be quite different 365 years from now. I pledge myself to making the future of America even better than its past.●

A TRIBUTE TO ASSEMBLYMAN DAVID C. SCHWARTZ

HON. JAMES J. FLORIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. FLORIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to bring to the attention of my colleagues a distinguished legislator from New Jersey, Assemblyman David C. Schwartz. Assemblyman Schwartz, who has represented the 17th Legislative District since 1978, is a clear example of a highly dedicated and concerned public official. He has introduced and has had signed into law many pieces of legislation that have benefited thousands of residents of our State.

Mr. Schwartz is the recipient of the Citizen of the Year 1985 award from the National Association of Social Workers—New Jersey. I can think of no one who is more deserving of this honor. This fine organization is conferring its award on Mr. Schwartz for his manifesting outstanding leadership in furthering the causes of human services and social work. Mr. Schwartz is receiving this prestigious award in recognition of his great integrity and his willingness to take risks in his role as an elected official to support unpopular causes for the welfare of disadvantaged individuals and groups.

Mr. Schwartz's legislative initiatives and local activities have demonstrated a deep compassion for his fellow citizens. As one among many examples of this, Mr. Schwartz was the author of legislation that created the New Jersey Hunger Commission and sponsored other legislation to provide several million dollars to provide emergency and long-term shelter and assistance to the thousands of homeless people in our State.

As chairman of the assembly housing and urban policy committee since 1982, Assemblyman Schwartz has been a leader in the critically important effort to revitalize our urban areas. Mr. Schwartz has drafted and helped shape and implement a comprehensive urban revitalization strategy in New Jersey that has drawn bipartisan praise and which can serve as a model for urban areas throughout the Nation. As a professor of political science at Rutgers University, Mr. Schwartz has drawn on his wide-rang-

ing expertise in sponsoring a package of legislation to create urban enterprise zones, an urban youth corps, urban action grants, the housing finance agency and programs to provide business assistance communities and a revolving loan fund and tax increment financing.

As a vice chairman of the assembly committee on aging, Mr. Schwartz addressed the needs of our senior citizens. His legislation in this area includes the grandparents rights bill, the Retirement Education Act, and the Alzheimer's Disease Study Commission. He has obtained funding that significantly increased home health care in New Jersey, and has obtained numerous grants for senior citizens programs in his district, which includes parts of Middlesex and Union Counties, and in his own town of Highland Park.

But Mr. Schwartz' fine effort extends beyond these areas. He was sponsor of the Public Employees Occupational Health and Safety Act, which was signed into law in 1983; his legislation established the New Jersey Developmental Disabilities Council in 1979 and his resolution established the first functioning municipal commission on the handicapped in America. In addition, Mr. Schwartz sponsored the Technical Training Act for Women in 1984, the job training center for women, and the Displaced Homemakers Act, also in 1984.

Mr. Schwartz' excellent legislative record demonstrates his outstanding service to New Jersey and his commitment to our fellow citizens. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that my colleagues will want to join with me and the New Jersey Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers in congratulating and honoring David C. Schwartz.●

THE FEDS CAN'T SEE THEIR LOSSES IN THE TREES

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following commentary published on the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal on November 14, 1984, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE FEDS CAN'T SEE THEIR LOSSES IN THE TREES

(By Peter Emerson, Anthony T. Stout, and Deanne Kloepfer)

Last month, President Reagan signed a piece of "timber relief" legislation under which the federal government will bail out speculative buyers of national-forest timber for their losses. Signing the bill gained him a few votes he didn't need in the Pacific states, forgave the judgment errors of some timber-industry executives and will end up costing the American public dearly. However, the bill represents only a small part of the public "relief" extended to those segments of the timber industry dependent on the national forests.

In 1982, during a deep recession, the U.S. Forest Service lost $740 million selling timber from the national forests for lumber, paper and other wood products. These losses, a result of below-cost timber sales on many forests, confirm what public land experts have long known: National forests are managed uneconomically at best, to the detriment of taxpayers, the environment and the timber industry. Over the last decade, if below-cost timber sales had been eliminated in both good and bad years, the federal treasury would have netted at least $2 billion more.

While lamentable and contrary to the clear intent of the law, this situation is far from surprising. Born of the need to conserve the nation's timber resources nearly a century ago, the Forest Service has traditionally shunned the use of economic criteria in planning and management decisions. It continues to rely on an absolete pricing system that frequently fails to recover the government's cost of growing and selling trees. Moreover, the Forest Service does not even track the costs of individual timber sales!

As a result, the Forest Service engages in commercial timber harvesting on millions of acres of public land where timber values are so low that profit-oriented landowners would not consider building roads and cutting trees. Several studies show the most consistent losses are in the Rocky Mountains and Alaska. The Forest Service's recent annual report acknowledges that 37% of timber volume was sold below cost in 1983. Agency data for Alaska yield especially disturbing results: On average, each dollar spent for federal timber sales returned merely two cents in timber sales receipts. A recent U.S. General Accounting Office analysis of 3.244 national forest timber sales in the West found that "in two Rocky Mountain regions . . . over 88% of the sales were below cost in 1981 and over 96% were below cost in 1982."

Concern about such unecomonic management goes beyond taxpayer losses. As accessible old-growth timber is depleted in the Western states, the timber industry is gradually shifting to more productive forest lands where tree farming is most profitable. In particular, private forest lands in the South have a vast, untapped timber-growing potential. The Forest Industry Council estimated in 1980 that domestic timber demand in the year 2030 could be supplied by private forests alone, using intensive timber management practices, if landowners could realize a 10% annual return on investment. Unfortunately, the continuation of below-cost timber sales in the national forests retards this development. Federal timber sold below cost depresses the market price, weakening economic incentives to invest in private forest lands. Timber firms are being encouraged to rely too heavily on the national forests as a source of wood at the expense of private timberland owners and investors.

Now that Congress has passed wilderness bills for many states, upward of 30 million acres of roadless national forest land have been released for development consideration in coming Forest Service plans. Much of this land consists of remote, high-elevation forests, with low timber-growing potential, on the Pacific Coast and in the Rocky Mountains. Many attributes of these roadless lands—wildlife habitats, unique natural ecosystems, potential discoveries in genetics and other sciences, and the solitude available—play an integral part in the development of Western communities. Financially unsound logging destroys wilderness values, hindering the growth of recreation industries and the diversification of the local economy.

Further, the Forest Service has not provided convincing documentation that below-cost sales yield significant non-timber benefits. The agency has said even less about the wilderness values that are forgone when roadless lands are cut or about the environmental impacts of logging and road building. In short, the Forest Service—with an admittedly complex management task—demonstrates little knowledge of the non-timber benefits associated with either cut or uncut forests.

The Forest Service also contends that many below-cost timber sales are necessary in order to replace existing trees with new, highly productive stands that will show a profit. The GAO examined eight representative below-cost timber sales. In each case, the GAO found that future net returns from regenerated timber stands were negative, even using the Forest Service's economic assumptions.

Reform of timber sales practices need not be economically painful and can be accomplished under public ownership of the national forests if: First, the Forest Service would stop selling timber at prices that do not recover the government's production costs. Only if there is a proven overriding benefit to other forest uses should below-cost timber be cut.

Second, the government should encourage better use of untapped timber growing capacity on private lands. While the elimination of federal below-cost timber sales from the market is an important first step in attaining this goal, other steps will be necessary. These include long-term research and technical information from the Forest Service and others, and continued industry support for cooperative timber-management programs between industry and private landowners.

Finally, in response to a situation mostly of its own making, the government may need to assist communities dependent on national forest below-cost timber in the transition to new areas of employment. Below-cost timber sales could be gradually phased out.

Limiting timber harvesting on the national forests to lands that are economically suitable will save taxpayer dollars, encourage timber production on private land, reduce environmental damage and retain society's future options for the uncut forests.

(Mr. Emerson and Mr. Stout are resource economists and Ms. Kloepfer is a policy analyst with the Wilderness Society in Washington, D.C.)●

TRIBUTE TO JOSE DE RIVERA

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, as the Member of Congress privileged to represent New York City's 15th District, I feel honored to be able to recognize and pay homage to the memory of an

extraordinary artist, Jose de Rivera, who lived in Manhattan. Mr. de Rivera an internationally known sculptor of monumental talent and vision, died on March 19, 1985, of pneumonia.

Jose de Rivera truly personified the adage that one man can make a difference. After struggling for years in obscurity, he rose to the top of the art world and left a legacy that will be appreciated by millions of Americans for years to come. With great technical mastery, he produced a body of work as endless in subtle variation and nuance as space and time suggest. Technical mastery and de Rivera became synonymous. Although he is best known for his "Infinity", a curvilinear form that rotates atop a black granite pylon in front of the National Museum of History and Technology of the Smithsonian Institution, Mr. de Rivera has numerous works on permanent display in museums throughout the country. Among others, his showings have included two world's fairs and, in 1965, the White House.

Time and space are forever inseparable in the world of Jose de Rivera. Whether one moves around a sculpture, or stands transfixed as it slowly revolves, the line continues unbroken by the slightest hesitancy. The incredibly refined curvilinear forms dissolve into traces of light or liquid, while the voids within become the forms, swelling and diminishing with such ease as to belie the complex geometry of their being. Time/space forms one element of de Rivera's work, the use of light is another. The sculptures are polished through many gradations of abrasive to an impeccable, gleaming surface. Light plays on the forms and reflects from them. When in motion, another and even more complex form is released. The ultimate impact of the sculptures is one of beauty and grace.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues in the House will want to join me in mourning the passing of this great man who gave so much to our country, and whose memory will live on "infinitely" through his work.●

A SALUTE TO RUBIE J. McCULLOUGH

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor and a pleasure to share with my colleagues the tremendous work and numerous achievements of my good friend, Mrs. Rubie J. McCullough of Cleveland, OH. The founder of the Harvard Community Services Center, Mrs. McCullough has dedicated her life and talents to improving the quality of life for the residents of the Lee-Harvard and Lee-Miles areas. She has made an indelible mark on these communities and the Cleveland metropolitan area.

In 1968, Mrs. McCullough was the president of the Lee-Harvard Community Association. During her tenure, she became painfully aware of the unmet needs and problems of the residents of her area. Mrs. McCullough decided to resolve some of the problems of her neighbors and friends in the area. Combining her strong sense of commitment to the community with several foundation grants, Mrs. McCullough established the Harvard Community Services Center.

Mr. Speaker, through the years, the Harvard Community Services Center staff, under the guidance of Mrs. McCullough, has provided a host of counseling, community and outreach programs. The critical work and achievements of the center have helped to make the Lee-Miles and Lee-Harvard areas amongst the most attractive to live and work in the Cleveland metropolitan area. This is probably the greatest tribute to the center and Mrs. McCullough.

The fervor and commitment with which Mrs. McCullough has pursued the problems of the area through the Harvard Community Services Center, have earned her the respect and admiration of people from all walks of life. I am proud to be associated with such a dynamic human being like Rubie J. McCullough.

At this time, I would like to insert a Cleveland Plain Dealer article on Mrs. Rubie J. McCullough into the RECORD. I ask that my colleagues join me in saluting Mrs. Rubie McCullough.

The article follows:

LEE-MILES, LEE-HARVARD AREA PAYS FOR MIDDLE-CLASS STATUS

(By Thomas S. Andrzejewski)

The fact that the Lee-Miles and Lee-Harvard neighborhoods have the highest household income in the city shows there is more to a neighborhood than statistics.

And attaining the American dream is not easy.

"My concept of middle-class is that my husband works and I have time to go volunteer at a hospital or something," said Rubie J. McCullough. "In this neighborhood, middle-class means everybody works. Even the kid has a paper route, and sometimes, the husband has two jobs."

The industrious residents have well-kept houses. Tracts in the eastern sections of the neighborhood were built in the 1950s and 1960s.

It looks like the suburbs—but again, appearances are deceiving.

The houses around Charles W. Eliot Junior High School are especially well-maintained, which makes it hard to believe the playground and athletic fields near the school, at 15700 Lotus Dr., north of Miles Ave., have been hangouts for street gangs that have harassed schoolchildren.

The drive for achievement has taken a toll on youth. Among the most-used services of the Harvard Community Services Center, of which McCullough is director, are programs such as day camp, because parents are not home days.

"They write about us being middle-class, but if that were true, we'd have much more parental participation in the schools," said McCullough.

McCullough, 66, has spent nearly three decades in the neighborhood, most of those years serving it as well as living there. Youth has been a special interest.

In 1968, as president of the Lee-Harvard Community Association, she received a letter from the principal of Eliot, asking her help in stopping school vandalism.

With some money from the old Cleveland: Now! and foundations, she founded the Harvard Community Services Center in the old convent of St. Henry's Catholic Church, near E. 183rd St. and Harvard Ave. It began as a drop-in center for teen-agers.

Another related incident helped. The old Montgomery Ward & Co. catalogue store at Lee Rd. and Harvard installed iron grating over its windows.

"I said, 'Oh my God, there goes the neighborhood! They're putting iron bars up on the windows,' " she said.

But the neighborhood didn't "go." The median household income in the 1980 census for the Lee-Miles statistical area was nearly $21,000, compared with $12,300 for the city and $18,000 for the county.

Housing prices, which have been increasing, have median of $37,000 and are among the highest in the city. The neighborhood had been all-white, but panic selling and real estate industry malpractice turned it all black in the 1960s.

To blame teen-agers for the ills of the neighborhood is wrong, said McCullough and LaJean Ray, program director at the center. Much of the street crime is done by older people, they said. Some are stirring up youngsters.

"There's a group of individuals who are out testing their oats," said Ray. "But most of the kids who live in the neighborhood are not the kind to belong to gangs."

What they want is to belong to something, so the Harvard Community Services Center is trying to draw youngsters into a community organization. It surveyed 900 students at Eliot, Whitney Young and Robert H. Jamison junior high schools and found more than 60 groups that the youths called gangs.

In all but a handful of cases, they were small groups, perhaps three or four youths, who formed a club they called a gang. The major ones, which are believed to be a problem, are gangs called the Harvard Home Boys and the Q-Dogs & Dolls. A number of youths in the survey said they were members of them.

"I don't see it as much of a gang problem, but a desire to belong to something," said Ray. "If you're not part of something, you're not something."

"What we would like to stress is the positiveness of the neighborhood," said McCullough. "The good kids—let's say the conforming kids—have standards, respect for themselves and the community. What we are trying to do is provide a vehicle, for those so-called good kids to develop."

It goes to show that money doesn't buy everything.

"We keep hammering that we need more police protection," said McCullough. "What we need is more community involvement."●

DU PAGE COUNTY: WILLING TO "BITE THE BULLET" ON BUDGET CUTS

HON. HARRIS W. FAWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, by now the impact of the President's proposed budget for fiscal 1986 on State and local governments is well documented. Of the $35 billion in budget authority in domestic cuts in the President's budget, $20 billion would come out of Federal aid to cities and States—an 18 percent cut from current levels of $112 billion. These cuts, which are part of the administration's effort to reduce the massive Federal deficit and eliminate red-ink spending, affect a great cross section of our country's populace.

Although most Federal, State, and local officials consider deficit reduction a priority for the 99th Congress, few of these officials have come forward to say that they would forfeit their Federal funds.

Du Page County, which is a part of my district, is the beneficiary of Federal funds through the General Revenue Sharing, Community Development Block Grant, and Job Training Partnership Act programs—just to name a few. Recently, I received a letter from the chairman of the county board, Jack Knuepfer, who eloquently expressed the concerns of the county government. His message was that the economic health of our Nation takes precedence over the channeling of Federal dollars to State and local governments.

Although Du Page County would lose millions of dollars in Federal support under the President's proposed budget, the county government realizes that it must share in the effort to balance the budget and reduce the $200 billion Federal deficit. The Du Page County Board knows that the strength of our State and local governments is contingent upon the welfare of our Federal Government. However, it is Congress which must have the political muscle to bite the bullet and fairly implement the necessary austere measures.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Knuepfer's letter be printed in the RECORD.

FEBRUARY 28, 1985.

Hon. HARRIS FAWELL,
U.S. Congressman, Cannon Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR HARRIS: The purpose of my letter is to relate to you the action taken by the DuPage County Board last evening, in instructing its delegates how to vote at the upcoming legislative meeting of NACO in Washington next week.

DuPage County is the direct recipient of three Federal funding sources: Revenue Sharing, Community Development Block Grant, and the Job Training Partnership Act. In addition, some indirect programs impact the County to a lesser extent. For example, cuts in Medicaid passed additional costs on to our Convalescent Home, and cuts in programs such as mass transit impact our commuters.

The action taken by the Board last night was not to importune either the President or the Congress to maintain these programs. While they will impact us, and we will have to tighten our belts and perhaps get along without some programs, the fiscal health of this country is more important to us than the dollars that trickle down.

The Federal government must get its house in order. We want to make that job easier. We want to make that job easier by not soliciting the support of either our President or our Congressmen and Senators who maintain these programs to which we have become accustomed.

Our voice no doubt will be a small one in the chorus sung by those who want the same handout, but also those who want more. We hope that this small voice can have some impact upon the spending plans of the Federal government.

We want to acknowledge that perhaps it is easier for DuPage County to take this position than it is or will be for other counties. If the Federal government was generating a surplus, it would be relatively easy to write letters of protest about the programs which support our local County government. That is not the case. That will never again be the case.

Given the irresponsibility on the part of the Federal government in spending more monies than it takes in, the question arises: Should we continue to push for the same goodies we have had for the past few years, even though the effect of that push is to further increase Federal deficits and irresponsible spending?

The Farm lobby is engaged in a battle at the moment to increase their share of the Farm Loan program. Mayors throughout the United States are disturbed by the proposed cuts and are sending the message to Congress that they need more, not less. Each government acting only in its own interest, has the effect of creating irresponsibility at the highest level.

I know it is well recognized that the political body that does not make loud noises does not succeed in getting any of the candy and cookies. But if the price of that candy and cookies is eventual bankruptcy of this country, then I think we must have a greater concern.

Sincerely yours,

JACK T. KNUEPFER,
County Board Chairman.●

CHIEF JAMES R. SPOLAR

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay honor to one of my constituents, Fire Chief James R. Spolar, a 35-year veteran of the Lyons Township Fire Department. Chief Spolar retired on February 5 of this year after many years of protecting life and property in the Lyons community of my district.

Chief Spolar was honored at a retirement party on Saturday, March 23, at which his integrity, ability and tireless service to his fellow man were acknowledged and applauded by one and all.

Among Chief Spolar's retirement plans is a scheduled move to Florida and a more leisurly life style. His influence and impact on the community which he leaves behind however, will be felt for many years to come.

I am sure that my colleagues join me in recognizing a gallant and worthy public servant and friend, Fire Chief James R. Spolar.●

UNITED STATES-SOVIET VISITS

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to join in the introduction of a resolution encouraging United States and Soviet leaders to visit their counterparts in the United States or the Soviet Union.

The attention of the world, at the moment, is focused on the arms control talks in Geneva. Of course, we all wish for a successful conclusion to those talks, but in the long term there will not be a lasting and sustainable peace between our two countries without a greater, mutual understanding of each other's interests, beliefs, and attitudes. In fact, without some degree of mutual understanding, an arms control agreement, itself, would be impossible.

For that reason, I think it is terribly important that we expand the level and range of contacts between United States and Soviet leaders.

A few weeks ago, members of the Supreme Soviet visited Washington and met with Members of this body and the other body. Those talks were informal, but I think very helpful. Both sides were given an opportunity to exchange views and ask questions about a whole range of issues affecting United States-Soviet relations.

It is my hope that more Soviet leaders will visit the United States, but I also think it is important for Members of Congress to visit the Soviet Union. In addition to talking with Soviet leaders, it is important for Members of this body to get a firsthand picture of the Soviet Union and its people. I think we need to know more about Soviet Government, economy, culture, and society. Visits can help do that.

The resolution we are introducing today will encourage such visits. I ask my colleagues to join in supporting this resolution.●

BARTER PROMOTION ACT OF 1985

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Barter Promotion Act of 1985. Passage of this bill will enable the U.S. Government to once again trade surplus agricultural commodities for needed petroleum and strategic minerals. This bill will help the farm economy, now in the throes of the hardest times since the 1930's, by reducing the enormous supplies of grains and dairy products held by our Government. It will help fill our strategic stockpiles, now woefully inadequate for national emergencies. And, in these times of budget constraints, we will see dollars of benefit for pennies of spending.

Barter is the direct exchange of goods, without the use of money. Once the only method to trade, barter became obsolete with the development of international monetary systems. Lately, though, barter has had renewed appeal. Close to a hundred countries now engage in barter. The Third World debt crisis has resulted in many countries being resource rich, but cash poor. They need products and commodities of other lands, but lack the cash to pay for them. Instead, many of these countries have opted to bypass completely the cash markets, and directly trade their goods for other goods.

A government-to-government barter program worked before in the United States, and it could work again. Between 1950 and 1973 the United States bartered close to $7 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities: milk, cheese, and butter; wheat, corn, and feed grains. In return we received petroleum, strategic minerals—items the country needs for production, such as tin and aluminum, which we get from overseas and need to stockpile in the event foreign supplies are cut off, and offshore goods and services used by the U.S. Armed Forces. We found, too, that barter was a good advertisement for the United States, for it helped feed the hungry.

PUTTING BARTER TO WORK

The potential for government-to-government barter has never been more apparent. As of last June the national defense stockpile was short $6.4 billion worth of goods. Supplies of aluminum, bauxite, rubber, copper, nickel, platinum, zinc, and a dozen other minerals were under 50 percent of stockpile goals. Purchases for the strategic petroleum reserve fell in half from previous levels when the deficit soared in 1983 and 1984. American farmers have seen their exports drop, largely due to the overvalued dollar: from $44 billion in 1981 to a projected $37 billion in 1984. What couldn't get sold is now overflowing Government coffers as surplus: millions of bushels of grain, billions of pounds of dairy products.

Our country could use barter, surely. What about other countries? I asked the Congressional Research Service to investigate possible barter opportunities for the U.S. Government. It found a slew of countries—Indonesia, Malaysia, Peru, Liberia, Honduras, Mexico, Venezuela, and many more—with the materials needed by our strategic stockpiles as well as "a demonstrated desire to conduct barter transactions." CRS estimates that we could swap some 27 billion dollars' worth of agricultural products for oil to fill the strategic petroleum reserve, minerals needed for the strategic stockpile, and military and international development services.

Despite the opportunity, the need, and a workable concept, this administration has resisted engaging in barter transactions. It has conducted one small series of barter transactions with Jamaica in the past 4 years. It set up a barter coordinating group over a year ago which has not yet resulted in any trades. The administration has taken a passive approach, when what we need is an active entrepreneurial spirit seizing on the plentiful opportunities to barter, for the good of the Nation and the distressed farm economy.

CUTTING REDTAPE

Bureaucratic bookkeeping tangles are often cited as the reason we have not bartered. My bill addresses that by making clear that the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Government agency which owns surplus agricultural goods, will get credit when those goods are bartered. I propose to prime the pump with a $300 million appropriation to CCC. It can use this money to pay itself when agricultural goods are swapped. This money would serve as the basis for a revolving fund that would be replenished as the General Services Administration acquired the minerals and oil from the USDA for the national defense stockpile and the strategic petroleum reserve. This appropriation will be offset by savings to the Federal Government in lower storage costs and lower farm program costs.

Passage of the Barter Promotion Act of 1985 will remove any reason for delay. With the farm economy in distress, with budget deficits preventing the filling of vital stockpiles, and with dozens of other countries actively seeking barter partners, we cannot afford any delay.●

CITIZENSHIP FOR LORI ANNETTE BURR

HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation which addresses a unique situation involving a family in my district.

A petition for the issuance of an immigrant visa filed by my constituents, Mr. and Mrs. William E. Burr of El Paso, was dismissed by the Board of Immigration Appeals. The beneficiary of the petition, their daughter, Lori Annette, is caught in a legal quagmire and is in need of legislative relief.

Lori was born on April 30, 1966, in Mexico and has resided with Mr. and Mrs. Burr since infancy although they are not her biological parents. Upon the advice of legal counsel in Mexico, the Burrs took affirmative actions to adopt Lori in May 1966, after she had been abandoned by her natural mother. They believed that they had legally adopted Lori and filed all necessary documents with the proper authorities. Until this time, there had never been any question or objection raised regarding the legality of the Mexican adoption process.

The petition was denied at the district Immigration and Naturalization Service level on the basis that the Burrs failed to establish that Lori was legally adopted. Immigration laws permit U.S. citizen parents to confer immigration status on an adopted child under section 201(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Under that section, the petitioner must show that the beneficiary is eligible for immediate relative status as an unmarried daughter or son by demonstrating that the beneficiary once qualified as their "child" within the meaning of section 101(b)(1) of the act. Adopted children are included in the definition of "child" as defined by the section. However, adoptions must conform to the applicable laws of the jurisdiction where it occurred and the statutory requirements of the act. The law requires the petitioner to establish eligibility for the benefits sought.

In this case, the Burrs were unable to meet the burden of proof that they complied with the laws of the State of Chihuahua, Mexico, at the time of the adoption activities. Lori is now 18 years old and her adoption at this time would not satisfy the requirement of section 101(b)(1)(E) of the act which requires that an adoption take place before the child reaches age 16. The Chairman of the Board of Immigration Appeals acknowledged that sympathetic factors were present in the case but had to dismiss the appeal as a matter of law.

Lori has lived in El Paso since August 1972, when she was age 6, and is presently a senior in high school there. The Burrs were never challenged about Lori's citizenship until they applied for a Social Security card. They had assumed that her adoption conferred upon her U.S. citizenship.

Lori now faces the possibility of deportation under the laws of the United States. She has no other family and is without relatives in Mexico. She will encounter difficulty in finding employment or pursuing higher education under the circumstances. Certainly, the uncertainty of her status or the possibility of deportation will cause additional stress to Lori and the Burrs.

I am, therefore, introducing legislation which would grant Lori full citizenship and enable her to enjoy the benefits that such status provides. The equaties are completely on her side and I would urge my colleagues to join me in assisting the Burr family in this matter.●

THE JIMMY STEWART FALCON FOUNDATION SCHOLARSHIP

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, Indiana, PA, in my Fourth District, has always been proud of one of its native sons, known far and wide through the movies—Jimmy Stewart. We have known him in our State, have met him on our streets, have seen him on the screen and our TV sets, and while he has gone many miles in many dimensions, we always feel that he has never left us. He is one of ours and will always be.

But he can still surprise us on occasion. And the 55th anniversary edition of Daily Variety in Hollywood, published Monday, October 29, 1984, made us feel another stirring of pride when he is one of its major features. The headline said: Jimmy Stewart Serves Country in Peace as in War, Funding U.S. Air Force's Falcon Scholarship to Assist Cadets; California Youth is First to Benefit.

As it makes good reading, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and, with your permission, enter it in the RECORD.

THE JIMMY STEWART FALCON FOUNDATION SCHOLARSHIP

(By Col. Barney Oldfield USAF (Ret.))

There's something special about Keith Brahms of Sherman Oaks, Calif., who came into the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs last July 6 with the class of 1988. He got there by being the first Lt. Jimmy Stewart Falcon Foundation scholar, and attended Santa Barbara's Northwestern Preparatory School to ready him for his appointment.

That Falcon Foundation Jimmy Stewart Scholarship was announced in October 1983. It was made possible by the check which comes the middle of every month signed by Stewart in the amount of $814.42, which represents his retirement pay as a Brigadier General in the reserve. The endowment now exceeds $60,000—and checks still come.

The word that it would go into operation was passed before the whole U.S. Air Force command structure of four, three and two-star generals convened from all over the world by AF Chief of Staff, Gen. Charles Gabriel. More than 100 of the cadets who were in the Academy as Falcon Foundation-assisted students were in the audience, too.

So far, more than 1,000 young people have been financially, and prep school, assisted since the Foundation was birthed in 1958.

Jimmy Stewart never missed many formations, curtain calls, callboard instructions or failed to return an agent's message, but here at the Academy that October 28, health reasons blocked his personal appearance. And that was an event which will reach beyond his substantial professional credits—as there will be a Jimmy Stewart Falcon Foundation scholar every year in perpetuity.

Lt. Gen. Ben Bellis, the Foundation's president, told the audience that Stewart had first sent him a wire regretting that he would ". . . be unable to attend because of a health problem I have." That from Jimmy Stewart, a sort of indestructible Air Force icon!

He had enlisted March 22, 1941, even before the U.S. got into WW II. Nine months later, he was commissioned and made a pilot, flew 20 flak-strewn missions against myriad German targets including Bremen, Frankfurt and Berlin. Many who had know him in those times had flown to Colorado to be present for this salute to him.

The occasion included another aviation "great," the celebrated C. L. (Kelly) Johnson, who fathered everything from the early P-38 forked tail fighter through the U-2 and SR-71—headline makers all.

The custom for the Falcon Foundation honorees is that their portraits are unveiled at the ceremony, and then are hung in what the Academy calls its "Gallery of Great Airmen." Although Jimmy Stewart retired as a Brigadier General in 1968, he insisted that the Falcon Foundation artist, Darla Lockwood, portray him as a second lieutenant in his flight jacket. It's that one-barred "shavetail," rather than wearing the one star to which he's entitled, which will look down from the Academy walls for all time.

There has never been a request for narration for an Air Force film, or a spot announcement to help recruiting, or a speaking date at an Air Force function that Stewart could bring himself to turn down if he could squeeze it into his schedule. For the last year, he and Lt. Gen James Doolittle have been cochairmen for the fund-raising drive for the U.S. Air Force Museum Fund. His old starrer, "Strategic Air Command," is still brought out on flyboy occasions, too.

The Falcon Foundation came about when it was first learned what a differential there is in various community schools, and how short graduates were found to be in mathematics, English, physics and chemistry. Such grads might be in good health, proficient in sports, have the personality and poise which lends to command, but were academic shortfalls. They could neither pass the entrance exams, nor if they lucked in, keep up with the tough regimen over the four years. The Falcon Foundation scholarships have for the most part been made possible by gifts and endowments established by industrial and aerospace firms and individuals.

The Jimmy Stewart one is called a trustee scholarship, because it's been done on the "installment plan," all monies sent by him into the endowment on hold until it could produce the required annual income to make the scholarship roll on and on.

Jimmy Stewart was an actor, yes, but he had that extra spark going for him. He'd mothballed his film career in midstream to serve his country—and that always made him admired, and different. To those other wearers of uniforms, he has never been just a shadow on a screen or a disembodied soundtrack voice. His has been the real experience of bloody ordeal and wild adventure aloft.

At that 1983 Academy affair, they did bow to his enviable record as a performer. Those five Academy of Motion Picture Arts & Sciences nominations and one Oscar; two N.Y. Film Critics "best actor" awards, as many kudos from the Venice Film Festival in the same category and France's "Victoire." There was that big Screen Actors Guild 1968 one for ". . . outstanding achievement in fostering the finest ideals of the acting profession"; in 1980 American Film Institute's "Life Achievement Award"; 1981, the American National Theater and Academy's "national artist award," and in January 1982, he was Grand Marshal for the annual Tounament of Roses Parade in Pasadena. In all the history of the Air Force Reserve, Stewart is listed as one of only two who ever received the "distinguished service medal for exceptionally meritorious service to the United States."

That long ago Stewart enlistment caused one of pre-WW II's most amusing incidents. Harried classification clerks at reception centers asked each one who came before them—mostly without looking up—what sort of civilian employment they'd known and level of compensation. It provided the precomputer and punchcards period a profile on which to base judgments as to already possessed aptitudes and capabilities. From such State, indicated schooling could be selected and directed. Stewart said he worked for MGM in Culver City, and made approximately $2,700 a week. At that point, the classification clerk looked up, but was evidently not a film fan and didn't recognize who was there before him.

"Come on, now," he said in exasperation. "Every $25-a-week clown that comes in here tells me what a big shot he is, and makes that bull $1,000 a week. Where is this MGM?" Stewart, never a fast talker, was nonplussed, but his honor impugned, gave the clerk the phone number and told him to ask for the payroll department. The clerk decided to call his bluff and put in the query, telling the answering party he was at the U.S. Army Reception Center. Did they have a Jimmy Stewart on their employment roster? Yes, they did. "What'd you pay him?" the clerk asked. When the answer came, he almost dropped the phone.

Private James Stewart, his honor, veracity, and credibility restored, then walked into uniform and his considerable history.

When the Lt., or Gen. Jimmy Stewart Falcon Foundation scholarship was born at the Air Force Academy a year ago, everyone in the big room stood, applauded and faced his portrait in lieu of having him there in person among them. There was no projected collection of old film clips to stand in for

him as each person there had his own personal cameo of him.

The real Jimmy Stewart that was, is, and always will be with them. As he will be with Keith Brahms, out of Sherman Oaks and Santa Barbara, Calif.—and who knows where all else once that class of 1988 begins serving.●

TECHNOLOGY AND THE FAMILY FARM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, March 27, 1985, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

TECHNOLOGY AND THE FAMILY FARM

Farmers have struggled in recent years. A combination of factors, including low commodity prices, high interest rates, falling land values, unfair foreign subsidies and the overvalued U.S. dollar, which prices our exports out of the world market, has increased farm operating costs and reduced farm income. Nearly 30% of U.S. farmers are in serious financial trouble, and 10–15% of them may go out of business this year.

A new study by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) points out new challenges for midwestern farmers. The report predicts that new farm technology—especially biotechnology and information technology—will revolutionize agriculture in the next two decades. The benefits of this technology could be dazzling. Developments such as genetically altered plants that resist pests and disease, and computerized farm management promise dramatic increases in production and efficiency.

The new technology could help American farmers compete in world markets. Some countries, such as Argentina, already produce crops at prices lower than ours. They might continue to outstrip us if we do not adopt the new technology rapidly.

Eventually, advances in plant biotechnology will probably have the greatest impact on production. So far, however, more progress has been made in animal biotechnology. For example, emerging technology will soon transform the dairy industry. Embryo transplants, computerized feeding and monitoring, and growth hormones could increase milk production per cow by 40% or more in the next 15 years. One cow will be able to reproduce 60 heifers per year.

But there will be negative effects as well. The use of new farm technology could dramatically change the make-up of American agriculture, with some big winners and some big losers. The new technology will accelerate the trend toward large, industrial farms, which will dominate agriculture. Many Hoosier farmers could be among the losers. The number of medium-size farms and farms in the Midwest and Northeast might continue to increase, but their share of net farm income will decline.

For example, increased production in the dairy industry resulting from new technology might create massive surpluses in the years ahead. Small dairies in the Northeast and the Midwest will experience increasing competitive pressure from large, efficient producers in other regions. Currently, 125,000 dairy farms meet U.S. demand. In the future, we will need only 5,000 large industrial farms. Fifty-cow dairy farms in the Midwest will be outpaced by 2000-cow operations in the Sun Belt. Drastic remedies—such as strict supply control programs with non-transferable quotas—may be necessary to maintain traditional dairy operations in the Midwest and Northeast.

Similar challenges are likely with other commodities. Plant and animal technologies are not in themselves biased toward large farm operations, but these farms will probably benefit most from them. The technology a farmer needs to be competitive is costly and complex, and large farmers are better able to acquire the necessary capital and expertise. In addition, large farmers have greater access to information about new technology, and they are often more willing to adopt it as it becomes available. If moderate-size farms are to survive, they will have to use the newest technology. If they do not adapt, they probably will have to expand into large operations, sell part of their assets and join the small, part-time farms, or quit agriculture. The challenges faced by Indiana farms are significant: the average farm in Indiana is half the size of the national average.

Some observers argue that a new farming system based on large industrialized farms will be more efficient, improve competition in the export market, and lower food prices. Yet, in my view, there are good reasons to save medium-size farms. Moderate-size farms are crucial to the economic survival of many rural communities: the quality of life declines in rural communities as average farm size increases. Large industrial farms also raise concerns about water quality and quantity, the rate of soil erosion, and increases in air and noise pollution. Moreover, ensuring the existence of a large number of moderate-size farms helps protect our food supply from severe weather conditions or diseases in one sector of the country, and from price manipulation by a few major producers.

We should take several steps to help moderate-size farmers. We must improve education to make new technologies available to these farmers and train them in their use. We should also help some farmers adapt to new endeavors. We might make it possible for farmers to grow specified "new crops" as a way to test their viability in a particular region. We should remove biases against moderate-size farms in federal programs and policies. For example, we could better target farm income-support programs for moderate-size farms. One such proposal, which I favor, would limit income support payments (such as target prices) given to large farms. We could similarly revise our farm credit and loan programs. Finally, our tax code often works against moderate-size farmers. Generous tax write-offs encourage farm expansion, as well as the use of farms as tax shelters by non-farmers, which artificially pushes up production and land prices. I support legislation to limit "tax-shelter" farming.

Whether or not these predictions turn out to be accurate, we should not ignore them. We may not be able to reverse many of the basic economic trends that could harm small and medium-size farmers, but we can take steps to make the new technology work for them.

(NOTE: Much of the information in this newsletter is in a report by the Office of Technology Assessment entitled "Technology, Public Policy, and the Changing Structure of American Agriculture.")●

EAGLE HOSE COMPANY NO. 1 OBSERVES 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, volunteer firefighters play a vital role in protecting our society, a role they have been playing in our Nation for almost two and a half centuries.

In 1736, Benjamin Franklin founded the first volunteer fire department. Today, nearly 250 years later, there are more than 800,000 volunteer firefighters who receive no pay for their services. They represent more than three-quarters of our country's 1 million strong firefighting force.

That means volunteer firefighters must respond to the majority of our Nation's 2 million fires each year; fires which threaten man, animal and plant alike in our homes, workplaces and natural preserves.

But that's not all. A large part of their duty, and in a sense the most important, is fire prevention. Volunteers teach people about fire hazards and the safety measures necessary to reduce the chance of fire. They also conduct fire inspections of private homes and commercial properties.

The responsibility does not end with fire-related duty. Many of the calls volunteers respond to involve medical emergencies such as auto accidents, heart attacks, boating emergencies, and natural disasters.

In the 33d Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent, Eagle Hose Company No. 1 of Lancaster, NY, will be celebrating its 100th anniversary on May 11, 1985.

As part of that observance, the anniversary chairman Arthur J. Robinson, has provided my office a summary of its history. I'd like to extend my congratulations to Eagle Hose Company No. 1 on this occasion and share this summary history with my colleagues:

HISTORY OF EAGLE HOSE COMPANY NO. 1

Organized—May 8, 1885.

First equipment was a white hose cart and was called the Old Bay, Eagle Hose Cart, the Old Reliable.

The first motorized apparatus was a Brockway four cylinder combination truck purchased from the American LaFrance Fire Company for $3,300 and went into service in November of 1917. After a new truck was purchased from the Buffalo Fire Appliance Corporation in June of 1935, the old Brockway was given to the Department of Public Works to haul black top for street repairs.

Following the bombing of Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, the company participated in providing Civilian Defense protection for the community. Some of these measures included using rooms in the basement of the Municipal Building for a Civilian Defense Control Center, adapting the fire alarm

system for use as both a fire and air-raid warning system and learning special fire fighting techniques for combatting conflagrations caused by air raids.

Among our present membership we have many relatives of founding members including six firemen with the Robinson family name. We also include five father and son combinations.●

VETERANS HEALTH CARE AWARENESS WEEK

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to designate the third week in June as "National Veterans' Health Care Awareness Week." In light of reports of the dramatically increasing number of veterans nearing age 65, I feel it is imperative that we focus greater attention on the future health care needs of this group.

As many of my colleagues know, the Veterans' Administration [VA] and the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] have completed individual assessments of the growing number of aging veterans and the inadequacy of current health care facilities to meet future needs. According to the VA, by the year 2000 the number of veterans over 65 will more than double to 9 million, making two out of every three elderly males in the United States eligible for VA medical care.

Current VA health care facilities are hardly adequate to accommodate the present needs of elderly veterans as is visible from the long waiting lists at VA hospitals and clinics. It is evident that the drastically increasing number of veterans nearing retirement age will place an even greater strain on an already overburdened health care system.

At a time when Congress and the Nation should be looking at ways to improve health care, the administration is proposing to tax veterans' compensation benefits and place tighter restrictions on eligibility requirements for VA health care.

Our Nation's veterans made a great sacrifice to this country when they entered service and part of the Government's contract with them was the promise of free VA medical care when they reach age 65. In my view we must not breach this agreement. Given VA projections of the increasing number of veterans, instead of trying to cut and tax health benefits we should be looking at ways to improve the current system.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today will, I feel, focus needed congressional and national attention on the growing health care needs of our Nation's veterans. I urge my colleagues to join with me in this effort to recognize this truly worthy and selfless group of American citizens.●

THE "RIGHT TO DIE" MOVEMENT: A DEADLY IDEA

HON. VIN WEBER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article recently placed in the Minneapolis Star & Tribune, addressing the issue of euthanasia and the "right to die" movement. The author of this article, Fr. Robert Barry, is an assistant professor of theology at St. Thomas College in Minnesota and has been nationally active in defining and clarifying how approval of this so-called "medical right" is absolutely frightening for all of us.

As responsible lawmakers, I believe we must all be aware of new ideas and the motivations behind these ideas that our society may be confronted with, and that we may be required to legislatively address. I strongly urge my colleagues to read this article and give serious thought to the author's warning.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[From the Minneapolis Star Tribune, Mar. 4, 1985]

THE DEADLY INTENTIONS OF "RIGHT TO DIE" MOVEMENT

(By Robert Barry)

Neal R. Peirce has done a disservice to advocates of the rights of incompetent patients not to be unjustly denied normal care and obligatory medical treatments. In his Feb. 3 article Peirce is wrong in claiming that there is a moral right to die. There are moral rights only to positive human goods, and death is not a human value. Although it is not an absolute evil, death is never something to be deliberately chosen.

There is no need to promote "right to die" legislation as there is a long-standing medical tradition that permits patients to refuse treatments judged useless or so radically burdensome that heroic efforts to receive or provide them would be required. In Minnesota, for instance, the Patients Bill of Rights permits patients to decline useless or severely burdensome treatments. Why should there be such an outcry for right-to-die legislation when patients are free to reject treatments judged to be elective?

The answer seems to be that some organizations are actively promoting euthanasia. At the recent International Conference of Right to Die Societies, it became quite evident that the euthanasia movement had four objectives. They sought to gain legal endorsement for passive euthanasia, active euthanasia, assisted suicide and suicide clinics. In order for any of these objectives to be obtained, it is necessary that legal acceptance of a "right to die" be won. The prolife community is concerned about legal endorsement of a "right to die" because that is the foundational principle upon which legalized euthanasia would rest.

Peirce termed the New Jersey Supreme Court decision a landmark. I beg to differ. Together with four prominent Roman Catholic moral theologians, I submitted a friend-of-the-court brief objecting to certain testimony given to the trial court. The New Jersey Supreme Court's decision presents a serious threat to nursing-home patients because it permitted guardians to authorize denial of life-sustaining food and fluid to incompetent residents when the judgment is made that the person will die within a year, when there is judged to be unavoidable (but not intolerable) pain, and when it is judged that giving foods and fluids is of greater burden than benefit. The standard is so elastic that it is hard to see how one could reasonably say that it protects an incompetent person's right not to be medically abused and forced to death by starvation or dehydration.

The right-to-die movement poses a serious threat to the integrity of the healing professions. With the abortion decisions, physicians could become killers of life judged inconvenient or socially burdensome. If this power of physicians to kill rather than to heal is extended by legal affirmation of a right to die, the integrity of the healing professions could be further compromised.

Peirce contends that cost is a chief problem not being faced. Considerations of cost must be tempered by considerations of the moral rights of patients to care and obligatory treatments and the duty of health-care professionals not to abandon their patients.

The right-to-die movement is invoking many of the moral and legal principles used by the abortion movement two decades ago. There is deep-seated distrust of the leaders of American medicine because they have uttered little protest against the destruction of 16 million lives. There is much distrust because the bitterest opposition to measures to protect the rights of obligatory medical treatments of handicapped newborns came from American medical leaders.

And people are now worried that a profession that has been allowed to kill so many of the inconvenient young will now begin to terminate the inconvenient elderly and incompetent.●

IN HONOR OF DR. RUTH W. WILSON, M.D.

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the accomplishments of an outstanding individual in the medical profession. Dr. Ruth W. Wilson, M.D. has served the people of Beaver County, PA, as a physician for 65 years, serving 50 of those years on the staff of the Medical Center of Beaver County, and its predecessor hospitals.

Dr. Wilson's life in medical service has been long and distinguished. She was born in McConnelsville, OH, and later graduated from Ohio State University in 1918. She continued her education at the Philadelphia College of Medicine, formerly the Women's Medical College in 1920. Dr. Wilson served her internship at Mercy Hospital in Pittsburgh from 1920–21.

Dr. Wilson's lifelong fight against tuberculosis and other diseases began with her studies at the Tuberculosis Institute in Pittsburgh. In 1920 the number of tuberculosis deaths was about 135 per 100,000 as compared to the current 5 per 100,000. Dr. Wilson committed her life to the cure of this infectious disease. She and her husband Dr. Fred Wilson married in 1926, and they worked together at the Beaver County Tuberculosis Sanitarium, at the present site of the Pennsylvania State University, Beaver Campus.

Dr. Wilson has received many honors for her meritorious service, including a honorary doctor of science degree from Geneva College in 1979. Four years ago, Dr. Wilson was inducted into the American Lung Association's forerunner, the National Tuberculosis Association.

In 1982, the doctor established a medical scholarship in her name at Geneva College to help make possible continuing premedical education for young people in Beaver County.

The humble and selfish service Dr. Wilson has given to Beaver County in her 65 years of medical practice will serve as inspiration to generations of other medical professions that will follow her example. All of us in Beaver County will miss her excellent devotion to the community, and we thank her for her fine record of outstanding service.●

TRIBUTE TO KEITH MAINLAND

HON. ROBERT J. MRAZEK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Speaker, the occasion of Keith Mainland's retirement from his distinguished performance as staff director of the Committee on Appropriations affords me the opportunity to state publicly my profound respect for his service to the committee, the Congress and the Nation.

While my tenure on the committee spans little more than 2 years, this has been time enough to grasp the obvious: That Mr. Mainland's job is a sensitive and demanding post, wholly unique in the entire Congress, and that he has carried out his duties with strength and aplomb. It is evident to me that both of the latter qualities are virtual prerequisites for the performance of the committee directorship. The director must maintain an iron will in his resolve to glean from a widely disparate committee membership, year after year, the money bills which fire our Federal engine. Yet he must perform this function with a strong sense of the reality of circumstance, prevailing mood and political climate, three wild cards in the congressional appropriations process.

The methods employed by the committee director to bring about consensus on these bills goes straight to the heart of Congress' power of the purse. He must advise without directing, disagree without offending, and advocate without transgressing the committee membership. From a maelstrom of numbers and priorities, he must shepherd through the committee a technically precise, complex and decipherable legal document.

Keith Mainland has carried out these duties with grace, integrity and acumen for the particular requirements of the post. He possesses an enviable blend of character, intelligence and loyalty, and has met his awesome responsibilities with a refreshing wit and humility. The qualities enabled him to exploit the depth of his knowledge free of condescension and to weigh the opinions of others free of prejudice.

Another somewhat talented individual, Thomas Wolfe, once applied his gifts to the description of true success. Wolfe wrote:

> If a man has a talent and cannot use it, he has failed. If he has a talent and uses only half of it, he has partly failed. If he has a talent and learns somehow to use the whole of it, he has gloriously succeeded, and won a satisfaction and a triumph few men ever know.

Keith Mainland can leave the Committee on Appropriations as the proud possessor of this special satisfaction and triumph, for his talents have benefited all of us with whom he has worked.

Keith, you will be one tough act to follow.●

GIFT AND ESTATE DEDUCTION FOR SOCIAL WELFARE ORGANIZATIONS

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would provide a measure of fairness in tax treatment of tax-exempt social welfare organizations.

Social welfare organizations, owned and operated on a nonprofit basis exclusively for the promotion of civic betterment and social improvement, are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code. In that respect they are similar in nature to charitable organizations, which are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Unlike a charitable organization, however, a social welfare organization may work for its goals by attempting to influence legislation without forfeiting its tax-exempt status. Thus, the same organization may be either a 501(c)(3) organization or a 501(c)(4) organization depending on the means it uses to achieve its goals.

Although both types of organizations enjoy tax-exempt status, there is a great disparity in the tax treatment of 501(c)(3) organizations and 501(c)(4) organizations. Contributions to 501(c)(3) charitable organizations are deductible from the income of a donor, and exempt from estate and gift taxes. Contributions to 501(c)(4) social welfare organizations, however, are not deductible from income tax and are subject to the estate and gift tax. Thus, someone who wants to donate a large amount of money to a social welfare organization not only will be denied an income tax deduction, but also will be liable for a substantial gift tax.

My legislation would allow a deduction from estate and gift taxes for donations to 501(c)(4) organizations. This treatment is appropriate for several reasons. First, the rationale for imposition of estate and gift taxes does not apply to donations to social welfare organizations. Estate and gift taxes are imposed to tax windfalls, to ensure that property is taxed at least once a generation, and to dilute concentration of wealth. None of these purposes is served by taxing donations to social welfare organizations, which in fact serve to transfer wealth from private ownership to organizations that serve the public.

Further, enactment of this legislation should have very slight revenue impact. Those few individuals who are willing to donate a large sum of money to the cause promoted by a social welfare organization, and forego a charitable deduction in so doing, are clearly not motivated by a desire for tax benefits. My bill simply removes what has been an effective deterrent to such giving. Because the current tax law has effectively prohibited such giving on a large scale, and also any revenue gain that might result from estate and gift tax on such donations, allowing a deduction for the estate and gift tax will have little or no revenue effect.

Donations to social welfare organizations, moreover, are analagous to political contributions, which are exempt from gift tax. Congress decided in 1975 to exempt political contributions from tax on the ground that, as then Ways and Means Chairman Al Ullman observed, "political contributions are in reality not a gift, but rather constitute contributions to further the general political or good government objectives of the donor". The same is true of donations to social welfare organizations, which are contributions to further the general political or good government objectives of the donor, and should therefore also be exempt from the gift tax.

In sum, this legislation would confer no special benefit on those who make generous contributions to social welfare organizations. Rather, it exempts donors from a penalty tax which should not even apply to their situation. It simply provides a measure of fairness for those who believe in a cause strongly enough to contribute generously to an organization that will promote that cause.●

FOUR MILLIONTH NATURAL GAS METER

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Southern California Gas Co. commemorated the installation of its 4 millionth natural gas meter with a brief ceremony in Carson, in the 31st District. Southern California Gas Co. is the largest natural gas distribution company in the United States and is 1 million meters ahead of the second largest gas distribution company, Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The company serves 14 million people residing in mainly the southern half of the State.

The governing bodies of both Los Angeles County and Los Angeles City presented Southern California's Chairman John Abram with resolutions citing the utility for its years of continued service to the residents of the community. John Abram presented a plaque and a natural gas-fired barbeque to Carson homeowners Eden Hernance and Zenaida Israel.

The gas company, a subsidiary of Pacific Lighting Corp., dates back to 1867. The 1 millionth meter was installed in 1941, the 2 millionth in 1955, and the 3 millionth in 1967.

I too want to extend my congratulations to Southern California Gas Co. and its employees for many years of fine service.●

THOUGHTS ON A WOMAN PRESIDENT AND A NUCLEAR CRISIS

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the work of one of my constituents, Richard Wendell Fogg, recently came to my attention. Mr. Fogg is the founder and director of the Center for the Study of Conflict. He has written extensively on the subject of nonmilitary responses to a nuclear crisis. This approach utilizes tactics such as we have developed in dealing with terrorists and kidnapers. I was particularly intrigued by Mr. Fogg's views of the way a woman President might handle a nuclear crisis differently from a man President. I would like to share with my colleagues the following article by Mr. Fogg on this topic which appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun. In the midst of this deadly arms race, we need new ideas and different perspectives to ensure our survival. I believe Mr. Fogg is making a significant contribution in this area.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, July 18, 1984]

THOUGHTS ON A WOMAN PRESIDENT AND A NUCLEAR CRISIS

(By Richard Wendell Fogg)

Now we know that a woman could have her finger on the American nuclear button. That's not so strange; Margaret Thatcher already has her finger on the British nuclear button.

But at the time of the 1980 presidential conventions, would you have guessed that a woman could be nominated for the vice-presidency of the United States?

SURPRISING PROGRESS

Progress has come by surprise before. Would you have guessed in 1964 that Congress would pass a major civil rights bill a year later and that a President from Texas (Lyndon Johnson) would say "We shall overcome" on television when he explained the bill?

Would you have guessed that President Nixon would fire and eliminate the entire dirty tricks department of the CIA? And that he would have one of the lowest military budgets (as a percentage of Gross National Product) of all modern presidents? And would increase the budget for many social programs? And that he would recognize China and promote detente with the USSR.

Mondale, Johnson, and Nixon did what many people said couldn't be done. These men, though politicians, weren't shackled by lack of optimism about what the public would accept. (Of course there were pressures on them to act as they did.) In the same spirit, if a woman were president, and she weren't shackled by lack of optimism either, what might she do in a nuclear crisis? Is there a feminine way to approach nuclear crises?

As far as I know, there are no female nuclear strategists. Analysts, yes, but not women who devise strategy for nuclear crises. Therefore it's hard to know what a female approach to the problem might be. But I have discussed the matter with many women and am willing to suggest some possibilities.

To begin with, most women don't say, as many men do, "Some people only understand the same kind of force they use themselves." Many women feel that nuclear counterthreats are not the only way to make nuclear aggressors back down. That's because nuclear aggressors are motivated by many things, just as everyone else is.

One clue to a female president's strategy for nuclear crisis comes from the work of Carol Gilligan, *Ms. Magazine's* woman of the year. She studies moral development in females. She has found that highly moral females emphasize building caring relationships. (Highly moral males stress justice.)

In a nuclear crisis, a female president might relate to the nuclear aggressor—the head of state. She might say, "Some very serious problems must have made you consider using nuclear weapons. If we've committed an injustice, we'll correct it. If you have a legitimate dispute with us, we'll negotiate it. If you have a problem that isn't our fault, we'll help you solve it anyway."

Many women assume that people do wrong things because of problems, and that nurturing can help wrongdoers behave. For example, Japan attacked Pearl Harbor partly because the West had cut off 75% of Japan's imports, including oil. Had Eleanor Roosevelt been president, she might have ended that embargo, nurtured the Japanese with trade, and perhaps prevented the war.

A female president might also develop relations with top leaders in the aggressor country other than the handful who would start a nuclear war. Her purpose would be to try to convince them to depose the aggressors. Every nation has a means of getting rid of its head of state, and there is a long history of nations doing so. Argentina deposed President Galtieri for his role in the Falklands crisis. The Soviet Union deposed Premier Khrushchev partly for his role in the Cuban missile crisis. Britain deposed Prime Minister Anthony Eden for his role in attacking the Suez area of Egypt in 1956. "Depose nuclear aggressors" should be the model for nuclear crises.

One more way women improve relationships to stop aggression is to reduce the fear that motivates aggression. A woman as president might publicly destroy some of our nuclear weapons in the middle of a nuclear crisis to reduce the adversary's fear. There would still be enough nuclear weapons left if she decided to use them later. She would be acting as staffmembers do in enlightened institutions for violent, disturbed people, where the rule is, "Never corner an inmate, or he or she may get violent."

A woman who was president might follow women's assertiveness training in a nuclear crisis and simply say, "No," to the demands of the aggressor. Rather than enforce her decision with warfare, a female president might enforce it with nonviolent action organized by governments and prepared in advance. That has never been done before so we don't know whether it would work. It may be progress that will come by surprise in the future.

A relationship-oriented thrust of nonviolent defense would be for the intended victims to show that they could fraternize with the invading troops and bureaucrats and make them unreliable.

In 1968, half a million Soviet troops invaded Czechoslovakia. They were told that they were putting down a rebellion. The Czech army stayed in its barracks, and Czech civilians convinced the Soviet troops that there was no rebellion. These troops became unreliable and had to be rotated within three days. The Soviets did prevail after eight months, but that was longer than the Czech military could ever have defended their country.

Some people feel that these proposals would not make a nuclear aggressor back down, but most people feel instead that the problem is that Americans wouldn't agree to do the things proposed. Johnson, Nixon, and Mondale's surprising progress suggests that we can achieve more than we think we can. Perhaps there is hope that we can deal with nuclear crises in nonmilitary ways. A female president would be more likely to develop these methods—but a male president could do so too.●

THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY: AN ILLUSION FOR THE LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment upon the callous way in which the long-term unemployed are being treated by the Reagan administration.

Mr. Reagan has announced that the Federal Supplemental Compensation Program will end on April 7. The immediate consequence of this decision is that 325,000 people will see a huge drop in their real income.

The President claims that, with the economic recovery this program has become unnecessary. Will the President inform us as to whether he asked the 325,000 dependent upon the program whether or not it is necessary? I think not.

If the economy is growing, and thousands of new jobs are being created each month as the President claims, then will he please explain why so many people have been unemployed for so long? Does he believe that these unfortunate people choose to rely upon welfare rather than take jobs or embark upon a federally financed training program? Of course not.

The cost of the Federal Supplemental Compensation Program is $1.85 billion per year. I would suggest that the people whose daily bread this money buys appreciate the outlay on this program far more than on B-1's, MX, or perhaps, the most frivolous of all, star wars.

I would ask my colleagues to reflect upon which is of more value. Money to feed and clothe families or yet more nuclear weapons to add to the arms race.●

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine a more appropriate time over the past several years for us to pay this tribute to the American farmer.

In the past, when I have stood before my colleagues and spoken about the importance—and the unique problems—of the farm community, I have almost always been compelled to point out that those who produce our food and fiber are not given the recognition they deserve.

I have often said that I fear that most Americans go to the supermarket, buy the food they need, and never really stop to think about how it got there. I have often bemoaned the fact that few people in our cities and suburbs really consider how amazing it is that, for every 78 people going through the checkout line, there is only 1 farmer out there producing the meat, the fiber, and the produce that they can so easily and economically purchase.

Generally speaking, I think this lack of recognition still exists—but I must say that events of recent weeks have focused a great deal more attention on the farmer than he usually receives. We have seen stories about the problems of agriculture on the front pages of the New York Times and the Washington Post; we have seen cover stories in Time and Newsweek about the "farm crisis"; and yes, our network newscasts have devoted an unusually large number of their precious minutes to the challenges of farming in today's economy.

And this has all had a very real effect on the American public. For the first time in recent memory, public opinion polls are showing that a substantial portion of the American people are genuinely concerned about the welfare of the farm community. As a Congressman who represents a major segment of that farm community, I welcome this increased awareness—even though I wish it did not require a "crisis" to bring it about.

But whatever the cause, we must view this time in the spotlight as an important opportunity for the American farmer.

If, through efforts such as today's tribute, we can make the American people more appreciative of what the farmer risks, how hard the farm family works, and how incredibly productive our agriculture is, we can perhaps be more successful in shaping policies that will help make farming the profitable enterprise that it should be.

There is no "producing machine" in the world that can match our farmers, and we as a Nation owe a great deal of our success and our high standard of living to that tremendous productivity. Thus, it is, indeed fitting that we take this time today to say "thank you" to our farmers, and restate our commitment in this House to pursuing farm policies and economic policies that will allow agriculture to prosper.●

DOT OBSTRUCTS CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF CONRAIL SALE

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole recently recommended to Congress that Conrail be sold to the Norfolk Southern. This recommendation raises critical issues involving transportation policy, antitrust policy, and tax policy. Congress must review these issues very carefully as part of its consideration of the Secretary's recommendation.

The Subcommittee on Commerce, Transportation and Tourism, chaired by our distinguished colleague JIM FLORIO of New Jersey, has been engaged in a careful examination of both the process and substance of Secretary Dole's recommendation. Unfortunately, the Department of Transportation is stonewalling the subcommittee. The Department has denied the subcommittee access to hundreds of vital documents for no good reason. This obstruction of the subcommittee's efforts raises serious questions about what DOT may be trying.

The Record, one of New Jersey's leading newspapers, recently raised this question in an excellent editorial. The editorial follows.

[From the Record (NJ), Mar. 13, 1985]

WHAT'S MRS. DOLE HIDING?

For more than a year, the Reagan administration pushed hard to sell Conrail, the huge government-owned freight railroad. But now, suddenly, it's stalling. On Feb. 27, Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole testified before the Republican-controlled Senate Commerce Committee in support of her plan to sell Conrail to the Norfolk Southern Railroad for $1.2 billion. Since then, she has been unable to find a free moment on her calendar for the House subcommittee on commerce, transportation, and tourism—which is, of course, controlled by Democrats. Instead of answering the subcommittee's questions, Mrs. Dole is busy blockading her files against its chairman, Rep. James Florio of New Jersey, who wants to inspect them.

The reason for this strange behavior seems plain: Mr. Florio's first question is how a maximum price of $1.2 billion came to be set before bids from most prospective buyers had even been submitted. Mrs. Dole apparently doesn't want to answer that question in public. The answer almost certainly contains the key to a much more important question: whether the public is getting a fair shake at $1.2 billion.

In its 10 years of existence, the taxpayers have poured $8 billion into Conrail. The money has been well spent, transforming a collection of seven broken-down private railroads into a sleek money-making system. Conrail's 1984 profit was nearly $500 million. It has cash reserves of more than $800 million; hundreds of millions in tax-loss carryovers from prior, unprofitable years; and billions of dollars' worth of new rolling stock and rehabilitated tracks. All this for $1.2 billion. It's a pretty slick deal.

We don't think it's sensible to sell the railroad at all, but there seems to be no restraining the administration in its reckless privatization of government functions. We also think that the best deal for taxpayers, workers, and shippers would be a combination of employee ownership with public stockholding—an option rejected by Mrs. Dole as too complicated and costly. It would bring in the largest sum, spread the benefits

of ownership over the largest number of shareholders, and guarantee continued rail service.

Employees now own 15 percent of Conrail, stock given them by Congress in return for cutting labor costs. Union restraint and high productivity have helped put Conrail in the black. Who knows if this cooperation would continue under Norfolk management? Continued Conrail service is vital to the economies of 15 states in the East and Midwest, and DOT promises to include in the sales contract a pledge not to shut down the railroad. Such pledges have a way of winding up in litigation when they prove onerous to the buyers.

In other words, there are plenty of good arguments against the administration's plan to sell Conrail, and there may be even stronger reasons that the administration is trying to conceal. Part of Mrs. Dole's job is to promote the political philosophy of the president, but her job is not to stonewall Congress and withhold vital facts from the American people. She should open her files to the House subcommittee.●

APARTHEID

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, the apartheid system of South Africa is an affront to all humanity. It is our moral responsibility to oppose the official system of racism in that country.

The repugnance that we all feel toward the apartheid system is captured in a recent essay by Elie Wiesel that appeared in the New York Times on March 25. Mr. Wiesel, in a sensitive and compassionate article, reminds us of our obligation and responsibility. He writes:

Without comparing apartheid to Nazims and to its "final solution"—for that defies all comparisons—one cannot but assign the two systems, in their supposed legality, to the same camp. Both have shown that laws can be twisted and distorted to the point of becoming instruments of tortune and death.

Mr. Wiesel's words take on added meaning in light of the killings of black South African demonstrators last week.

Mr. Wiesel displays a rare sensitivity to injustice because of his own personal experience with prejudice and hate. The deep concern and outrage expressed in this article is emblematic of his lifelong struggle against injustice in any form.

I pay tribute to Mr. Wiesel for his denunciation of apartheid and commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 22, 1985]

APARTHEID'S SO-CALLED LAW

(By Elie Wiesel)

Shame: that is what a white man, a Jew like me, feels while visiting Soweto in South Africa.

I remember: it was 10 years ago. I had come on a lecture tour of several cities. The organizers did not hide their concern: was I going to embarrass them by speaking out against apartheid? "Don't forget," advised a well-know liberal, "that after your speech, you return home while we stay here." In other words, I was not going to suffer the consequences. I promised him that I'd say nothing until I had studied the problem.

My project was to visit the blacks in their ghetto. The next day I traveled to Soweto, and what I discovered there made me doubt the human species. I felt guilty, confronted by the unspeakable suffering of the oppressed men, the resigned women, the children with melacholy eyes. Because of my color, and also my nationality, I was supposed to be superior to them. I belonged to another social and ethnic order, I belonged to another humanity. And I wasn't proud of it.

But beyond my shame, there was something else. What I understood in Soweto is that the racial laws of South Africa are wrong, not only because they result in collective and individual oppression but also, and especially, because they are laws.

Racism itself is dreadful, but when it pretends to be legal, and therefore just, it becomes altogether repugnant. Without comparing apartheid to Nazism and to its "final solution"—for that defies all comparisons—one cannot but assign the two systems, in their supposed legality, to the same camp.

Both have shown that laws can be twisted and distorted to the point of becoming insturments of torture and death. When the law itself becomes criminal, its authors are doubly criminal because they deprive their victims of the basic right granted to all human beings: recourse to justice. But beyond this, in South Africa justice itself is manipulated and perverted—and this scandals remains an affront to humanity.

That individuals commit injustice against their peers is, unfortunately, a regular occurrence. That they should be protected by those in power is not uncommon. At times, governments also abuse the law in order to strengthen their authority. But the South African Government goes further: by raising segregation and racial persecution to the ethical level of law, it puts into practice the antinomian rules of Orwell's world. Evil becomes good, inhumanity is interpreted as charity, egoism as compassion.

Victims no longer have the right to complain. Their misfortune is ridiculed. The torturer decides whether or not they suffer. He determines the shape of their liberty and their language. By exposing them to constant humiliation, the torturer attacks not only their right to live but also their very being.

That is why, in meeting South African blacks, the visitor is ashamed not to be like them. He is ashamed of his liberty.

As a Jew, I am all the more sensitive to this kind of injustice. I had no hesitation, after leaving Soweto, about denouncing apartheid in all my lectures. At Durban, Cape Town, Port Elizabeth and Johannesburg, the South African public showed its understanding. Certainly, to them, the situation is more complex, perhaps more tragic because it is unsolvable, than it appears to an outsider. Yet the young, the intellectuals and the students are opposing the Government with an increasingly dedicated resistance. It is also for them that we must act: our support extends first to the victims and then to their allies. Without such resistance, we would all be accomplices.●

MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary conduct the Voice of Democracy scriptwriting contest. Students entering this contest compete for six national scholarships ranging from $1,000 for sixth prize to $14,000 for first prize. Miss Meredith A. Stafford was selected as the Alaska State winner and she will go to compete nationwide for the top scholarship prizes. Miss Stafford is currently a junior at Robert Service High School in Anchorage, AK. She is involved in the NJROTC and plans to attend one of the U.S. Military Academies. The following is her exceptional speech, written to this year's theme "My Pledge to America":

MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA

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

In this Pledge we offer our allegiance to our flag and people. But what exactly is this allegiance? We sometimes neglect to think past those thirty-one words. As citizens of the United States, we are responsible to our nation—to ourselves indirectly—for abiding by her laws, defending those laws, and working to make her better.

When this country was founded, almost two centuries ago, a constitution was framed to provide for our rights and needs. Still, the Constitution of the United States cannot serve this purpose if we simply go about our business, leaving it to do so by itself. Our actions are what give it its power to protect us. If we were to go through life honoring only our own needs and desires, taking from others what we wanted regardless of their wishes, the Constitution would mean nothing. Others could be just as disrespectful of us, and we would have no protection. But if we abide by this country's laws, which are based on the Constitution, we contribute more and more to its validity.

This leads naturally to the defense of these laws. This is not to say that we should take the law into our own hands. If we did so, we would violate the rights of those we act against just as surely as they violate the rights of their victims. Execution of the law is a difficult, complicated procedure for which this country has developed the militia, a police force and, of course, the court systems. The people of whom these bodies are composed are trained to execute the law properly. This is something we should not attempt to do on our own. However, there are times when we are called upon to help defend the law. For instance, if I were to see a person attempting to break into a home, it would be my duty to call the police to come look into it.

Or course, there is much more to the people of America than obedience to laws and respect for others. Although these things are very important, we would not have gotten very far if it hadn't been for

one other thing: the contribution of knowledge and wisdom to our country. Each generation is supported by and works with what is left by previous generations. They, in turn, develop it further for the next generations. We must help to keep this process alive, to provide information for a future America, so that it will continue to grow. All contributions are important, whether in science, to give us knowledge, or in philosophy to give us the guidance we need to use that knowledge wisely.

When we pledge our allegiance to the United States of America it is important to remember that we are at the same time making a special commitment to her. My pledge to America is: that I respect her laws, and live by them, and that I help her to be all that she can be by passing on what I gain throughout my lifetime in knowledge and wisdom to her future generations.●

THE TRUE NATURE OF CONSTRUCTIVE ENGAGEMENT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express deep outrage over President Reagan's recent remarks about the massacres taking place in South Africa.

The internal situation there is very tense. More than 220 persons have been shot to death by South African police in the past year, and hundreds more have been seriously wounded. It is not as though the police are fighting a battle to halt general lawlessness, as the President stated during his March 21 press conference. Rather, they are the agents of a repressive state which will use any means to stop the free expression of dissent by blacks.

Mr. Speaker, the President's use of a law and order analogies hearkens back to a time when dogs were unleashed on civil rights marchers to preserve a perverse status quo in the American South. Yes, the South African security forces represent law and order—but which law, and which order?

It is the immoral law of racial subjugation which can find a precedent only in Hitler's Third Reich. And it is an order imposed by force, intimidation, and racial segregation. There is no defense for South Africa's security methods, and Ronald Reagan should be ashamed of himself for implying that there is such a defense.

The President has revealed the true essence of constructive engagement. It is not a means by which we will gradually exert our influence over Pretoria to ease its policy of apartheid. It is instead a tacit agreement that economic ties will remain unchanged while free rein is given to the security forces.

Mr. Reagan has reduced himself to using illogical and racist statements about the recent spate of violence in South Africa. He should learn from history that many revolutions take place when a particular group is pushed to the brink, with no option other than a desperate bid for freedom. This is what is happening in South Africa, and Ronald Reagan should be aware of the consequences of his policy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer the following article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 26, 1985]

APARTHEID'S SO-CALLED LAW

(By Elie Wiesel)

Shame: that is what a white man, a Jew like me, feels while visiting Soweto in South Africa.

I remember: it was 10 years ago. I had come on a lecture tour of several cities. The organizers did not hide their concern: was I going to embarrass them by speaking out against apartheid? "Don't forget," advised a well-known liberal, "that after your speech, you return home while we stay here." In other words, I was not going to suffer the consequences. I promised him that I'd say nothing until I had studied the problem.

My project was to visit the blacks in their ghetto. The next day I traveled to Soweto, and what I discovered there made me doubt the human species. I felt guilty, confronted by the unspeakable suffering of the oppressed men, the resigned women, the children with melancholy eyes. Because of my color, and also my nationality, I was supposed to be superior to them. I belonged to another social and ethnic order, I belonged to another humanity. And I wasn't proud of it.

But beyond my shame, there was something else. What I understood in Soweto is that the racial laws of South Africa are wrong, not only because they result in collective and individual oppression but also, and especially, because they are laws.

Racism itself is dreadful, but when it pretends to be legal, and therefore just, it becomes altogether repugnant. Without comparing apartheid to Nazism and to its "final solution"—for that defies all comparisons—one cannot but assign the two systems, in their supposed legality, to the same camp.

Both have shown that laws can be twisted and distorted to the point of becoming instruments of torture and death. When the law itself becomes criminal, its authors are doubly criminal because they deprive their victims of the basic right granted to all human beings: recourse to justice. But beyond this, in South Africa justice itself is manipulated and perverted—and this scandal remains an affront to humanity.

That individuals commit injustice against their peers is, unfortunately, a regular occurrence. That they should be protected by those in power is not uncommon. At times, governments also abuse the law in order to strengthen their authority. But the South African Government goes further; by raising segregation and racial persecution to the ethical level of law, it puts into practice the antinomian rules of Orwell's world. Evil becomes good, inhumanity is interpreted as charity, egoism as compassion.

Victims no longer have the right to complain. Their misfortune is ridiculed. The torturer decides whether or not they suffer. He determines the shape of their liberty and their language. By exposing them to constant humiliation, the torturer attacks not only their right to live but also their very being.

That is why, in meeting South African blacks, the visitor is ashamed not to be like them. He is ashamed of his liberty.

As a Jew, I am all the more sensitive to this kind of injustice. I had no hesitation, after leaving Soweto, about denouncing apartheid in all my lectures. At Durban, Cape Town, Port Elizabeth and Johannesburg, the South African public showed its understanding. Certainly, to them, the situation is more complex, perhaps more tragic because it is unsolvable, than it appears to an outsider. Yet the young, the intellectuals and the students are opposing the Government with an increasingly dedicated resistance. It is also for them that we must act: our support extends first to the victims and then to their allies. Without such resistance, we would all be accomplices.●

THE McALLISTERS

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the month of March began with a very special day in the Plymouth, MI, area. Indeed, March 1 marked an event that represents what makes America very special and that is such an important part of the American spirit. That is—entrepreneurship, the willingness to take a chance for the possibility of increased personal and hence our national productivity.

Bill and Jack McAllister took that chance 40 years ago. The first of this month Bill and his wife, Lois—who now helps Bill run the operation—celebrated the 40th anniversary of the McAllister grocery store.

I have known Bill and Lois since I was a youngster. Bill and Lois are exemplary of what makes this country great. Bill served his country with distinction in the U.S. Navy during World War II. The McAllisters have given jobs to over 100 youths from the community—instilling in those young people the work ethic, another integral part of what makes this country strong. Both have been community leaders in Northville and Plymouth, MI.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a copy of an excellent article in the February 25 edition of the Plymouth Observer, written by W.W. Edgar. It tells the McAllisters' story so well, a story that all America should read.

The article follows:

MCALLISTERS HIT THEIR 40th YEAR

(By W.W. Edgar)

There will be a merry old time in the McAllister grocery store on Northville Road on Saturday, March 1.

At that time, Bill (Pod) McAllister, a well-known businessman in the Plymouth area, will be reliving some of the memories of the gamble he and Jack took when he was discharged from the U.S. Navy at the end of World War II.

McAllister served as a fighter pilot in the war, and after being discharged, he and brother Jack decided to open a grocery store.

"There were no jobs to be had," he recalled, "and it is a bit difficult to realize that it was just 40 years ago from March 1 that we took a gamble and opened the store.

"It was only a little 25 by 50 foot but it was the only grocery in the area outside of the C.F. Smith store on Starkweather in the city."

It was a gamble but with strict devotion to business it has been a success and in this 40th anniversary "Pod" can't help recalling the start.

"We tried everything. Nothing was too much trouble. We even delivered cold beer just as the milkman delivers milk these days. The beer was $2.99 a case and it now sells for $10. We sold Coca-Cola at six bottles for a quarter and cigars were only 15 cents."

As he helps celebrate the birthday of the store, he tells of the strange things that he did to keep the store running while the population kept growing.

"Would you believe it, we used to skin bear and deer for the hunters to keep in their ice boxes at home. It was a lot of work, but it helped build the foundation for the 40 years we have been here at the same spot.

"Of course, we've enlarged it three times and we have taken on more articles but it is still the same McAllister store."

"Recalling his memories, while wife Lois, who recently was honored with a place in the Detroit Bowling Hall of Fame, looked on, McAllister admitted that the first 10 years were tough.

"But we weathered the storm. Then Jack left, and Lois and I are running the store now. It still is a different type of market. We gave up selling meat quite a long time ago, but today we even sell bait for the fishermen. We keep it refrigerated and it is quite saleable during the fishing season."

Looking back over the years, McAllister is proud of the fact he has from time to time hired more than 100 young people from the community. Two of them, Earl Harrison and Ted Byers, have been with him from the start. Several of the others have become bank presidents and two others wound up as college professors, while many of the football players got their first business experience in the store.

While it still is a popular market-place with the right to sell liquor, and is a station for the state lottery, the market has taken on the popular belief that it is a branch station for the University of Michigan athletic program.

"We became interested in Michigan when our daughter was a freshman, the year Bo Schembechler became head coach.

"We haven't missed a home game of football since then, and I once had the privilege of riding with the team to the Pacific Coast for a game. We also started the custom of having the paintings of the quarterback and a speedy halfback on the windows of the market.

"It sure is a great change from the little market we opened 40 years ago on a gamble. But it has been a lot of fun and hard work. But, now looking back, it was worth every minute we put into it."●

MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary annually conduct a Voice of Democracy essay writing contest. I am proud that this year's Connecticut State winner is a resident of my district from the town of Oakville. Her name is Mary Rinaldi, and she is a junior at Watertown High School. Miss Rinaldi has an outstanding record of achievements in school and community activities. She is vice president of the Spanish Club, Library Service Club, Executive Board, Band Track, Sage Program, and was chosen to participate in the Hugh O'Brien Youth Leadership Foundation. Mary is also a member of the National Honor Society. Her awards include: the DAR Leadership Award, the Ancient History Award, the All Around Student Award, and the Language Achievement Award. I think her essay, "My Pledge to America," presents an issue which all citizens should reflect upon during their lives:

MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA

(By Mary Rinaldi)

What is a pledge? Looking in the dictionary we see that it is a promise or agreement to perform or fulfill some act, contract or duty. Throughout the history of our country, men and women have been making pledges and by honoring them, they have made this country truly great.

Back in the year 1776, we see that Thomas Jefferson made a pledge in the Declaration of Independence. He said, "and for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor". This declaration was a starting point to obtaining the freedom of a nation. This pledge was honored in the Revolutionary War, for men gave up their lives, fortunes and honor to establish a country that was ruled by a government, "of the people, by the people, for the people".

Another pledge that comes to mind when looking at this title is one learned in early childhood, "The Pledge of Allegiance". This pledge of faithfulness to one idea has been passed on through generations and has made this country and her people one in freedom and has truly made this country great.

I have been very lucky in life because I have been given the chance to travel all over this great country of ours. On one of my trips, I was able to visit Pearl Harbor in Hawaii. As I stood in a memorial over the great battleship *Arizona*, I was reminded of a pledge that a civilian makes to become a soldier. He pledges to protect the welfare of his country at all costs. As I stood on a little hill at Punchbowl, overlooking more than 3,000 graves of brave American soldiers I could not help feeling deep sympathy for all the soldiers, men and women alike, who gave their lives to protect America, their homeland, so that it would remain great for future American generations yet to come.

In his inaugural address, John F. Kennedy said this, "Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friends and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans, born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world. This we pledge and more." Every once in a while we have a great leader, who inspires people. A leader with charisma, who is able to say, "Come Follow Me." The pledge made by this man is still true today. America is a nation committed to the rights of human beings all over the world. This is a pledge that each generation hence tries to fulfill as best as possible.

Some people nowadays would disagree with me, when I say America is number one in the world. If you asked these people, which country is most productive in the world, they would probably say Russia or Japan, but they are wrong. America, is the most productive nation in the world.

My pledge to America is this: At the age of eighteen, I plan to register to vote, and be the best possible citizen. I hope in the future to make decisions that will benefit my country. I don't just want to follow the leader, I want to be the leader. I want to guide my nation wisely. By helping my country I hope to become one of the guiding hands in running our country and government.

In order to achieve this, I must be a good student now. When my fellow students go out into the world looking for jobs and starting careers, I hope they will remember the words of John F. Kennedy, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country!"●

FLORIO TO REMAIN IN HOUSE

HON. BOB EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday our colleague from New Jersey, [JIM FLORIO] announced that he will not seek the governorship in the 1985 election.

Widely perceived as the frontrunner for the Democratic nomination, Congressman FLORIO cited as the major reason for his decision the large and important agenda of legislation coming before his committee in Washington.

Many of us who have worked closely with JIM in the House believe that this is New Jersey's loss and the Nation's gain. As chairman of a key Energy and Commerce subcommittee, JIM is a nationally recognized leader on environmental protection, railroad transportation, and other issues. JIM'S dedication to his work is the subject of an article in today's Philadelphia Inquirer by Dale Mezzacappa, and I am pleased to share it with our colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Mar. 27, 1985]

FLORIO CHOSE TO RETAIN A KEY ROLE IN CONGRESS

(By Dale Mezzacappa)

WASHINGTON.—Jim Florio was clearly in his element.

Just one day after announcing his decision not to run in the Democratic primary for governor, the South Jersey congressman sat in the chairman's seat in the huge Energy and Commerce Committee hearing room. With relish and, as usual, with facts at his fingertips, he excoriated chemical company officials and government bureaucrats for welching on their responsibilities to protect the environment and public health.

Such activity is, after 10 years in Congress, Florio's favorite role here, and one in which he has developed a national reputation and an undeniable expertise.

When he announced his decision not to run, Florio said that a full agenda in Washington was a major reason. Although that is often used by politicians who do not want to take the risks involved in running for higher office, in Florio's case it may well be true.

As chairman of the House subcommittee on commerce, transportation and tourism, Florio is critically placed to influence action on most issues involving mass transportation and the regulation of hazardous substances.

Because both those issues have critical impact in New Jersey, what he does here in the next few months could affect the quality of life in New Jersey as much as anything he could accomplish as governor.

Right now, he is in the forefront of the fight to thwart the Reagan administration's attempts to abolish Amtrak and end assistance to other mass transportation.

Should mass-transit aid end, fares could go up 40 percent, and thousands of New Jerseyans could be forced back into using their cars to commute over already crowded roads. If Amtrak were eliminated, about 25,000 people—many in the state—could lose their jobs.

Florio also is the lead figure in the House in the effort to extend the Superfund toxic-waste cleanup program, which has a profound effect on New Jersey. And he is taking the lead in efforts to control accidents and hazardous emissions from chemical plants—the subject of the hearing yesterday. Such accidents already have accounted for numerous injuries in highly industrial parts of New Jersey and is suspected by some as contributing to the state's relatively high cancer rate.

"Part of the reason I decided not to run was the importance of my work in demonstrating the failings of the Reagan Republican philosophy," said Florio during a break in the hearing. He said he believed that the Reagan administration was "tearing apart the social and economic fabric of our society by doing such things as trying to end mass transit and failing to regulate chemical hazards. In Washington, I can better clarify the 'big picture' effect of their policies."

Florio also said that he had had an offer from a major publisher to write a book called *Detoxifying America* that would dwell on chemical hazards in this country and what he has characterized as the government's inadequate response. The focus on the potential problems here has been intensified by the Union Carbide disaster in Bhopal, India.

Yesterday morning, Gov. Kean—the man Florio would have tried to unseat—came to Washington to meet with the state's congressional delegation. Kean asked the bipartisan group to fight to save mass-transit aid, Amtrak and the Urban Development Action Grant program, and to stave off efforts to limit Medicaid spending. Kean also urged a greatly expanded toxic-waste Superfund.

Although Kean, a Republican who calls himself a Reagan supporter, did not put it that way, he was essentially asking the delegation to fight the administration on just about every issue important to the state.

"To me, it was tragic, the governor coming here asking for relief from the Reagan program that he had advocated before the election," said Florio. "I am much more comfortable with my position, and I feel I can bring greater attention to the state, the Democratic Party and the eventual Democratic nominee [for governor] in this role."●

MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, since 1962, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary have sponsored the Voice of Democracy scholarship contest for high school students around the country. I am proud to announce that this year's winner from Virginia, Nancy Snyder of Dale City, is from my congressional district. Nancy's work, entitled "My Pledge to America," is truly inspiring and deserves to be read by everyone who cherishes this country.

I congratulate Nancy on her selection as one of this year's scholarship recipients and would like to submit her essay into the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

MY PLEDGE TO AMERICA

The story of a new born nation grown great in a short period of two hundred years is the history of the United States of America. Thirteen original disjointed colonies were built into fifty powerful states, unified in a commitment to democracy, by American citizens who contributed their ideas, beliefs, and strengths.

History books sing the praises of great men—Washington, Jefferson, Rockefeller, Ford. Yet this nation was also built by men whose names will never grace the pages of a high school text—farmers and businessmen who, thru skill, determination, and good fortune, gained success. The future of America, as did it's past, lies in the pride, dedication, and achievements of its citizens.

Our ports have long greeted men and women from all nations who have come here to reach a shining star. These same men and women have harbored a spark—a spark of desire which flames and blazes into a yearning to achieve success. This flame is the fuel that has led men to take a risk, to invest in long shot stock, to build a crazy flying machine, or to invent a horseless carriage. My pledge to America is to harbor this same spark, to achieve the personal success which is the success of this nation.

Where can a line be drawn between selfishness and a pledge to America? Success at the expense of others is selfishness. Success by means that are against this country's laws and principles is selfishness. However, success thru hard work, dedication, and determination is a pledge to America, it is my pledge. To me, whether the pledge is to one's country or to oneself it is one and the same.

America is truly a land of opportunity. No other country in the world offers the opportunities and advantages which exist in America. If these valuable gifts are allowed to go to waste, this nation is lost. It is my goal to employ the unique opportunities available to me in this great country. Thru our system of free enterprise, dedication, and hard work, I hope to achieve personal success, for it is the honest and honorable use of this nation's resources which replenishes them. These resources are then available to generations of Americans, for whom we must be strong and proud. The achievements of a nation's people are the achievements of the nation.

Our vow cannot end with our personal success. It must continue thru pride and patriotism—an appreciation of this land of greatness. We must honor and cherish the nation which offers us unequaled opportunity—speak of it proudly, hold it in high esteem. We must carry our heads high. As Americans we must honor our pledge. We must adopt those same qualities our ancestors possessed, those qualities which have enriched our heritage and made our nation great.

Now it is my turn to give. It is my belief that through my own personal growth and success I can contribute my ideas and my strengths to the institutions which make this nation great; education, business, and government. Any contribution which enriches these institutions is a contribution to America. By achieving personal success either through business or politics, my strengths will become some of the strengths of these institutions and therefore the strengths of the nation.●

TRIBUTE TO ANDOR WEISS

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Mr. Andor Weiss, the executive director of Aishel Avraham, a nursing home in the Williamsburg section of Brooklyn.

As a result of the tireless commitment and dedication of Mr. Weiss, Aishel Avraham has become a model example of care for the elderly in this country.

In a society that looks mostly to the young and to the new, the aged are often tragically ignored and pushed to the side. At Aishel Avraham, through, the efforts of Mr. Weiss, have prevented this tragedy from occurring. He instills in the residents a sense of dignity and respect that they so richly deserve.

The large number of volunteers who consistently contribute their time to Aishel Avraham testifies to both its excellence and uniqueness. Three hundred and fifty members of the Brooklyn community regularly help the residents in a variety of ways. From high

school students to rabbis, the volunteers feed those patients who cannot serve themselves, write letters for those whose eye and hand coordination have failed them, assist in baking projects, or simply listen to the concerns of the residents.

It is my hope that the dedication and care demonstrated by Mr. Weiss will inspire others so that the elderly in this country receive the finest care.●

TRIBUTE TO COL. PAUL W. ARCARI, USAF

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, Col. Paul W. Arcari, U.S. Air Force, Chief of the Entitlements Division of the Directorate of Personnel Plans, will retire after 30 years of distinguished military service. Although his retirement will be most directly and dramatically felt by the Air Force, it will also create a vacuum in the other uniformed services, in other agencies of the executive branch, and in the Congress.

Colonel Arcari has become an institution in the Department of Defense. His reputation as the single most knowledgeable individual in the field of military compensation is beyond question. He earned that reputation over the last 16 years by demonstrating his ability to understand and explain the most complex aspects of military compensation. Understanding and explaining the status quo, however, would not by itself be remarkable. Colonel Arcari went far beyond the status quo, evaluating proposed changes to the military compensation system and, when existing alternatives were found lacking, creating ingenious solutions to confounding problems. He has rightfully earned the respect of his peers and his superiors as a result of his aggressive, intellectual, and purposeful leadership in this area.

As chairman of the Military Personnel and Compensation Subcommittee, I understand the immense task inherent in coming to grips with the problems in this area. Colonel Arcari has described and defended the Air Force position consistently and forcefully throughout the years. This has not hampered him, however, from providing the committee with otherwise unavailable assistance and expertise, without which we could not have fully understood the impact of our decisions. This willingness to address alternatives, "to see the other side," is what has made Colonel Arcari one of the most influential forces in the field of military compensation legislation.

Few of us can point to specific accomplishments that survive the test of time. The military compensation system, however, stands as a continuing testimonal to the multitude of accomplishments of Colonel Arcari. Little of importance in the military compensation system fails to exhibit the fine touch of the genius of Paul Arcari. But that manifestation is only a measure of input. More important is the impact that the military compensation system has on output, and the output can be observed in the status of the U.S. military personnel.

It is no coincidence that military personnel today are the best who have ever served. It is no coincidence that force managers today have a wealth of tools for addressing problems that persisted in the past but have now been eliminated. It is no coincidence that personnel management in the Air Force has been held as an exemplar for other services to emulate. The explanation, instead, lies with the impact of a single man and the people he has led for the past decade and a half. The explanation, Mr. Speaker, lies with Col. Paul W. Arcari.●

A TRIBUTE TO JOLIET CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL WRESTLING TEAM

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to bring to the attention of you and my fellow colleagues the success of the Joliet Central High School wrestling team. I am proud to announce that the Joliet Central Steelmen have won the Illinois Class AA Championship Wrestling Trophy in Champaign, IL, after an undefeated season.

Under the skillful and dedicated leadership of their coach, Mr. Mac McLaughlin, the Steelmen have brought a great sense of pride to their fellow students and to their community. This sense of pride is not only based on the athletic success of the team, but also on the fact that the team members are scholastic achievers with nine of their team members on the honor roll and the remaining nine being in academic good-standing. Together in the true sense of a "team effort," the members of this team were successful in achieving their common goal—winning the State championship.

Coach McLaughlin and the Central High Steelmen have raised to a higher level the morale and spirit of their school. I congratulate every person associated with the Joliet Central High School wrestling team, and I further extend my words of praise to the parents and family members whose devotion and behind-the-scene support gave this team a strong base from which to evolve.●

TRIBUTE TO COL. PAUL W. ARCARI, USAF

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the occasion of the retirement of Col. Paul W. Arcari, Chief of the Entitlements Division in the Personnel Plans Directorate of the U.S. Air Force, pass without acknowledging the outstanding contribution he has made to the well-being of our service members.

As the ranking Republican member on the Military Personnel and Compensation Subcommittee, I have seen the remarkable progress made in the field of military compensation in recent years. Colonel Arcari has presided over the greatest confluence of changes ever made to the military compensation system. Although he has had some influence in every major development we have seen, certain programs stand in continuing testimony to the impact he has had. Among these programs are the aviation career incentive pay, the variable housing allowance, the overseas allowance, the overseas cost-of-living allowance, junior enlisted travel, do-it-yourself moves, and CHAMPUS improvements.

These programs and many others will continue to serve as the foundation for military compensation for years to come. They will serve as the models for efficient and effective programs. And people will come to know, from these programs the "Arcari touch."

Colonel Arcari has assisted the committee innumerable times. Each time we have benefited from the help. We did not always agree, because we held different objectives at times; but we always understood the ramifications of our decisions better as a result of Paul Arcari's help. And the military compensation system is, today, significantly better for it.

However, the ultimate reward for Paul Arcari for his years of dedicated and distinguished service is the mark he has left on service members. That is the bottomline; that is the final measure of success. Service members are better off today financially, than they have ever been. Their well-being has been the singular, overriding concern of Colonel Arcari; and their well-being could not have been in more capable hands.

Few service members know Colonel Arcari; not many recognize the debt of gratitude they owe him. He is an unsung hero, and an untiring and faithful public servant. His retirement

highlights an era of enlighted leadership that will be extremely difficult to maintain. Paul Arcari is a hard act to follow; he has, however, set in place the necessary framework to carry on his work, and we expect that his influence will continue to be felt for many years.

Mr. Speaker, we wish Col. Paul W. Arcari the best in the future; he has unquestionably and unselfishly given all military personnel his best in the past.●

UNITED STATES-SOVIET EXCHANGE

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by 61 of my colleagues in introducing a resolution to encourage greater contact between the Members of the House of Representatives and their counterparts in the Supreme Soviet. Both the United States and the Soviet Union spend substantial portions of their annual budgets in response to threats posed by the other. Yet our understanding of each other from personal experience is minimal. Fewer than one in five Members of the House have visited the Soviet Union. A far smaller proportion of our counterparts in the Supreme Soviet has visited the United States. Certainly both sides have much to learn.

Last month, Mr. Vladimir Shcherbitskiy led a delegation from the Supreme Soviet to the United States. In the past year, several delegations from Congress have visited the Soviet Union. While we cannot guarantee that such visits will generate a full and complete understanding, we can be certain that a failure to encourage these visits is to our mutual disadvantage. We cannot ensure that the Soviets will reciprocate our desire to have a greater exchange, but we feel an obligation to encourage Members of the House to travel to the U.S.S.R. and to increase their understanding of its Government, its culture, and its people.

The atmosphere for improving understanding will never be more favorable, and the need will never be greater. We recognize that by visiting the Soviet Union we are not working miracles. We understand the difficulty of trying to learn about a complex society in a limited time. We realize that congressional visits will not, of themselves, guarantee peace. Nevertheless, we encourage a greater exchange because we are convinced that knowledge and awareness are preferred over ignorance and misperception.●

ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL: DEFUSING A TOXIC TIME-BOMB

HON. KEN KRAMER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today—together with my Colorado colleagues HANK BROWN, DAN SCHAEFER, and MIKE STRANG—I am introducing legislation to require expedited and effective cleanup of one of the most serious environmental threats in America: chemical contamination of the land and water at the Army's Rocky Mountain Arsenal, located just 10 miles from downtown Denver.

The arsenal is a toxic time-bomb ticking away on the doorstep of one of America's fastest growing urban areas. Its soil and the ground water that flows beneath it have been dangerously contaminated by the chemical wastes generated during almost four decades of manufacture and demilitarization of chemical munitions and by the manufacture and processing of commercial pesticides and herbicides.

To its credit, the Army has worked diligently to control the contamination and keep it from affecting people and property in the communities that border the arsenal.

But containment is not good enough. The arsenal must be cleaned up, and cleaned up as quickly as possible consistent with doing the job right.

Recognizing this, the Army has proposed a 15-year, $357 million program to excavate the contaminated soil and other material—some 16 million cubic yards of it—treat it, and place it in an above-ground disposal facility on 1 to 2 square miles near the center of the 27-square-mile arsenal.

However, after studying testimony presented to the Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, on which I serve as ranking Republican, I have concluded that 15 years is too long.

The bill I am introducing today calls on the Army to quickly develop a detailed plan to clean up the arsenal in half the time—by September 30, 1993. It specifies that the plan must give priority to cleaning up the worst sources of continuing environmental contamination, to the use of state-of-the-art waste treatment technologies that will reduce significantly the amount and toxicity of the hazardous substances on the arsenal, and to close coordination with State and local officials to assure selection of the best possible disposal site for the remaining wastes.

I believe that cleanup of the contamination on the arsenal and cleansing of the ground water tainted by this contamination can be a model for dealing with hazardous waste sites all over America. The legislation that Messrs. BROWN, SCHAEFER, STRANG, and I are introducing is, I believe, an important step toward making this possible. We invite all our colleagues to join us in sponsoring this important environmental-restoration initiative.●

HOUSE RESOLUTION 100

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning the House voted on and passed House Resolution 100, the omnibus primary expense resolution, which provides in the 1st session of the 99th Congress for the funding of the standing and select committees of the House.

Mr. Speaker, during yesterday's vote on House Resolution 100 my vote was not recorded due to an the fact that my written vote was not recorded and was somehow misplaced.

Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that my vote was not counted in the affirmative. After attending all the subcommittee hearings and speaking on the House floor in support of this resolution, I am disappointed that written vote was not recorded.

Mr. Speaker, I am equally distressed that my vote was not counted in the affirmative because in preparing for legislative action on House Resolution 100, Chairman GAYDOS and the members of the Committee on House Administration endeavored to ensure that each committee has adequate funds to conduct its legislative and oversight responsibilities. Furthermore, in meeting this goal, the committee acted in a fair, bipartisan, and efficient manner.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment Chairman GAYDOS and all the members of the Subcommittee on Accounts for their fine work and expeditious handling of this omnibus primary expense resolution.●

IN MEMORY OF ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. BONIOR of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commemorate the achievements of a man of rare dedication, our former colleague Al Lowenstein, who tragically died 5 years ago this month.

Nonetheless Mr. Speaker, it is my intent to do more than just to recall the memory of Al Lowenstein and his important life's work, but also to remind my colleagues of the upcoming

formal opening of the Lowenstein papers at the third "Allard K. Lowenstein Symposium," which is going to be held at the University of North Carolina on Friday, March 29, through Saturday, March 30.

In connection with his special concerns about the many disabled American servicemen which served their country in Southeast Asia, I would also like to draw attention to an important statement on Vietnam veteran issues by Al Lowenstein from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1970:

FAIR PLAY FOR VETERANS

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, men will differ on the justice and wisdom of war and of particular wars, and in this country differences on these questions have never been so pronounced as they are now. What we do not differ about, however, is the debt incurred by the Government to the men whose lives and limbs it risks in pursuit of the military and political objectives that led it to go to war.

The United States has recognized its responsibility to its military veterans since the Second Continental Congress passed the first national pension law on August 26, 1776. The history of Government policy toward veterans since the Revolution has been a gradual and proper enlargement of that responsibility. Since 1925, when the first Government-sponsored veterans hospital was established, we have accepted the obligation of providing medical care for wounded war veterans. After World War II at the same time we began to provide financial and educational benefits for returning GI's, Congress appropriated more than a billion dollars to construct the largest public hospital system in history. By 1962, there were 120,945 beds in veterans hospitals around the country.

But since 1962, despite our deepening involvement in Vietnam, the number of beds in VA hospitals has decreased by over 7 percent, while there has been a 19-percent increase in the number of patients in them. The ratio of hospital personnel to patients in veterans hospitals is 1.5 to 1 compared to 3.5 to 1 in university hospitals. There is roughly one psychiatrist for every 250 patients in a veterans hospital, resulting, among other things, in an inordinate use of chemical tranquilizers. A UCLA psychiatrist testified before Senator Cranston's Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs that we are putting mentally disturbed veterans in "chemical cocoons" because we are not spending the money necessary to give them adequate psychiatric care.

As Chairman Teague has pointed out, over $20 million in new equipment already installed in VA hospitals stands idle for lack of personnel, a state of affairs that has resulted in unnecessary deaths, according to VA hospital officials who have testified before the Cranston subcommittee. These officials have also testified that conditions in our veterans hospitals are continuing to deteriorate and may soon drop to a level that will disgrace the country and leave many helpless and disabled veterans without even minimum standards of medical attention.

Army Capt. Max Cleland, a triple amputee told Senator Cranston's subcommittee that he did not receive a wheelchair for 1 year after he returned from Vietnam without his legs and with one arm. He went without a paycheck for 2 months because of bureaucratic snarls, and received virtually no advice about his future therapeutic care.

Is it any wonder that many wounded war veterans feel that, in Captain Cleland's words:

The war may have been a cruel hoax, an American tragedy, that left a small minority of young American's holding the bag.

It is incomprehensible that the administration continues the war and discontinue funds and programs to help those who must fight it.

Because of medical advances and improvements in evacuation techniques, more wounded servicemen are surviving in Vietnam than in any other war. Technology makes it possible now to provide immediate medical aid for seriously wounded soldiers and then to fly them for special care to hospitals in Japan and even in the United States, within 16 hours, if necessary. These remarkable achievements save thousands of lives, and we are grateful for that.

But our obligation to brave men like Captain Cleland does not end with evacuation and quick medical care. It is wrong to consign men like these to veterans hospitals that are understaffed, overcrowded, and poorly equipped, or to ignore their needs if they are to find a suitable place in society when they are able to leave the hospital. As an urgent beginning, new medical facilities must be constructed and old ones modernized. They must be staffed with however many top-flight personnel are necessary to accommodate the thousands of disabled veterans who are coming back from Vietnam.

The administration has been trying to obscure the fact that it is callously and senselessly cutting back on veterans programs at precisely the time they are needed most. Last June, the President announced that "veterans benefits programs have become more than a recognition for services performed in the past. They have become an investment in the future of the veteran and his country." One could only wonder how seriously the President regarded this "investment" when he then proceeded to slash the 1970 VA budget by nearly $90 million, $78.5 million of it for hospital construction and operating expenses. Perhaps even more astonishing was the President's request that Congress restore funds for the same 4,000 new VA personnel that he had earlier cut out of President Johnson's 1970 budget—a request he followed in quick order with a decision to drop the jobs again after signing the supplemental appropriations bill for 1969.

Furthermore the administration's 1971 budget shows neither the intention nor the capacity to begin to correct the sorry conditions of the veterans hospitals, or even to boost educational benefits for returning veterans faced by skyrocketing costs. The requests in the new budget for most veterans programs will barely keep pace with inflation. For example, an additional $69 million requested for VA hospitals will largely go to defray an estimated $40 million salary hike for blue-collar workers. And cost-of-living and other salary increases, together with rises in general medical costs, will consume the balance of the $69 million.

The President's action on the GI bill provides another example of performance failing to match promises. Despite numerous official statements urging discharged servicemen to return to school, and in the face of all the documentation that is available to show that the inadequate education allowance is the major obstacle discouraging or preventing servicemen from doing so, the President has said that a 13-percent increase in GI bill benefits is all he will countenance. He has threatened to veto the $40-a-month increase we are considering here today. I cannot believe that kind of threat will dissuade us from standing firm for the kind of program that justice and commonsense so clearly demand. Both houses of Congress recognize the legitimate needs of veterans, and have supported necessary and good programs even when this administration has opposed or refused to implement them. In fact, a very curious situation is developing in which the President spe[illegible] lions to pursue the war while he [illegible] deafer to the needs of those who are fighting it.

That is a good example of what we mean when we talk about the mixed-up priorities that threaten America's balance and achievement, and that soon may threaten her survival. We must go on with the effort to set these things right, but meanwhile there can be no excuse for penalizing our veterans, of all people. They have already given more to America than most of their fellow citizens—more, in some cases, than should have been asked. It is wrong to ask them to give more now, when so little is being asked of so many others.

I include at this point in the Record the text of a letter from Mr. William F. Ward, the legislative officer of the Nassau County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I commend it for study to Members of the House:

MERRICK, NY.

DEAR COMRADES: Your Legislative Committee has adopted the following program geared to the times and for the ever-changing needs of our veteran, his widow and dependents. Our program this year is divided into three parts: National, State, and County and Town levels:

NATIONAL PROGRAM

H.R. 693: Provide medical benefits to veterans of the Mexican Border Campaign.

H.R. 692: Extend from the present six months to nine months the period of time that seriously disabled veterans may be cared for in a private nursing home at VA's expense.

H.R. 693: Provide that VA furnish outpatient treatment and any medical services necessary for seriously disabled veterans who are in receipt of the special housebound or aid-and-attendance allowance for service connected or non-service causes.

H.R. 693: Eliminate the so-called "pauper's oath", or statement of inability to defray hospital expenses, for a veteran 72 years of age or older to be admitted to a VA hospital.

H.R. 693: Authorize VA to furnish drugs prescribed by a physician for all disabilities, service-connected or non-service connected, for seriously disabled veterans receiving the special house-bound disability rate.

H.R. 2768: Eliminate the six months' time limitation for veterans who are furnished nursing care for service connected disabilities.

H.R. 3130: Furnish outpatient treatment for nonservice connected disabilities as well as for service connected disabilities for war veterans rated as permanently and totally disabled for service connected disabilities.

H.R. 9334: Increase the per diem rate to $7.50 where a veteran is receiving hospital care in a State home and liberalize the program generally.

H.R. 11959: Amend the education provisions of the GI Bill to allow receipt of cer-

tain additional Federal educational assistance benefits for children and widows, of deceased veterans who died of service connected causes as well as children and wives of totally disabled service connected veterans.

It has come to our attention because of Personnel cutbacks, National Cemeteries, the final resting place of our comrades, are fast turning into slums for the want of possibly five or six maintenance personnel; we are told that cultivation of grave sites cannot be continued at Government expense and families of our deceased comrades must, when visting these graves, perform menial clean-up details.

Under the existing G.I. Benefit Bills, the G.I. Home Loan program is a farce because of:

(a) Exorbitant interest rates.

(b) Continued apathy on the part of banks who enjoy tax exempt privileges in refusing and discouraging potential veteran home buyers to finance under the Veterans Administration. We find, too often, that banks push FHA mortgages and other types of conventional mortgages, thus increasing the cost to our newer veterans in closing payments, points, etc.

NEGATIVE ATTITUDE OF ADMINISTRATION

The Administration has recommended that action be deferred on the following legislation pending further study:

Increase dependency and indemnity compensation rates for service connected widows.

Provide additional monthly payments for each child for widows in receipt of DIC benefits.

Increase insurance for those serving in the Armed Forces from $10,000 to $15,000.

Provide double indemnity coverage for Armed Forces personnel assigned to duty in a combat zone or for extrahazardous duty.

Provide dismemberment indemnity coverage for loss of or loss of use of limbs and eyes.

Establish a Vietnam era Veterans Life Insurance Program for a permanent plan of insurance for those discharged from the Armed Forces.

Increase education and training allowance for all VA educational programs by a sufficient amount to offset the cost of living and cost of education since the latest increase in education training benefits.

STATE PROGRAM

1. Resolve that rumors emanating from study groups of the New York Legislature, have suggested the possible curtailing of N.Y. State Veterans Tax Exempt Benefits.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, Nassau County, unanimously support opposition to any proposal that would deny veterans currently receiving monetary benefits based on service. The VFW further recommends that the current formulas be liberalized to include veterans of Viet Nam era and the later part of the Korean War Police Action. In the latter two categories, no muster out payments, insurance dividends and other monetary benefits were, and are available.

2. To amend the State Constitution so as to provide the payment of a Korean and Viet Nam Bonus, similar to that paid to veterans of WW II.

3. To seek the establishment of a Joint Legislative Committee on Veterans Affairs.

4. With the establishment of the Oxford Home as the N.Y.S. Veterans Home, the current capacity of 80 beds be increased to a minimum of not less than 160.

5. Throughout the State of New York work load and rendered services to veterans, their survivors and dependents, have been increasing. The work efforts of the County Regional offices reduces much of the work load of the two existing V.A. regional offices. The service agencies, mandated by State Law, still receives minimal state subsidies established in 1946. Because it is apparent that State subsidies formulas have increased, the Welfare Department, hospitals, parks, roads, etc., we believe that, the formulas increasing state aid by amending Article 17, Section 359 of the Executive Law by substituting $10,000 for $5,000; to substitute $5,000 for the present $2,500 and to substitute 75% for the State's reimbursement share which is now 50%.

6. Under the guise of "Academic Freedom" we seem to be financing our own destruction. We seek to absolutely prohibit the utilization of any and all buildings, schools, colleges, or other facilities that receive subsidy in whole, or in part from the State of New York, by individual or organization who is known to advocate the overthrow of our government, or willfully encourages acts akin to treason.

7. We urge the withdrawal of any and all forms of State Assistance granted to students who knowingly direct, lead or are involved in any manner in acts of violence against the administration or plant facility of public or private institutions of higher learning.

LOCAL LEVEL—COUNTY, TOWN

1. Resolve that rumors emanating from study groups of the New York Legislature, have suggested the possible curtailing of N.Y. State Veterans Tax Exempt Benefits.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, Nassau County, unanimously support opposition of any proposal that would deny veterans currently receiving monetary benefits based on war service. The VFW further recommends that the current formulas be liberalized to include veterans of the Viet Nam era and the later part of the Korean War Police Action. In the latter two categories, no muster out payments, insurance dividends and other monetary benefits were, and are available. We urge our local officials to support our State representatives on this matter.

2. VFW (Nassau County) supports limited middle income housing program, financed through Federal Urban Renewal Program and that veterans and returning Viet Nam Veterans be given priority.

3. That the existing townships within the County of Nassau take immediate steps to increase partial subsidies paid to veterans organizations for the observance of Memorial Day; that the subsidies should conform to the authorized allowances paid to veterans groups in the Incorporated Villages.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM F. WARD,
Legislative Officer.●

WASTE AND ABUSE IN DEFENSE

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, in November of last year, the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers published a series of stories in their trade magazine, the Machinist (page 2, No. 7, vol. XXXIX), about the billions of dollars of taxpayers' funds wasted each year in defense procurement. They raised a number of excellent examples of how this rip-off occurs. I would like to share these examples with my distinguished colleagues in order to emphasize the need to continually monitor rampant defense waste.

A report done by the Air Force revealed that major military contractors were charging the Federal Government 20 times their actual labor costs.

At the Pratt & Whitney division of United Technologies, the cost of standard labor on its TF-30 aircraft engines was about $10. The study showed that by the time P&W added on costs such as overhead and administration as well as a 13-percent profit (on labor), the hourly price to the Government reached about $195.

It has revealed that General Dynamics, Grumman, Boeing, and Lockheed were among 17 U.S. companies who paid no Federal taxes between 1981-83. General Dynamics has not paid since 1972.

General Electric, President Reagan's former employer, was the single biggest beneficiary of the tax rip-off. It earned $6.5 billion in pretax domestic profits over 3 years and paid no Federal taxes. Instead, GE was able to claim refunds of $283 million for taxes paid before Reagan took office.

The Machinists also learned, "that the Air Force intended to buy 3,000 spare circuit boards for the B-52 despite an auditor's conclusion that they are not needed and will cost 10 times the current price. When the Air Force heard about the rip-off, they confronted the man who blew the whistle, Ompal Chauhan, and threatened to fire him."●

TRIBUTE TO COL. PAUL W. ARCARI, USAF

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a tribute to a man who has served his country long and faithfully during a distinguished military career. Col. Paul W. Arcari, Chief of the Entitlements Division within the Directorate of Personnel Plans, U.S. Air Force, is a man who exemplifies the characteristics of leadership that textbooks attempt to describe. His retirement at the end of this month will create a vacuum, but the legacy he leaves will live long into the future.

The measure of leadership is not limited to an individual's singular accomplishments but extends more broadly to the impact the individual has on the environment in which he works and on those around him.

As the former chairman of the Military Personnel and Compensation Subcommittee, I know of the impact Paul Arcari has had on his environment. No more knowledgeable individual has ever assisted the subcommittee. Expertise is a fundamental requirement for a good leader; Paul Arcari has, from this perspective, rightfully earned the admiration of all with whom he has worked. He is a font of knowledge, and his advice is sought by the other uniformed services, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Office of Management and Budget, and the committees of Congress.

His influence on those he has advised has been immense because Colonel Arcari has credibility. He has been willing to explore all sides of an issue, not just to limit his discussion to the Air Force position. More importantly, Colonel Arcari has been able to give account to congressional constraints or overall objectives that may differ from those held by the Air Force and offer constructive suggestions within the congressional frame work. This characteristic, perhaps more than any other, has resulted in his ability to shape policy in a direction that is most beneficial to the U.S. Air Force.

The leadership of Colonel Arcari is best demonstrated, however, by his impact on those around him. All who have known Paul Arcari have benefited from the relationship. Those for whom he worked left the relationship with greater knowledge, understanding, and ability to address the critical policy issues that affect our airmen, soldiers, sailors, and marines. Those who worked for him became clearer thinkers and better leaders themselves. Paul Arcari has been the mentor, the teacher, the counselor of dozens of people; and therein lies the greatest influence of this leader. For these are the people who will carry on after Colonel Arcari's retirement; his influence has spread far beyond his own presence and will ensure a beneficial impact for many years to come.

Finally, although all great leaders are respected, not all of them are liked by those who work for them. Col. Paul Arcari, however, has sought and found the path to both. He exemplifies the proposition that the respect of a subordinate for his superior springs from a corresponding spirit in the heart of the superior. He is a hard task master, but he is loved, admired and respected by all who know him.

Mr. Speaker, Col. Paul W. Arcari is a true leader and a man who will be sorely missed as he retires.●

SUPPORT GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong opposition to any attempts to abruptly end or drastically cut the Federal Revenue Sharing Program, as proposed by President Reagan. In recent weeks, I have heard from many of the over 60 local communities in my district and their message is clear: Elimination of revenue sharing can only result in one of two things: cuts in basic services such as police or fire protection or higher local property taxes.

This proposal could not come at a worse time for local communities in my district, many of which have yet to see the benefits of the economic recovery which is so heralded by the administration. We need to keep in mind that over the last 4 years, programs providing assistance to local communities have been cut by more than 50 percent in real value. Further, local governments have already budgeted expected revenue-sharing funds in their current year budget. If we abruptly take these funds away, many cities and counties would be unable to maintain minimal public services.

While I recognize that reducing massive budget deficits is a first priority, these deficits are created and perpetuated by the unwillingness of the President to balance the budget involving other programs. Instead of imposing a Governmentwide spending freeze—which would allow programs like revenue sharing to continue—President Reagan has chosen once again to increase military spending by over $30 billion. To offset this, he wants to completely eliminate revenue sharing and other valuable Federal programs.

Not only would a Governmentwide spending freeze make more sense from a policy standpoint—since all programs would have to sacrifice equally—but it would also result in much lower deficits than those projected by President Reagan. I think many of us would be ready to consider cutting back on programs like revenue sharing if it were our only alternative to reduce deficits. But the fact is that a disciplined freeze in spending will deliver far stronger a punch to the solar plexus of the deficit than any alternative because it reaches the politically untouchable programs like the military and entitlements. And, such an approach has the virtue of continuing, with restraint, programs like revenue sharing that make a positive contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the President continues to refuse to compromise his request for massive increases in military spending and consider a spending freeze as an option for deficit reduction. My view of the national interest is that we cannot afford not to enact such a program.

The truth of it is that there is no free lunch in passing on to local governments more of the burden for funding public services. Cuts in revenue sharing must inevitably lead to increases in property taxes and cuts in public services.

I urge my colleagues to reject the President's proposal to eliminate revenue sharing this year and further, to pass a multiyear extension of the program at current funding levels.●

DENYING LOANS TO NICARAGUA, A SOUND ECONOMIC DECISION

HON. C.W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, based on sound business sense, there is a solid economic basis for our efforts to prevent future loans to Nicaragua from U.S.-sponsored international financial institutions.

The New York Times reported this morning that the Government of Nicaragua is the first nation ever to fall 6 months behind in repaying outstanding loans to the World Bank. Nicaragua has already been found to be in the arrears in payments to the International Monetary Fund. As of December 31, 1984, Nicaragua fell more than $14 million behind in its interest and principal payments to the World Bank. Overall, Nicaragua's total outstanding debt to the bank is $134.14 million.

Because Nicaragua has established itself as a poor credit risk, our Nation is now recommending that the Inter-American Development Bank reject Nicaragua's request for a $58.4 million loan. It is my hope that my colleagues will support this effort to deny future loans to Nicaragua.

As the largest contributor to the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank, our Nation has every right to influence proposed loans to nations whose prospects for timely repayment of the loan are questionable. Mr. Speaker, if you or I, or any American citizen walked into a bank with a credit rating as poor as the Nicaraguan Government's and applied for a loan, there is no question that the bank's loan officer would reject our request on the spot. That is simply good business. No bank should, or would choose to lend to any individual, business, or nation with a record of skipping payments for 6 months at a time.

My entire argument here for opposing loans to Nicaragua focuses purely on economic and business factors. It ignores entirely the foreign policy reasons for which we should also oppose any future loans to Nicaragua. As I have said in the past, even though we are the largest contributor to the international development banks, we find all too often that these banks consistently loan large sums of money to nations who are not our friends or allies. In fact, many nations who receive these loans turn their backs on our Nation at every chance. Nicaragua is the most recent example.

In the 6 years since the Sandinistas took control of Nicaragua, the Inter-American Development Bank has loaned the country more than $150 million. Yet Nicaragua remains one of the poorest Central American nations because the Sandinistas refuse to put in place the economic and agricultural reforms they promised the Nicaraguan people and the Organization of American States. Instead, the Sandinistas have undertaken a campaign to discourage the development of free economic markets. They have channeled funds designated for economic development into accounts to pay for their growing military force which continues to export arms, violence, and terrorism to neighboring countries.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are trying to reduce Federal spending in every area possible, we must look closely at our Nation's foreign aid programs, especially those providing funds to the international development banks. If we cannot influence proposed loans to nations that are clearly poor credit risks, let alone threats to the peace of our hemisphere, then we should stop spending American taxpayers' dollars to support these banks.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 27, 1985]

NICARAGUA IN ARREARS ON WORLD BANK LOANS

(By Nicholas D. Kristof)

Nicaragua has become the first country ever to fall six months behind in repaying loans to the World Bank, according to information contained in one of the bank's publications.

The debt problems reflect Nicaragua's deteriorating economy, for which it largely blames the United States-backed rebellion against the Government. The arrears will also make it more difficult for Nicaragua to get help from other institutions or banks.

The World Bank document, a 45-page information statement released two weeks ago, states only that it has placed on "nonaccrual status" the debt of "one member country," which it does not identify. But the debt figures of this unnamed country exactly match those of Nicaragua listed elsewhere in the same report.

Developing nations have occasionally fallen behind in repaying loans to the World Bank. But they have always scrupulously avoided falling six months behind, because at that point the World Bank puts the loan on nonaccrual status. This means that the bank does not credit payments as income until they are actually made. Under the standard accounting practice, payments are entered in the books when they fall due, even if they have not been received.

A spokesman for the bank declined to confirm that Nicaragua is on nonaccrual status. The bank's spokesman said, however, that the country mentioned in the report was believed to be the first ever to fall behind by six months. The report said that the country, as of Dec. 31, was behind on $4.55 million of principal payments and $9.55 million of interest payments.

Nicaragua's total debt to the World Bank is $134.14 million; the country's total foreign debt is a little more than $4 billion. It has also fallen behind in repaying private banks, which are now reviewing a debt-management proposal submitted about two weeks ago by Managua, according to a banker familiar with the negotiations.

"It is true that Nicaragua has been in contact with the World Bank in order to settle the effects of the economic difficulties Nicaragua is having," said Marcos Wheelock, financial counselor in the Nicaraguan Embassy in Washington, "Nicaragua is behind in payments."

Mr. Wheelock said he could not confirm that his country was six months behind, but he said talks were under way with the World Bank and that no repudiation of the debt was being considered.

"We are under economic stress imposed by the C.I.A.-financed war by national Guards of Somoza, accompanied by some ex-members of the Sandinista revolution," he said. "That places an extra burden on us in addition to the burden of the world depression."

NICARAGUANS BLAME U.S.

Last month, President Daniel Ortega Saavedra of Nicaragua described his country's economic situation as "hellish" and blamed the Reagan Administration for "orchestrating a campaign of lies" that had cost Nicaragua more than $1 billion in lost credits and exports during the last four years.

Francisco de Paula Gutierrez, a private consultant on Central America based in Costa Rica, said in a telephone interview that the World Bank arrears would make it more difficult for Nicaragua to get financing to buy imports or to arrange the sale of exports. Other Central American countries and East bloc nations have already begun to cut off credits to Nicaragua, he said, and are demanding immediate payment in all trade transactions.

"I don't see how the Nicaraguans will be able to pay their debts unless they get external financing," Mr. Gutierrez said. "And I don't see how they will get external financing unless they pay their debts."

The United States has blamed ill-advised economic policies and an expensive military buildup for Managua's deepening economic crisis. The United States has urged the Inter-American Development Bank, which is now holding its annual meeting in Vienna, to reject a $58 million loan to Nicaragua. The arrears to the World Bank are expected to bolster the arguments of Secretary of State George P. Shultz, who wrote to the development bank in January that "Nicaragua is not creditworthy" and warned that a loan to Nicaragua would make it more difficult to win Congressional passage of funds for the development bank.

The World Bank's loans to Nicaragua are less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the lending agency's total loans, and a World Bank spokesman stressed that the bank's liquidity was in no way jeopardized by the arrears.

The World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank are not private commercial banks but are jointly sponsored by a number of nations to lend money to countries for development.

[From USA Today, Mar. 25, 1985]

U.S. FIGHTS $58 MILLION LOAN TO THE SANDINISTA REGIME

(By Juan J. Walte)

WASHINGTON.—A bitter U.S.-Nicaragua dispute over the politics of international development loans threatens to overshadow today's annual meeting of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Delegates to the four-day session in Vienna, Austria, got a taste of what to expect when Nicaragua accused the United States Sunday of "blackmail."

At issue: U.S. opposition to a $58.4 million loan requested by Nicaragua for agricultural projects. A letter to the bank from Secretary of State George Shultz says the Marxist government there is not credit-worthy for the loan.

The United States is the regional development bank's richest member. Bank President Antonio Ortiz Mena said Shultz's letter is "not a threat . . . it's a fact of life."

Since October 1960, the bank has loaned almost $28 billion to Latin American and Caribbean countries. Some Latin American members feel the U.S. position is based more on politics than economics.

AGAINST RACISM AND DISCRIMINATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the recent killing of 29 innocent blacks by South African police is only the latest in a long line of atrocities that have resulted from the abhorent system of apartheid. The administration's policy of "constructive engagement" has done little to change this most repugnant system, which challenges our fundamental beliefs about principles of equality and justice.

Human rights and the fight against discrimination are firmly supported by the American people. We can no longer stand aside, we can no longer remain silent in the face of such egregious violations of human rights.

Luthern Pastor Martin Niemoller, an opponent of the policies of Nazi Germany, gives the justification when he said: "First Hitler came after the labor unions and I did not speak up because I was not a union member. Then Hitler came for the Jews, and I did not speak up because I was not a Jew. Then Hitler attacked the Catholics, and I did not speak up because I was not Catholic. When he came for me, no one was left to speak up."

Mr. Speaker, Americans are speaking up and they will be heard. South Africa's policy of state-sponsored,

state-enforced racism and discrimination must be fought by freedom loving men and women everywhere.●

THE IDES OF MARCH—1985

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I believe most of us are familiar with March 15, 44 B.C., when a soothsayer warned Julius Caesar: "Beware the Ides of March." He didn't and the results were tragic.

But, I come not to recall Caesar but the "Ides of March"—1985!

On that day, a daily newspaper in western Pennsylvania carried three stories relating to the Nation's trade problems. They contained a message, I believe, for us all.

The first dealt with the administration's efforts to reach an agreement with Japan on the shipment of steel products here. The headline over the story proclaimed: "Japan Agrees to Limit Sale of Steel Exports to U.S."

Would that that were true, Mr. Speaker. Alas, it is not. If one reads beyond the headline, you find a somewhat different picture.

First, the Japanese consent is only verbal. Nothing has been signed and, according to a spokesperson in the office of the U.S. Trade Representative, we don't know how long before there will be a signed agreement.

Consequently, we don't know what has been agreed to. We do not know what products are to be regulated or how many. We do not know tonnage limits. As chairman of the executive committee of the House Congressional Steel Caucus, I am extremely interested in those details.

Second, the news article states Japan's share of the American steel market for the next 5 years, retroactive to October 1, 1984, will be 5.8 percent. That doesn't sound like much of a reduction to me, since Japan's share had been 6.9 percent.

It makes one wonder how much success the administration will have in its efforts to cut overall steel imports from the 26-percent level of last year to the 18-percent target it has set.

Third, it appears from the article, the Japanese consent was given reluctantly. An official of the Japan Iron & Steel Exporters Association was quoted as saying the restraints will place a burden on Japan's steelmakers and if the controls are too precise and strict the Japanese industry will be unable to comply with the needs of U.S. steel users.

These points alone tend to make me wary of being overly optimistic about this agreement. Optimism, I have learned from experience, is often a case of seeing more in something than actually is there.

But, there is more. In the same newspaper on the same day, there was another article dealing with the efforts of the United States to persuade Japan to open up its markets to U.S. goods in order to reduce our $36 billion trade deficit with Japan.

That article talks of powerful Japanese bureaucrats who are resisting the U.S. request. It also cites Ezra Vogel, a professor at Harvard University and the author of the 1979 book, "Japan as Number One," as saying Japan has failed to live up to promises made over the last 5 years to provide greater trade access for the United States and others.

Professor Vogel indicates the time may have come for the United States to take a strong line, even to the point of carefully considered trade sanctions to pry open the Japanese markets.

"If we don't stand firm and begin to use some tough leverage," the professor said, "things are going to get worse. If we don't use that power to get some concessions from Japan, we're going to have political explosions at home."

Some of us in this House, Mr. Speaker, have been calling for such a stand for the past several years. We've been ignored, even as late as a few weeks ago when the administration washed its hands of attempting to pressure Japan into retaining quotas on cars imported to the United States. Its decision was to let Japan make the decision.

And, that brings me to the third article which appeared in the March 15 issue of that newspaper. It was a short item, a "filler," but it carried a message from Takashi Ishihara, chairman of the Japan Automobile Manufacturers Association.

"We shouldn't curb our exports, as the United States is not asking us to do so," Mr. Ishihara is quoted as saying. "Each car maker should make its exports in an orderly manner, leaving the matter to its judgment."

The voluntary restraints on Japanese auto imports is due to expire at the end of this month. What happens if the Japanese automakers heed Mr. Ishihara's advice and flood the American market with small car imports?

I'll tell you what will happen. The American small car industry will go belly up. Our automakers will produce only middle-sized or big cars, leaving the small car market entirely to imports. If that happens, then the American consumer had better pray that gasoline prices remain low. For if gas prices begin to go up, you'll see another surge in demand for small, high-mileage cars. The middle-sized and big car markets will become desolate; the demand for small foreign cars will force prices up and profits overseas and the American auto industry could virtually disappear, along with hundreds of thousands of jobs.

A grim scenario, Mr. Speaker? Undoubtedly—and hopefully wrong. But, remember the Ides of March—1985!

U.S. USES THREATS TO ENTER JAPANESE MARKET

TOKYO.—Backroom tensions between the United States and Japan appear to be on the brink of triggering one of the biggest blowups between the two Pacific trading partners in years.

Less than three months after Japan chalked up a staggering $36.8 billion trade surplus with the United States in 1984, Washington is making its toughest demands ever on the Japanese to open their markets immediately to more U.S. goods—and is backing up its demands with harsh new threats of protectionist retaliation if dramatic steps are not taken by Tokyo in the next few weeks.

Powerful Japanese bureaucrats are resisting Washington's determined new push for greater market access for American products.

In Tokyo Wednesday, Nobo Matsunaga, newly appointed Japanese ambassador to the United States, said U.S.-Japan trade relations have reached a "critical moment." He said he could not predict whether new Japanese market-opening measures expected to be announced in early next month would be enough to satisfy the United States.

Returning to Tokyo from high-level talks in Washington this week, former Japanese Foreign Minister Saburo Okita warned his countrymen that sentiment toward Japan in the United States "is like that before the outbreak of a war."

Even U.S. Ambassador to Japan Mike Mansfield, who usually plays down the significance of U.S.-Japan trade friction in the context of the countries' larger strategic ties, recently said the two nations have reached a "crisis year."

With the bilateral U.S. trade deficit with Japan headed toward $50 billion this year and a new U.S. recession widely predicted for 1986, Reagan administration officials are determined to finally break what they see as Japanese intransigence against opening its markets.

U.S. trade representative William Brock said in Tokyo last month that the size of the current U.S. trade deficit with Japan was "intolerable." Brock told the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week that when the Japanese claim that U.S. goods compete in an open market inside Japan, "it simply is not a factual statement."

Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone pledged at a January meeting with President Reagan to work for more open markets in telecommunications, pharmaceuticals, forest products and electronics.

Japanese moves on telecommunications industry regulations in particular are being watched as a "litmus test" of whether Japan is willing to give open access to competitive U.S. goods, said Undersecretary of Commerce Lionel Olmer.

"America is saying, 'We don't believe you've tried hard enough and we aren't going to wait anymore,'" said Harvard Professor Ezra Vogel Wednesday. He was in Tokyo with the investment and trade mission of Massachusetts Gov. Michael Dukakis.

Vogel, author of "Japan as Number One," the 1979 book celebrating the virtues of Japanese industry and society, said Japan has failed to live up to promises made over the last five years that it would open its markets to the United States and other trading partners.

Near the heart of Japan's reluctance to open its markets, said Vogel, are jealously guarded discretionary powers that allow the bureacracy to control Japan's imports.

"Their backs are to the wall now. We're asking these bureaucrats to dismantle laws that given them their discretion, their power."

JAPAN AGREES TO LIMIT SALE OF STEEL EXPORTS TO U.S.

WASHINGTON (AP)—Japan has agreed to limit its sale of steel to the United States—the last of this country's major suppliers to do so, the office of U.S. Trade Representative William E. Brock said yesterday.

The accord will limit Japan's sales to 5.8 percent of the U.S. market, said press officer Desiree Tucker. That would be a small drop from last year's level.

Japanese steelmakers let it be known that they will consent to the Reagan plan reluctantly.

Haruki Kamiya, an official with the Japan Iron & Steel Exporters Association, said the restraints will place a burden on Japanese steel producers and cautioned U.S. officials monitoring the voluntary agreements to watch that other countries do not violate their quotas.

Kamiya said that if the controls required under the agreement are "too precise and strict," the Japanese industry will be unable to comply with the needs of U.S. steel users.

Under a plan announced by President Reagan, steel imports are to be kept to 18.5 percent of the country's total market for steel, compared with 26.7 percent last year. Similar agreements have been reached with other major exporting countries, most recently with South Korea.

There was an implied threat that unless the agreements were reached, rulings would be sought from the U.S. International Trade Commission and the Commerce Department that the exporting governments have been subsidizing the sales and selling their steel here below fair price levels.

Such rulings would result in additional customs duties that would keep out imports by raising their cost to American importers.

Ms. Tucker said the agreements with South Korea and Japan will be signed as soon as details of wording and translation are settled. She would not estimate how long that would take.

Ms. Tucker said the agreement with Japan was reached Wednesday between Japanese negotiators and Robert Lighthizer, the deputy U.S. trade representative, after a three-day round of talks.

The object of the limits is to protect orders and jobs for the U.S. steel industry, despite complaints from other countries that the United States is becoming more protectionist. Members of Congress threatened to impose limits by law if no agreement was reached.

The key point on total Japanese steel exports was settled last December, with Japan's share in the U.S. market dropping to 5.8 percent from 6.94 percent.

Ms. Tucker said it has been agreed that the agreement will last for five years, beginning Oct. 1, 1984.

A major problem in the negotiations has been the specific categories to be regulated. The specification of the categories was important in keeping down Japanese export of costly items such as pipes and tubes.

When Japanese exports of cars to the United States were limited, the exporters increased their shipments of more expensive models.

QUOTABLE

Takashi Ishihara, chairman of the Japan Automobile Manufacturers Association, had this advice for Japanese automakers facing a March 31 lifting of voluntary restraints on exports to the United States: "We shouldn't curb our exports, as the United States is not asking us to do so. Each car maker should make its exports in an orderly manner, leaving the matter to its judgment."●

SOLVING HUNGER WITH THE RIGHT STUFF

HON. CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mrs. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, thanks to the efforts of the media the ravaging destruction caused by hunger, malnourishment, and famine-related diseases is now clearly recognized by all Americans as a problem in need of immediate attention. We are thankful for the efforts of those Americans who are contributing their money and time to private voluntary organizations providing direct relief to the hundreds of millions of starving people in the developing nations. At the same time, we must recognize that the threat of famine is going to be with us for decades to come unless we seriously undertake long-term development strategies that help people help themselves in protecting themselves against the threat of hunger.

I believe the House Select Committee on Hunger and its task force on hunger clearly recognize this fact. Indeed, this was a key conclusion of the report prepared for the select committee by the Office of Technology Assessment "Africa Tomorrow: Issues in Technology, Agriculture, and Foreign Aid," December 1984. As the report highlighted:

A consensus is emerging that the technology most needed in sub-Saharan Africa should be: low-risk, resource-conserving, small-scale, affordable (not capital intensive), locally produced and repaired, adapted to local labor availability, and consistent with traditional agricultural methods.

In essence, technologies must be appropriate for the local setting. To be appropriate, the natural limitations of the African environment must be considered in the design of the technology.

The OTA report also "finds that important changes in the U.S. approach could substantially improve food production," and recommends a number of new initiatives, especially recognizing that "farmers and herders with little access to economic and natural resources hold the key to increasing food production in Africa. Technologies to help these low-resource producers are largely lacking, especially in developed countries such as the United States."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my congressional colleagues some very encouraging research and development in what OTA calls Technology Types: The Right Stuff. Over the past 14 years, Mr. John Jeavons and his colleagues at the Ecology Action food research center in Willits, CA, have produced some astounding results with small-scale, low-input food production methods. Their work has been translated into action by local practitioners around the world, including use of their manual by the Peace Corps in Africa.

They have recently released a new manual describing this phenomenal progress, entitled "One circle: How To Grow a Complete Balanced Diet in 1,000 Square Feet or Less." For comparison, the same 2,400 vegetarian diet in India requires 30,000 square feet, or 30 circles, while the U.S. mechanized equivalent requires 10,000 square feet, or 10 circles. A meat diet grown by U.S. techniques would take from 45 to 85 circles. "One Circle" uses the high-yielding, biointensive techniques presented in Jeavons earlier manual, "How To Grow More Vegetables Than You Ever Thought Possible On Less Land Than You Can Imagine," based upon deep-digging techniques that allow for dense spacing of plants.

Minimizing land requirements in food production is a critical factor in alleviating starvation because deforestation and desertification are drastically reducing the available land for sustaining food production. A study by the Environmental Fund indicates that up to 90 percent of the agricultural land available to the Third World in 1980 may no longer be farmable by the year 2000 due to these two processes. Should that occur, notes Jeavons, "only a little over two circles of farmable land might be available to each man, woman and child for food, fuel, building materials, fiber for clothes and income crops."

The biointensive method not only requires substantially less land, but is also achieved utilizing a fraction of normal water requirements, can rely on locally derived fertilizers and pest controls rather than costly synthetic fertilizers and pesticides, and can be achieved using simple hand tools instead of expensive machinery. Needless to say, minimizing the inputs and maximizing locally available materials and labor, avoids the key problem faced by most poverty-stricken villagers—lack of cash and credit.

Mr. Jeavons' research is timely indeed. Since 1978, the number of people dying from starvation has tripled to more than 45 million per

year—two-thirds of them children. Some experts expect hunger-related deaths to leap tenfold before the end of the decade. Jeavons cites a 1983 UNICEF study that points to another more hidden side to the effects of malnourishment: "for every child under age 5 who has died, another has been left blind or deaf or crippled or retarded." In India, the report notes, 85 percent of the children will never be physically and/or mentally normal due to the malnutrition which has already occurred—even if they are fed perfect diets the rest of their lives. Concludes Jeavons, "the need for personal, smallest area, complete diet, resource-conserving, food-raising approaches becomes apparent in light of this overall world picture."

I encourage all my colleagues to seriously study "One Circle," as well as Jeavons earlier manual, "How To Grow More Vegetables * * *" which contains growing information on vegetable, protein, fodder, cover, and fruit and nut tree crops. More information is available from Michael Totten of my staff.●

LEGISLATION TO PROMOTE COGENERATION IN THE NORTHEAST AND MIDWEST

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation on behalf of myself, Mr. BROYHILL, and several others which will both assist energy-intensive basic industries and reduce our Nation's reliance on energy imports by promoting cogeneration—an extremely efficient method of energy production. Our bill will meet these goals by clarifying that the Nation's three registered gas utility holding companies may participate in cogeneration activities.

This bill is intended to address a problem arising out of a very strict interpretation on the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 [PUHCA] by the SEC. From a policy viewpoint, there is simply no reason to prevent these three companies from participating in cogeneration. Our bill will clarify the intent of Congress on this matter once and for all, and will merely put these three companies on the same footing as every other gas utility in the country.

By way of background, a cogeneration system is one which produces both electricity and steam from a single fuel source, such as coal. By reducing the amount of otherwise wasted heat, cogeneration significantly reduces industrial energy costs. According to the Department of Energy, cogeneration can produce average energy savings of between 15 and 18 percent for the five major energy consuming industries—steel, glass, paper, cement, and chemicals.

Congress recognized the importance of promoting cogeneration with the passage of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act in 1978. While cogeneration is catching on in many areas of the country, industry in the Ohio Valley has lagged behind for several reasons:

This region's industrial firms, which have been pouring their investment dollars into modernizing plants, cannot afford to invest in cogeneration.

Private investors, such as large engineering and contracting firms, are more attracted to cogeneration projects in high growth areas such as the Southwest.

Current law prohibits the three gas companies in the area, which are large enough to take on the major cogeneration plants needed by heavy industry, from participating in cogeneration.

The three registered gas utility holding companies—Consolidated Natural Gas, National Fuel Gas, and Columbia Gas—have much to offer to the development of cogeneration. Because of the large initial capital investment required, industry cannot meet these costs alone. In addition, the gas industry's expertise in thermal energy and knowledge of the needs of its industrial customers are valuable in the successful operation of a cogeneration facility.

The proposed legislation is simple and noncontroversial. It merely unlocks the regulatory handcuffs, dating back to PUHCA, which prevent the three principal distributors of natural gas in the Ohio Valley from participating in cogeneration.

PUHCA was enacted in 1935 to regulate the activities of utility holding companies. Of the 214 holding companies which registered under the act by 1938, only 12, including these three gas companies, still remain actively regulated by the SEC, the act's administrator.

While the SEC does not object in principle to the ownership and operation of cogeneration facilities by these three companies, the SEC has, under a narrow interpretation of PUHCA, indicated that the current law prohibits gas utility holding companies from engaging in cogeneration because it is not "functionally related" to their primary role as gas distributors. Clearly, the authors of the 1935 legislation could not be expected to foresee the development of cogeneration technology nor the necessary role to be played by the registered gas companies 50 years later. PUHCA was never intended to prevent these three companies from participating in cogeneration, and there is no sound reason to do so today.

Our bill does nothing but clarify that these three companies may participate in cogeneration, putting them on an equal footing with every other gas company in the Nation. The SEC will maintain its traditional role over the registered gas utility holding companies and the financing of all cogeneration facilities. Thus, registered gas companies wishing to participate in cogeneration projects will still need, for example, to obtain the SEC's permission to acquire assets, securities, or other interests. They will also still be subject to the restrictions on intercompany loans and intercompany transactions and to the requirements of regular reporting and recordkeeping.

Moreover, the SEC will retain the power to investigate and institute enforcement actions and to forbid involvement in any cogeneration or other project which would be detrimental to the public interest, the interests of investors or consumers, or to the proper functioning of the holding company system administered by the SEC.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this worthwhile legislation which will save energy and help make our basic industries more competitive.●

MIAMI-DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: NO. 1 IN THE NATION

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely proud to learn Miami-Dade Community College in south Florida has been named the leading community college in the Nation by researchers at the University of Texas at Austin.

In a study on the pursuit of teaching excellence, Miami-Dade was the overwhelming choice for first place because of its strong and stable leadership, its emphasis on teaching and learning, its admissions policy, and its reputation for accepting and rewarding exceptional teachers. Much of the credit for the success of this fine institution should go to the president, Dr. Robert H. McCabe. Dr. McCabe is committed to providing our community with outstanding educational opportunities. He is a fine administrator and we are fortunate to have him.

To the teaching staff, administrators and students at Miami-Dade Community College I extend my heartiest congratulations for receiving this recognition of excellence.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM E. FOUNTAIN

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, sir, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Dr. William E. Fountain upon his selection as the 1985 recipient of the California Medical Association's Frederick K.M. Plessner Memorial Award.

The award, which consists of $5,000 and a commemorative silver bowl, is given to the California physician "who best exemplifies the ethics and practice of a rural county practitioner." Dr. Fountain, a man who is totally dedicated to his profession, has chosen to donate the $5,000 to a child nutrition program in Merced County.

Dr. Fountain, fondly called Dr. Bill by his many patients, spent most of his youth in Merced. He received his A.B. degree from Stanford University and went on to complete his medical degree there as well. He returned to Merced for his residency at the county hospital there, and subsequently opened a private practice in 1937. Dr. Fountain spent 3½ years on active duty with the U.S. Navy Medical Corps in the South Pacific during World War II, and received a Presidential Citation for his outstanding service. Having married Esther Lockhart in 1943, Dr. Fountain returned to his private practice in 1945.

Locally, Dr. Fountain represents the highest standards of medical care and ethics, both to his colleagues and his patients. He was instrumental in promoting the construction of the original obstetrical unit at the Merced County Hospital, because of his concern over the unsafe conditions surrounding in-home deliveries for indigent mothers. Dr. Fountain is notable in that the quality of care he delivered never varied, regardless of whether a patient was able to pay him or not. Dr. Fountain continued to make house calls up until his retirement in 1983, a rarity these days. He feels it was his duty to go where he was needed and treat whoever needed his help to the best of his ability. This was especially evident during the 2 years he served as the Merced County Public Health Officer. Although he had a thriving private practice, he went all over the county, to the farm labor camps and the rural schools, always giving the same personal and loving care he gave to all his patients.

Beyond his exceptional devotion to health care, Dr. Fountain is an active participant in many areas of community affairs. He is a long-time Rotarian, having served as president from 1979 to 1980. He is a member of the American Legion and the Elks Club. He also belongs to the Merced County Medical Society, California Medical Association, the American Medical Association, and the American Academy of Family Practitioners. Since his retirement he has been active in the San Joaquin Valley Health Consortium, and was appointed as a director in 1984. He is presently working on a project to bring nutrition education to 10,000 youngsters in Merced city and county schools.

I hope you will join me in saluting this fine man. He epitomizes the truly dedicated, humanitarian, honest, ethical rural physician that the Plessner Award was created to honor. He has earned the trust and loyalty of generations of patients and his fellow physicians. He is one we would all do well to emulate.●

SUPPORT THE COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER PROGRAM

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my strong support for the Community Health Center Program. Authorizing legislation for both community and migrant health centers expired at the end of fiscal year 1984, currently these programs are operating under a continuing resolution and must be reauthorized. I urge my colleagues to lend their full support to reauthorization of Federal funding for these vital programs.

Health centers supported through the primary care program authorities have proven to be effective and efficient providers of quality health care to millions of Americans, most of whom have no other available source of health care. Nowhere is the need for community health centers more evident than in my home district which has been especially hard hit by unemployment in recent years. Community health centers provides care to indigent persons who lack public or private coverage—including large numbers of the current unemployed—as well as Medicare and Medicaid recipients refused care by other private providers.

Independent studies have shown that primary care health centers in the past decade have provided continuous, high-quality health care to their patients; have increased the use of preventive services; reduced illness and hospitalization rates among their patients, and held down costs to a level considerably lower than for other health care providers, which results in tax savings.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we must consider measures to trim the Federal deficit and ensure that Federal expenditures are made in an efficient and cost-effective manner, it is gratifying to note that federally funded health centers have provided care in a continuously more efficient fashion. According to Federal data, between 1974 and 1983, community health centers: increased their volume of services by more than 300 percent, while grant funding increased by only 65 percent; they increased productivity by 43 percent; increased their collection of third-party reimbursements by 250 percent; and they actually decreased their costs per encounter by 21 percent. As with any effective and much needed health program, the demand for community health center services continues to grow. Federal funding of these centers must be continued and it must be sufficiently adjusted to meet these needs.

The Federal support received by the health centers is used solely to subsidize the cost of care for the indigent, uninsured persons, to cover the cost of nonreimbursable services such as preventive service and health education and to establish the capacity for the delivery of health services in areas that need them most. Community health centers serve to insure their local communities against the cost of care for uninsured—they provide vital services to persons who otherwise would be unable to receive necessary medical care.

In my home State of Ohio there are 13 community health centers with over 46 sites throughout the State, serving people in 44 counties. These health centers have an average of 752,083 patient visits per year. The State of Ohio is currently receiving $12 million in Federal support for their community health centers.

Another important part of community health care is the National Health Service Corps [NHSC]. In Ohio there are 109 doctors working under this program, providing valuable services in 28 sites. Assignment of doctors under this program is based upon the definition of the health manpower shortage area [HMSA]. Because I represent an area that has one of the highest unemployment rates in the country, I feel that the definition of a HMSA should be changed to give greater emphasis to poverty and other factors identifying problems of access. This would insure that NHSC doctors are placed in areas where they are needed most.

Community health centers and other vital programs provided through federally funded primary care programs provide countless Americans with health care services that would otherwise be denied because of financial hardship. Federal funding of these programs has been cost-effective and has enabled these centers to expand their services and reach out to more

and more needy individuals. At a time when we are pumping more Federal money into the construction of weapons of destruction, it is imperative that we here in Congress do not ignore vital domestic programs designed to assist those Americans who many times remain silent and have no voice. When the time comes, I urge all my colleagues to fully support continued Federal assistance to community health centers and other valuable primary care programs.●

AID TO NICARAGUAN FREEDOM FIGHTERS

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 27, 1985

● Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, today the Washington Times carried an article which provided for the public the text of a letter from Eden Pastora Gomez, a leader of the freedom-loving Nicaraguan opposition to the Sandinista government. Eden Pastora was a Sandinista hero, its most renowned figure, until he broke with the Sandinistas in 1981 over their betrayal of their revolution. Commander Zero, his combat code name, was raised in a conservative Catholic family but turned against the Somoza government with just cause. His father was killed by Somoza's National Guard in 1942 for alleged subversive activities. Eden Pastora returned as a young man from medical studies abroad to join the guerrilla struggle against Somoza. He became head of logistic operations for the Sandinista movement operating out of Costa Rica. In 1978 he turned the civil war irrevocably against Somoza when he and a unit of only 25 men seized the National Palace in Managua with the entire 135 member Congress in session inside, so exciting the Nicaraguan people, that the Sandinistas became the leading resistance group and the very symbol of the resistance to the Somoza government. In July 1979 resistance became victory, and the Sandinistas took over Nicaragua.

Mr. Pastora served in high ranking positions in the new government, first as Vice Minister of Interior and then as Vice Minister of Defense and Chief of the National Militia. Increasingly disgruntled at the left-radical policies of the Sandinista regime, and at the presence of thousands of Cubans who by then permeated the Managua government, Pastora resigned in July 1981 and went in self-imposed exile. In April 1982 he publicly denounced the Sandinista leadership as having betrayed the revolution, and helped found the Sandino Revolutionary Front, invoking the name of Sandino against the Communists who had betrayed it. He then became the military leader of the Democratic Revolutionary Alliance, or ARDE, returning to the countryside to lead armed resistance once more against an oppressive government in Managua.

My colleagues should recognize that Eden Pastora may be a revolutionary, and has told me that to this day he remains a Sandinista, but he is no thug. He is a brave man who loves freedom. He points out that the fate of Nicaragua and that of the United States are not easily or safely separated.

Mr. Pastora has written a powerful and eloquent appeal to the President of the United States, and I am enclosing it for the RECORD. Don't read it and weep—read it and give him the support he deserves.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing you on behalf of the Democratic Revolutionary Alliance to thank you for your unwavering support for our struggle to bring freedom and justice to Nicaragua, a goal shared by all Nicaraguan freedom fighters. As I told the Conservative Political Action Conference, in the often lonely struggle for freedom, we are fortunate to have you as a best friend. With your leadership and strength, democracy will prevail in the struggle against communist oppression.

Our objectives, simply put, consist of making good the original commitments made by the Junta to the Nicaraguan people and to the Organization of American States, which were later betrayed by the Junta. To accomplish this objective, we have to be strong enough to achieve the following intermediate objectives: 1) withdrawal of Cuban, Soviet and other communist forces in Nicaragua, 2) reduction of Nicaragua's communist armed forces, which oppress the Nicaraguan people and threaten Nicaragua's neighbors, and 3) an end to the export of subversion from Nicaragua, which would be the logical consequence of achieving the first two objectives.

These are reasonable objectives that any truly democratic government would meet. Meeting them would reduce the economic burden on the people of Nicaragua and foster peace in Central America. A democratic Nicaragua at peace with its neighbors would need even less military strength than existed under Somoza. The huge armed forces now in Nicaragua are the military arm of the Communist Party. They are assisted and often commanded by troops from many communist nations who have enormous combined experience in crushing the peoples of weak states, such as Afghanistan, Cuba, Angola, and Vietnam. Their purpose is to subjugate the people of Nicaragua and to foment subversion and terror throughout Central America in pursuit of Soviet strategy. The ultimate goal of that strategy is to weaken and defeat the United States, the main enemy of the Soviet Union.

Accommodation with communists can only lead to defeat. Communists engage in negotiations only to divide, weaken, and confuse their enemies and to legitimize their victories. Many in your State Department and your Congress believe that you can negotiate successfully with communists, but even they must concede that you must negotiate from a position of strength. Why would the Junta deal with Nicaragua's freedom fighters if they can crush them militarily? Can anyone find an example of communist concessions to a weak opponent? Communist governments always crush weak opponents, especially their own weak and unarmed peoples. To be strong, Nicaragua's freedom fighters do not need the tanks and airplanes that the Junta has, but we do need basic supplies and equipment. If your Congress does not want a communist Central America, they must allow you to give those to us.

For my part, I do not believe that freedom fighters should negotiate with communists. We are willing to accept the ultimate sacrifice, but only to achieve a total solution. The communists objective is to destroy us, and negotiations are one weapon in that battle. Our objective must be to win, not to accommodate. Negotiated settlements with communists are piecemeal surrender. Until you became president, the United States had left a trail of betrayed allies now living under oppression. Your loyal dedication to the support of allies and freedom fighters everywhere gives us the confidence to fight on even when your Congress denies us material aid.

Many in your government, however, are defeatists who believe that we cannot win. I think some even believe that the United States cannot win. Communist military strength and threats unnerve them. In the event of a crisis, perhaps like the Cuban Missile Crisis, they will advise you to accept the less dangerous course and to accept a communist government in Nicaragua, as happened in Cuba. If that happens, Latin America will have many more Nicaraguas, and the United States will be defeated by the Soviet Union.

I know that we can win. Even without American support, our forces in the South have 7,000 fighters and control 10,000 square kilometers as well as an internal front. Our forces and those of the Nicaraguan Democratic Front in northern Nicaragua have expanded greatly, to the point that we cannot arm and supply them. Joining together our efforts is the only true way for Nicaraguans to overthrow the communist regime. With American support, so many people will join the freedom fighters that the Junta will either have to accept democracy or flee Nicaragua.

In the battle for Central America, the first communist objective is to consolidate control over Nicaragua in order to make it a communist fortress from which subversion can be spread throughout the region. I know this from my own experience with the Nicaraguan Junta members. They themselves have drawn the line. In Nicaragua today, if you do not support communism, you become an enemy of the revolution and must be destroyed.

We are fighting the combined forces of the entire communist bloc with the full support and direction of the Soviet Union in military and propaganda warfare. Your own nation is the main battlefield for the propaganda war, but we bear the burden of fighting them on the military battlefield. If we lose, all of the democracies in this hemisphere will be threatened, even the United States. We are the front line of the battle to preserve democracy. The people of the strongest democracy cannot turn their back on the freedom fighters of the small nations of Central America. We want no American blood spilled on our battlefields, but we must ask for your material and moral help. With your help and the support of our people, we can win the decisive battle for

freedom in Nicaragua. If we lose, American blood will be spilled, no matter what liberal Congressman say today. No North American administration can tolerate a communist Central America.

The organizations of Nicaraguan freedom fighters disagree on some things, which is normal among democratic people. We share, however, a common objective of gaining control over our own destiny and achieving a society of freedom and justice, as you have in the United States. Our revolution was betrayed by the members of the Junta. The Soviet Union, through Cuba and other clients, has turned our dreams of freedom into a nightmare of oppression. God willing, the Nicaraguan people, with the help of the American people, will realize our dream of a free, democratic Nicaragua.

Without Totalitarianism nor a Return to the Past.

EDEN PASTORA,
Commander-in-Chief, Democratic Revolutionary Alliance (ARDE).●

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 28, 1985, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 29

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for the cotton industry.
SR-328A

Finance
To hold hearings to review the findings of the President's Commission on Industrial Competitiveness.
SD-215

10:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Military Construction Subcommittee
Closed business meeting, to markup S. 537, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for military construction programs of the Department of Defense.
SR-222

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 679, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, and the Federal Maritime Commission, and S. 102, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the maritime construction differential subsidy.
SR-253

Foreign Relations
To continue hearings on S. 659, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for the Department of State.
SD-419

APRIL 1

8:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Closed business meeting, to resume markup of S. 674, authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Defense.
SR-222

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for the rice industry.
SR-328A

Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the care and advocacy for mentally disabled persons in institutions.
SR-428A

10:00 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on the nomination of Donald J. Devine, of Maryland, to be Director of the Office of Personnel Management.
SD-342

2:30 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
Closed business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence community.
SH-219

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for the sugar, wool, and honey industry.
SR-328A

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR-253

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the activities of the Office of Government Ethics.
SD-366

Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 522, to prohibit the use of Federal financial assistance to perform abortions except where the life of the mother would be endangered.
SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the care and advocacy for mentally disabled persons in institutions.
SR-428A

Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the Veterans' Administration home loan guaranty program.
SR-418

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Commodity Credit Corporation, Foreign Agricultural Service, Office of International Cooperation and Development, Food-for-Peace Program (Public Law 480), Soil Conservation Service, and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.
SD-124

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for certain defense programs, focusing on strategic defense initiative.
SD-138

Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Agency for International Development.
S-126, Capitol

Governmental Affairs
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 483, to ensure that the Federal Government assume the full cost of legislating and regulating Federal purposes and mandates.
SD-342

Judiciary
To resume hearings on the proposed sale by the Department of Transportation of Conrail.
SD-226

Judiciary
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on International Trade, Finance, and Security Economics to examine investigation management procedures by the Department of Justice of certain Navy shipbuilding claims.
SD-G50

Joint Economic
International Trade, Finance, and Security Economics Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Proce-

dure to examine investigation management procedures by the Department of Justice of certain Navy shipbuilding claims.

SD-G50

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Agency for International Development.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SD-138

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on S. 484, to extend for 3 years the moratorium on the ban of the artificial sweetener saccharin.

SD-430

APRIL 3

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for the peanut industry.

SR-328A

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of State, and the U.S. Information Agency.

S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to examine corporate takeovers.

SD-538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD-G50

Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the U.S. International Trade Commission, U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative.

SD-215

Judiciary
Security and Terrorism Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-430

Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To continue hearings on the care and advocacy for mentally disabled persons in institutions.

SR-428A

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for certain defense programs, focusing on Navy shipbuilding and conversion.

SD-116

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.

SD-138

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the U.S. Secret Service, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, all of the Department of the Treasury.

SD-124

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on the availability of environmental impairment insurance and its relation to the implementation of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act [Superfund] (Public Law 96-510), and the Resource Conservation Recovery Act (Public Law 98-616).

SD-406

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of the Treasury.

SD-124

Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.

SD-226

APRIL 4

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for the Food for Peace Program and export industry.

SR-328A

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, the Marine Mammal Commission, and the Small Business Administration.

S-146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings to examine corporate takeovers.

SD-538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To continue hearings in closed session on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SR-253

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 6, to clarify and improve certain health-care programs and services provided and administered by the Veterans' Administration, and related proposals.

SR-418

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

SD-124

Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of the Treasury, focusing on multilateral development banks.

S-126, Capitol

Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.

SD-116

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for Conrail, United States Railway Association, and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation.

SD-138

Environment and Public Works
Environmental Pollution Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 53, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1989 for the Clean Water Act, and related measures.

SD-406

APRIL 4

10:00 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings to review public attitudes on the Federal budget deficit and Federal tax reform proposals.

2359 Rayburn Building

10:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To continue hearings in open session on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SR-253

APRIL 5

9:30 a.m.
Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment/unemployment situation for March.

2322 Rayburn Building

APRIL 15

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for conservation programs.
SR-328A

1:30 p.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 667, authorizing funds for certain programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD-538

2:00 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for research and extension programs.
SR-328A

APRIL 16

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of the Secretary of Education, Departmental Management (salaries and expenses), Office for Civil Rights, and Office of Inspector General, all of the Department of Education.
SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, Department of Transportation.
SD-138

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior.
SD-138

APRIL 17

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for United States agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on commodity assistance for rural credit programs.
SR-329A

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Education, including education for the handicapped, rehabilitation services and handicapped research, special institutions, including Howard University, bilingual education, and adult and vocational education programs.
SD-116

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Justice, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
S-146, Capitol

Finance
To hold hearings to review an Administration report on prospective payment for skilled nursing facilities under the Medicare Program.
SD-215

Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the International Labor Organization.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury.
SD-124

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Securities and Exchange Commission.
SD-538

APRIL 18

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for U.S. agriculture commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs, focusing on agribusiness.
SR-328A

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for Amtrak.
SR-253

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Endowment for the Arts.
SD-138

APRIL 23

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To resume hearings on S. 501 and S. 616, bills to expand export markets for U.S. agricultural commodities, provide price and income protection for farmers, assure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and continue low-income food assistance programs
SR-328A

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Education, including elementary and secondary education, education block grants, impact aid, research and statistics, and libraries.
SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.
SD-138

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of the Treasury, U.S. Postal Service, and General Government programs.
SD-138

APRIL 24

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Education, including student financial assistance, guaranteed student loans, higher and continuing education, higher education facilities loans and insurance, college housing loans, educational research and training.
SD-116

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, the Legal Services Corporation, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.
S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Federal Trade Commission.
SR-253

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the Environmental Protection Agency.
SD-124

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation.
SD-138

APRIL 25

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for ACTION (domestic programs), Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and National Council on the Handicapped.
SD-116

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for rail safety programs.
SR-253

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
*HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD-124

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for energy and water development programs, focusing on atomic energy defense activities.
SD-116

Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of Management and Budget, including the Office of Federal Procurement Policy.
SD-138

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of Indian Education, and the Institute of Museum Services.
SD-138

APRIL 30

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, Prospective Payment Commission, Railroad Retirement Board, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, OSHA Review Commission, and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.
SD-116

Environment and Public Works
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Governmental Efficiency and the District of Columbia on global forecasting capability.
SD-342

Governmental Affairs
Governmental Efficiency and the District of Columbia Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Environment and Public Works on global forecasting capability.
SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Office of the Secretary and the Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior.
SD-138

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Transportation and related agencies.
SD-124

MAY 1

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
Room to be announced

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Supreme Court of the United States, and the U.S. District Courts.
S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
SR-253

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and certain independent agencies.
SD-124

Appropriations
Transportation and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Transportation and related agencies.
SD-138

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the General Services Administration.
SD-138

MAY 2

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
HUD-Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and certain independent agencies.
SD-124

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for territorial affairs, Department of the Interior.
SD-138

MAY 7

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services
SD-138

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-406

MAY 8

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

MAY 9

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-406

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.
SD-138

MAY 14

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Energy Information Administration, and the Economic Regulatory Administration, Department of Energy.
SD-138

Governmental Affairs
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 483, to ensure that the Federal Government assume the full cost of legislating and regulating Federal purposes and mandates.
SD-342

MAY 21

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Holocaust Memorial Council, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior.
SD-138

MAY 23

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for Naval Petroleum Reserves, and fossil energy.
SD-138

OCTOBER 1

11:00 a.m.
Veterans Affairs
To hold hearings to review the legislative priorities of the American Legion.
SD-106

CANCELLATIONS

MARCH 28

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Business meeting, to consider pending committee business.
SD-226

APRIL 2

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the Veterans' Administration home loan guaranty program.
SR-418

APRIL 4

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 6, to clarify and improve certain health-care programs and services provided and administered by the Veterans' Administration, and related proposals.
SR-418