SENATE—*Monday, April 29, 1985*

(Legislative day of Monday, April 15, 1985)

The Senate met at 12 noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Righteousness exalts a nation but sin is a reproach to any people.—Proverbs 14:34.

God of truth, righteousness and justice, help us to take seriously the wisdom of the proverb. Help us to understand that purity is power and power is diminished as purity is diluted. All agree that there is no substitute for integrity. Forgive us, Lord, when, knowing this, we compromise conscience and delude ourselves that we are somehow getting away with it. Forgive us when we build a high wall between private and public life as though there is no connection. Remembering that it takes very little water in gasoline to stop the engine may we realize there is no way public power can escape the dilution of private indiscretion. Grant, Holy God, that we may seek purity and practice integrity. In the name of Him who was perfect in purity and power. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, under the standing order, the leaders each have 10 minutes, followed by a special order for not to exceed 15 minutes by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], followed by morning business not to extend beyond 1 p.m. with statements limited therein to 5 minutes each.

Following routine morning business, it will be the intention of the majority leader to resume consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the budget resolution, under a statutory 50-hour time limitation. It is my understanding there are still about 42 hours and 38 minutes left under the resolution plus the pending amendment; there are about 49 minutes remaining on each side, so there is some time for debate or, if there is no debate, just time for the clock to run on amendment numbered 41 to the tree to get us to a vote hopefully on the so-called leadership package tomorrow or at some early date.

I would indicate to my colleagues that we do plan long and late sessions this week. We will be coming in, if not at 8 o'clock, 8:30, 9 o'clock starting, if not tomorrow, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. Saturday there is a good possibility of a session although I understand there may be some conflicts there, something about the Kentucky Derby that has created some interest, a bipartisan interest. So we will explore that. We are going to have a derby here, but they have all the horses. So we will examine that closely.

We would also like to take up today, if we can, by unanimous consent a resolution with reference to Ortega's visit to Moscow. There has been a great deal of concern expressed on the floor about the President's visit to Bitburg. We think we ought to express greater concern about Ortega's visit to Moscow within a week after the House rejected all aid to the Contras, even humanitarian aid. It is my understanding he is there to pick up $200 million from Moscow to further his Marxist-Leninist aims in Nicaragua. I hope we would have that resolution drafted and we could bring it up by unanimous consent during morning business. It should not be a partisan matter. I would guess that many Senators on both sides are deeply concerned that the Sandinistas will take the action of the House as an encouragement of their policies to enlarge the sphere of communism in that area. So we would like to dispose of that today if agreement can be reached on the language of such a resolution. If not, we will keep trying.

But in any event, we will be back on Senate Concurrent Resolution 32 at 1 o'clock. I think it is fair to say, because there are a number of Senators on each side with rather serious conflicts, there is not much likelihood for a vote today.

SENATOR GARN'S SPACE ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it is not very often that a U.S. Senator has the opportunity to make a major contribution in a field outside politics and government. But Senator JAKE GARN achieved such a feat as a crew member on the space shuttle *Challenger*.

Senator GARN's responsibilities on this space shuttle mission were significant. They involved undergoing a series of medical experiments in order to provide original data on the effects of space travel. He fulfilled all of his duties admirably, and functioned as an integral member of the *Challenger* team. This experience will undoubtedly enhance Senator GARN's role in maintaining oversight on U.S. space programs.

From everything I have heard Senator GARN say and seen printed about his experience, he seems to have relished the time he spent far away from all of us in Washington.

But we are all very happy to have him back. And, I think I can speak for all of us in the U.S. Senate, when I note that we were very relieved that JAKE took off and returned safely, and, that we are very proud of his accomplishments.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANFORTH). Under the previous order, the acting Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time on this side.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

CAN THE SUPERPOWERS DEVELOP THE TRUST NECESSARY FOR ARMS CONTROL?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is my sixth speech in this arms control series. In earlier speeches, I have contended that arms control demands a President who is committed to seeking an agreement with the Russians. Second, arms control requires a willingness to stop all nuclear weapons testing. Third, arms control must constitute a process that builds on its past successes. Fourth, arms control must include a verification system that will detect militarily significant cheating and that is constantly improved with advancing technology. Fifth, in this speech I will contend that arms control requires the development of a reasonable degree of trust and cooperation between the two superpowers.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Can and should this great free country of ours trust and cooperate with the Soviet Union, a nation that is based on total state control and coercion, a nation that denies freedom to its own citizens as well as to the neighboring nations it dominates? The answer is simple: Yes, we can. In this nuclear world, we must. Does this mean we must become friends and allies? Of course not. To most Americans, the Soviet Communist system is anathema. For a nation like the United States, which has enshrined human freedom as its No. 1 value, the Soviet Union, which vehemently suppresses human freedom as its central policy, does not represent the kind of company we wish to keep.

There is more. There is worse. The Soviet Union and the United States are the two great superpowers. We are in competition for world influence. No matter what arms control agreements we negotiate, we will continue in competition. The Soviet Union has repeatedly used its colossal military power to invade and suppress those who would be free of Communist control in Hungary and Afghanistan.

It has military troops actually stationed in East Germany, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the Baltic countries. It has used the violence and brutality of its military forces to suppress anti-Soviet patriots in East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and now Afghanistan. It has built a far larger military force than the United States. It has a 3 to 1 predominance in tanks. It has far more land based nuclear missiles which have extraordinary accuracy and much greater megatonnage than America's nuclear arsenal. How can we expect to develop any significant degree of trust and cooperation with such a potential adversary? There are two major reasons why we can. First, the United States has an entirely different but at least equal and probably superior military power. Our Navy is superior to the Soviet Union in every significant respect. We have far greater naval tonnage, greater firepower, much greater naval air power, a much superior Marine Corps.

Our strategic nuclear war heads are about the same in number as the Soviet Union. We do have less nuclear megatonnage, but 75 percent of our nuclear weapons are deployed in submarines and bombers that have a much greater prospect of survivability. Only 25 percent of the Soviet nuclear arsenal enjoys this less vulnerable deployment. Our ships and planes are at sea and in the air far more than the Soviet Union's. So why can we negotiate with the Soviet Union? Because they know our submarines and bombers can certainly survive any nuclear strike they might initiate. They know that we could retaliate with a pulverizing response that would totally destroy every Russian city and kill most of its population.

Furthermore, the list of Russia's aggression, grim and terrible as it is, tells a consistent story. The Soviet Union has never attacked a nation or a group of nations that have anything like equal power with the Soviet Union. Invading Hungary or East Germany or Afghanistan is one thing. Taking on Western Europe and the United States is something quite different. And the Soviet Union in its 67-year history has not come close to military action against any country that was not both a neighbor and an apparent pushover. The Soviets have been an Eastern European bully. They have consistently picked only on the little kids.

And when we put the economic and military power of the United States together with the economic and military power of the NATO countries against the Warsaw Pact, it is strictly no contest. For more than 5 years the Soviet Union has been stumbling around in little Afghanistan unable to bring its primitive, weak, almost unarmed, neighbor into submission. On the other hand, this country has made it clear that if the Soviet Union invaded Western Europe, NATO would either stop them or the war would go nuclear and very quickly.

Gorbachev is not Hitler. The Soviet Union is not Nazi Germany. Whatever else our long experience with the Soviet Union teachers us, we know that it is cautious, picks military fights only with nations that are smaller, much smaller and much weaker and are generally on its borders. Does the Soviet Union want "Lebensraum" living room as Hitler put it? No way. The Soviet Union, with the largest land area of any nation on Earth, obviously has no need for more land. Furthermore, in the one great, world war since the Soviet Union took power in Russia, the United States and the Soviet Union fought as allies. So we have a record of war time cooperation. And above all we have an overwhelming common interest in preventing nuclear war. Both nations have literally everything to lose and nothing to gain from a comprehensive, mutual, verifiable nuclear arms control agreement. Such an agreement would save hundreds of billions of dollars of spending and taxing by the United States. But it would be even more helpful for the people of the Soviet Union who today are spending at least as much as the United States is spending on their military effort but are doing so with an economy that produces only half as much overall.

These obvious benefits of arms control to both countries not only provide the underlying basis for such an agreement. They also provide the reason why we can expect both nations to abide by a comprehensive nuclear arms control agreement. Here's why: Violation of such an arms control agreement that resulted in a renunciation of the treaty would mean restarting the arms race and imposing once again the painful economic burden of military spending and the sharply increased threat of a nuclear war that could utterly destroy both countries. If ever there were an action that human beings could achieve that would serve the interests of mankind, that action is now clear and conspicuous. The time has come for a mutual, verifiable, comprehensive nuclear arms control treaty. And now. Before it is too late.

DONALD PFARRER—A MARINE VETERAN SPEAKS OUT ON VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Sunday, April 28 Milwaukee Journal carried one of the most cogent and compelling analyses I have read anywhere about the Vietnam trauma that this country suffered. All of us have read many editorials and commentaries in the last few weeks on that bitter experience. The author of this short article is Donald Pfarrer. For years he was a reporter on the Milwaukee Journal. He left the Journal a year or so ago. He now lives in Vermont. He is a writer and, as anyone who reads this article can tell, a tremendously talented writer. Pfarrer also served with the Marines in Vietnam. In this article, he nails our Vietnam policy to the cross. Whether Senators agree or disagree with what Pfarrer has to say, it is well worth reading.

Let me read a little excerpt from the article. It reads:

> The conduct of our national policy in Vietnam was vacillating, cowardly, spineless and perfidious. I am speaking of the country into which I was born and which was born into me, which I feel to be part of myself and my destiny, of the country I cannot but love, whose evils and blunders stir my deepest emotions and whose triumph and glory as the inventor of human liberty, and as the homeland of liberty today, are among the reasons I can affirm life on this Earth.
>
> Yet I do not see how one can explain, much less exonerate, American policy and conduct in Vietnam. We went into what we thought was an easy venture and we stumbled and groped with bloody hands for the doorway when we found it hard and dark.
>
> A STAINED CONSCIENCE
>
> Every South Vietnamese soldier who died after our withdrawal is a stain on our conscience. Every "re-education" camp, every neighborhood committee of surveillance in what used to be Saigon are chargeable in some degree to our irresolution.

Then Mr. Pfarrer concludes as follows:

> I do not claim that Vietnam veterans are wiser than other Americans or love their country more. I do propose two distinctions.
>
> The first is that these men served a noble ideal.

While their wealthier and better-educated contemporaries stayed home, for reasons that seemed sufficient to them, the veterans risked their lives and 58,012 died on the frontier of the long war against totalitarianism.

The second is a distinction of knowledge, dividing the veterans from the party of conciliation, appeasement and hopeful weakness in the Congress and elsewhere in American public life.

The veterans have seen the abyss. The others act as if they grew up in a pleasant suburb and have always lived there.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Donald Pfarrer to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Apr. 28, 1985]

WHY DID WE LIE TO OURSELVES?

(By Donald Pfarrer)

Even today I hate to face the meaning of Vietnam, and to write about that meaning for publication is next to impossible. I believe I share this reluctance and aversion with the nation as a whole—because I do not think the country has faced Vietnam yet, or can face it. The meaning is too difficult to reconcile with the modicum of pride and dedication which remains in us.

Let me try to state it, then, in the plainest terms. The conduct of our national policy in Vietnam was vacillating, cowardly, spineless and perfidious. I am speaking of the country into which I was born and which was born into me, which I feel to be part of myself and my destiny, of the country I cannot but love, whose evils and blunders stir my deepest emotions and whose triumph and glory as the inventor of human liberty, and as the homeland of liberty today, are among the reasons I can affirm life on this Earth.

Yet I do not see how one can explain, much less exonerate, American policy and conduct in Vietnam. We went into what we thought was an easy venture and we stumbled and groped with bloody hands for the doorway when we found it hard and dark.

A STAINED CONSCIENCE

Every South Vietnamese soldier who died after our withdrawal is a stain on our conscience. Every "re-education" camp, every neighborhood committee of surveillance in what used to be Saigon are chargeable in some degree to our irresolution.

I cannot defend the South Vietnamese army as one of the best. But I have known South Vietnamese army and Vietnamese Marine Corps officers who spent most of their adult lives fighting communism. Some were Catholics from the North; many were natives of the South who knew as well as anybody in this country that the Saigon government was not a full democracy. But they saw a difference between that and communism. That there is such a difference, and that the difference is qualitative, these men attested with their lives.

It amazes me that so many Vietnamese have migrated to the United States. We in this country have a dim understanding of what they are leaving behind, but these people have every right to condemn and despise America. That they don't is one of the few sources of relief in the terrible episode whose 10th anniversary we are now observing.

A CHRONIC AFFLICTION

Episode may be the wrong word. The affliction may indeed be chronic. We do, after all, live in the country that did nothing when its embassy was stormed in Tehran and its diplomatic staff taken hostage. The country that did nothing when its Marines were bombed to death in Beirut is the same country that lost its way and its honor in Vietnam. It is the same country that has done nothing about the Russian murder of an American officer in East Germany.

In fact we conduct our foreign policy pretty much the same way we deal with the predators who rape, rob and abuse the people in our big cities. We talk, scold, indulge in elaborate and time-consuming negotiations and legalistic charades, and repudiate by our actions the values we uphold in our philosophy.

For it is a question of values.

I cannot criticize the people who said in 1964 and '65 that we should stay out of Vietnam. I agreed with them. I was guilty of saying that the whole of Vietnam wasn't worth the life of a single American soldier. I may have been right strategically but I was wrong morally.

Once the government had committed American lives to the struggle I volunteered, among other reasons, because I could not imagine staying home while American soldiers were dying overseas. If their deaths meant anything at all to Lyndon Johnson and the Congress, they must have meant that the supreme value was at stake. Nothing else but human liberty could justify the sacrifice.

But if the war was a stragetic error, and I believe it was, we piled upon this the greater error of denying the logic of our own values. I do not say we had to stay forever. I do ask: Why did we sign a lying peace treaty? Why did we deny the South Vietnamese army and air force spare parts, money and ammunition? Why, above all, did we deny the South Vietnamese our moral support?

I do not claim that Vietnam veterans are wiser than other Americans or love their country more. I do propose two distinctions.

The first is that these men served a noble ideal.

While their wealthier and better-educated contemporaries stayed home, for reasons that seemed sufficient to them, the veterans risked their lives and 58,012 died on the frontier of the long war against totalitarianism.

The second is a distinction of knowledge, dividing the veterans from the party of conciliation, appeasement and hopeful weakness in the Congress and elsewhere in American public life.

The veterans have seen the abyss. The others act as if they grew up in a pleasant suburb and have always lived there.

(Donald Pfarrer, a former Journal political reporter, now lives in Vermont. He served in the Navy for three years beginning in 1957 and with the Marines in Vietnam from December 1965 to December 1966. He received the Bronze Star.)

DR. MENGELE'S CRIMES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently in Jerusalem, survivors of Auschwitz testified about the gruesome experiments of Dr. Joseph Mengele. Dr. Mengele studied twins in an effort to discover the genetic secret for a master race.

Victims told of senseless brutality and torture, including mutilation and forced starvation. Mengele's bizarre experiments included the shipping of body parts for study, blood exchanges between twins, and radiation treatments so severe they left permanent burns. One victim, speechless for almost 20 years as a result of Dr. Mengele's experiments, spoke only with the aid of a special microphone.

Some of the hearing's most shocking testimony was delivered by Ruth Eliaz, who gave birth to a child at Auschwitz. Mengele refused to give the infant food to see how long it would take to die. Rather than see her baby die in misery, she murdered her own child. Mengele cursed her for cheating him out of his experiment.

After 3 days of moving testimony, a distinguished board of inquiry, including Gideon Hauser, prosecutor at the Adolph Eichmann trial, Telford Taylor, chief American counsel at Nuremberg, and famed Nazi hunter Simon Weisenthal, found that Mengele should be committed to trial for "war crimes and crimes against humanity." The panel also stated that Mengele's continued freedom brings "shame and dishonor to the free world."

Likewise, failure to ratify the Genocide Convention should be a source of dishonor for this Nation. If the United States is truly to be the greatest democracy in the world, let us join with the 96 other nations which have already ratified this treaty and make sure that crimes like Mengele's never occur again.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUDMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business.

APPLAUDING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEAD START

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to recognize the 20th anniversary of the federally supported Head Start Program. This program has blossomed into a public and private sector effort to help families throughout our Nation by providing necessary educational and social services to many children.

I strongly support the continuation of Head Start. It successfully combines parental involvement with the delivery of social services. It strives for support through public and private involvement. But its primary purpose is giving our American youth an opportunity to begin their education in life. I join in applauding this fine program on its 20th anniversary and pledge my support to see this program extended in its reauthorization next session of Congress.

During this year of celebration many activities are occurring in my State of Utah. I would like to share with my colleagues a recent news article by Douglas Palmer that appeared in the Deseret News and ask unanimous consent that the entire text be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Deseret News, Mar. 21-22, 1985]

HEAD START PROGRAM IS CELEBRATING 20 YEARS OF HELPING UTAH CHILDREN

(By Douglas D. Palmer)

The Head Start program gives some 1,400 Utah children a jump on learning and life.

The child development program, which serves children from disadvantaged backgrounds, is observing its 20th anniversary in Utah this week.

The governor signed a declaration Thursday calling attention to the program and its accomplishments in serving youngsters and their families. About 200 children from the Head Start program at Matheson School in Salt Lake City paraded through the Capitol Rotunda about 10:30 a.m. and later released balloons from the Capitol grounds. Afternoon classes were to hold a parade at the school, 1240 American Beauty Drive, and to release their balloons about 3 p.m.

Children from Head Start programs in the Granite School District were to release balloons at Sugarhouse Park the same day. Parents of children in the Mountainland Head Start program in Provo attended a "Make It-Take It Conference" at Utah Technical College. Parents made educational toys and games that can be used in teaching and playing with their children at home.

Almost a million children from low-income families enter school for the first time each year. While their more fortunate classmates may face the new challenge with assurance, many children from low-income homes begin school with health programs and a lack of self-confidence.

Without the will to move ahead, these children often fall behind in their first years of school. Without a proper beginning in school, many children frequently have problems for many years to come. Research has shown it is possible to greatly strengthen the ability of a disadvantaged child to cope with school and problems at home and his neighborhood. Providing such help early means thousands of children look forward to a brighter future.

"The program is making exceptional progress in helping children learn," said Rudy Anderson, Salem, director of the Mountainland Head Start program and president of the Utah Head Start Directors Association. "We focus on a child as a member of a family. We work with the whole family rather than just the child. Parents play a very important part in any Head Start program."

One of the major parts of the program is building self-esteem in the child and his parents.

"We have a number of ways we do that," Anderson said, "including the Parent Policy Council, which is equal in power to the board of directors. Council members are actual policy makers. Head Start is the only federal program of which I'm aware where parents have more influence than just an advisory committee. They have strong influence in the hiring and firing of teachers and directors."

Head Start places strong emphasis on preventive health and early identification of health problems. Each Head Start child is given a physical and dental examination and treated for any problems detected.

Seventy-four percent of the current teaching staff at the Matheson School program are former Head Start parents. Eleven of the teaching staff, 44 percent, have professional degrees or child-care credentials.

Forty-four of the 430 children enrolled at Matheson School have physical or mental handicaps. During the 1984-85 school year, the school has received 20,403 volunteer hours, according to Merrill Wells, director.

Rachel Wilson, Salt Lake City, says her daughter, Clarissa, 4, has learned many things since beginning the program last fall at Matheson School.

Mrs. Wilson, who has two other children, ages 3 and 2, spends at least one day a week at the school working with her daughter and other youngsters.

"I have learned many things at the school. The teachers have taught me many things that will help me in working with my children. It's possible that our family won't qualify for help in the future. If we don't, the things I have learned will help me in working with my own family," Mrs. Wilson said.

"I wish more people were aware of the program. It's one of the greatest things that can happen to children because it helps them to realize early that learning is fun."

THE DEFICIT REDUCTION PACKAGE

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I want to express my support for the budget package—the so-called leadership plan—which is now before us. Reducing the Nation's massive budget deficit is the single most important action which Congress can take this year to insure prosperity for our citizens.

I have differences with this package and will try to have those adjusted. But it is important that we get on with the task.

The goal we strive for in public service is to build a better future for our children—to turn the country over to the next generation in better shape than we found it. We now have an exciting opportunity to attain that goal. If we succeed in taking decisive action to bring down the Federal deficit, our Nation's economic future will be a brilliant one.

The Federal deficit is clearly the most pressing problem our country faces today. Perhaps that sounds like an exaggeration. Looking at the national problems we debate here in the Senate, which is the most serious? Is it our relations with the Soviets? Trying to contain nuclear weapons? American's industrial competitiveness? The danger of hazardous waste? The conditions of our public schools? All of these are serious matters and each is receiving all the careful attention we are able to devote to them. But the most threatening peril to our country, because it is not yet being attended to, is our inability to live within our means.

We are, this year, spending over $200 billion that we do not have, and this will grow to nearly $300 billion by 1990. Our Nation is borrowing one out of every four dollars we spend. It took us 196 years, which included seven major wars and the great depression, to incur a national debt of one trillion dollars. We will double that in 6 peacetime years, 1981 to 1988. We are now spending $143 billion—13 percent of total Federal expenditures—just to pay for the interest—not the principal, just the interest—on the national debt. Unless we do something, in 1988, interest will require 20 percent of our taxes, and upward if the deficits continue.

Is this the legacy we want to leave our children and future generations?

But the Federal deficit is not simply a problem for our children to deal with. It threatens each American, here and now. Large deficits threaten our economic recovery. They make it defficut for manufacturers to compete in the international marketplace. They discourage industrial expansion. And more importantly, they mean fewer jobs for American workers.

There are some bitter pills in this package that I am not eager to swallow. If it were up to me, I would give everyone on a Government retirement program a raise, but just stop and think for a moment. If a deficit reduction package is not passed, who will be hurt the most—the ones with the least to begin with, the elderly on fixed incomes.

If the deficit continues, inflation will surely rise, interest rates will go up and the essentials of life—food, clothing, and shelter—will increase in cost beyond what any Government program could protect. What kind of future will this be? Remember the demographics of this country are changing. People retire now in their early sixties, their average life expectancy is for another 15 years and probably more. Today our seniors must plan for the future as never before. If the deficit grows and grows, how will these people plan for these years? If we do nothing with the deficit, we are telling these people, don't plan for your retirement years, just try and get by as best you can. This is the most unfair option before us.

The Federal Government now has to borrow so much money to finance the growing national debt that it sops up much of the available capital. Competition is keen for the small supply of available funds. This results in higher interest rates. Higher interest rates make it extremely difficult for people, especially younger people, to afford to buy a home or automobile. Higher interest rates also mean a slowdown in investment, making it hard for businesses to expand. This means fewer jobs and a decline in productivity. And when productivity declines, so does our standard of living.

Federal deficits are having a devastating effect on the ability of industries in Rhode Island and throughout the country to compete in world markets. The biggest threat to our ability to compete is underinvestment. In order to keep up with raid technological changes taking place in the world today, American companies must make new investments in modern equipment and facilities. High interest rates have led to an extremely strong dollar, causing our exports to be expensive and imports cheap. This has been extremely damaging to our export-oriented industries. We have spent a great deal of time this year discussing the difficulties in the farm belt. It is important to remember that those problems are to a considerable degree the result of our loss of agricultural sales abroad due to the strong dollar.

Our trade deficit was $123 billion in 1984, compared with $39 billion in 1981 and surpluses in the 1970's. This is very harmful to Rhode Island, where 12 percent of our manufacturing jobs are dependent on exports. Manufacturers, in order to compete not only with sales overseas but sales in the United States, are moving their manufacturing facilities abroad so they can produce competitively.

During hearings in the Senate Finance Committee this past January, three distinguished economists from both Republican and Democratic administrations—Martin Feldstein, Charles Shultze and Alan Greenspan—all agreed on one thing. Reducing the deficit is the most important step we can take to assure economic growth in this country.

We have a precious opportunity right here and now to solve our problem. Our country is relatively prosperous. But recently there have been several signs that we must act soon to resolve the deficit problem or our economic recovery could unravel. Last week the Commerce Department reported that economic growth has slowed to 1.3 percent in the first quarter of this year—the slowest advance since the 1982 recession. Our trade deficit for the first quarter is estimated at $30 billion—compared to $26 billion for the first quarter of 1984. American factories operated at 80.8 percent of capacity in March, down from 81.2 percent in January.

While these signs may not be cause for immediate alarm, they do indicate that our economic recovery can go into a tailspin unless we bring down interest rates and lower the dollar's value abroad. We have to begin by curbing Government borrowing. And that means attacking the deficit problem head on.

In order to keep our economy on track by reducing massive Government borrowing, economists agree and the leaders of both political parties agree that we must reduce the deficit to 2 percent of the gross national product—or $100 billion—by 1988. Here is a plan to do just that. The leadership budget package will reduce Federal deficits by nearly $300 billion over the next 3 years. It will provide a sound foundation for continued economic growth that will benefit every American—without raising taxes.

The passage of this budget plan represents far more than a challenge to reduce the deficit. It is a magnificent opportunity as well—an opportunity to assure that prosperous times will continue; an opportunity to assure that our children and future generations will continue to find productive jobs; an opportunity to assure that young couples will be able to afford homes; an opportunity to assure that small businesses will be able to expand and remain competitive; an opportunity to assure that the pruchasing power of American families will not be eroded by inflation.

The approval of this package is important to the economic vitality of the State of Rhode Island. The effect of the cheap dollar brought on by massive Federal deficits is having an extremely harmful effect on our export-oriented industries, which affect the jobs of 18,000 Rhode Islanders. Deficits cause our exports to be expensive abroad, imperiling the jobs of those who work in our export industries.

The deficits are also making it difficult for our other industries to compete effectively here at home due to competition from low-cost imports. Industries which employ large numbers of Rhode Island workers—companies like Cranston Printworks, Taco, and Bostitch to name only a few—are finding it increasingly difficult to compete with inexpensive foreign goods. The budget plan now before us will provide a more secure future for those employed in my State and every other State by making American goods more competitive.

The leadership plan will also help to make it possible for young people in Rhode Island and in other States to afford a home. I find it extremely discouraging that the current mortgage interest rate on a 30 year fixed rate mortgage is 13.5 percent, with added "points" up front. High interest rates brought on by the deficit are placing the American dream of home ownership farther and farther beyond the grasp of our citizens. If we take positive action to reduce the deficit we will help to assure lower prices for home buyers. It has been estimated that even a 1 percentage point drop in interest rates will reduce the annual mortgage payments of the average home buyer by $600, or $50 a month. That same 1 percentage point decline in interest rates will mean an additional 300,000 home sales each year.

Reducing the deficit and bringing down interest rates will also improve the climate for prosperity of small businesses in Rhode Island and across the Nation. High interest rates discourage expansion and innovation. When interest rates come down, the net income of small businesses rises, and so does productivity. And this means American jobs remain secure. When interest rates decline by 2 percentage points, the estimated net increase in income is 18 percent for firms with 19 or fewer employees, and 26 percent for firms with between 20 and 99 employees. For most small businesses this can make a crucial difference in their ability to stay competitive.

The choice for the future is clear. If we do nothing and allow these deficits to continue unabated, every American stands to lose. But if we seize this opportunity to keep our economic recovery on track, every American stands to gain. This is an opportunity we cannot afford to pass up. We know what it is to have 21 percent prime interest rates, 12 percent inflation and 10.5 percent unemployed. None of us want those bad days to return.

But if we are prepared to take action on the deficit now by approving the leadership plan, these good times can become far better. Interest rates will decline. Our products will compete abroad. There will be more jobs. The best is ahead. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this package so that these goals can be realized.

In closing, I want to talk directly to Rhode Islanders for a moment: I have worked on your behalf for many years, both as your Governor and your Senator. We have always shared the same goals and aspirations for ourselves and our State. As the Senate works on this package in the days ahead, I will be facing many difficult choices. I will be voting on the side of those who have always wanted a chance for a good job, for our young people who want to start a family and buy a house in Rhode Island to keep their families together. I will be voting so that our children in high school will have a chance to go to college instead of being saddled with an enormous debt. In short, my vote will be for all Rhode

Islanders, each of whom has a dream for the future.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1985.

The Senate resumed consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Pending:

(1) Dole-Domenici Amendment No. 37, in the nature of a substitute.

(2) Dole-Domenici Amendment No. 38 (to Amendment No. 37), of a perfecting nature.

(3) Dole-Domenici Amendment No. 39 (to Amendment No. 38), in the nature of a substitute.

(4) Dole-Domenici Amendment No. 41 (to the resolution), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on amendment No. 41. Neither side yielding time, time shall run equally.

ONE-HOUR RECESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 1 hour and that the 1 hour be equally divided on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon, at 1:21 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:21 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. WILSON].

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

The Senate continued with consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? If neither side yields time, time runs equally, being charged to both sides.

(Later the following occurred:)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished majority leader is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 42

(Purpose: An amendment proposing a substitute for the pending amendment)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk for myself, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, and additional cosponsors, the names of whom I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HECHT, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. WALLOP, and Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 42.

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following: On page 2, line 8, strike the figure——

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk continued and concluded reading the amendment.

The text of the amendment follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 42

(A substitute for the pending amendment.)

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

On page 2, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$736,200,000,000".

On page 2, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$793,600,000,000".

On page 2, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$866,300,000,000".

On page 2, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$955,900,000,000".

On page 2, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 2, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$900,000,000".

On page 2, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,400,000,000".

On page 2, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$44,800,000,000".

On page 2, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$51,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$56,100,000,000".

On page 2, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$61,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$186,200,000,000".

On page 3, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$200,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$216,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$248,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$1,055,600,000,000".

On page 3, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$1,076,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$1,139,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$1,216,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$949,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$969,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$1,013,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$1,055,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$212,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$175,400,000,000".

On page 4, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$146,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$99,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$1,849,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$2,088,000,000".

On page 4, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$2,316,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$2,529,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$25,500,000,000".

On page 4, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$238,700,000,000".

On page 4, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$228,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$213,100,000,000".

On page 4, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$52,900,000,000".

On page 4, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$69,200,000,000".

On page 4, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$30,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$74,500,000,000".

On page 5, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$27,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$74,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$25,600,000,000".

On page 5, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$79,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 6, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$292,600,000,000".

On page 6, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$252,000,000,000".

On page 6, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$312,800,000,000".

On page 6, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$276,100,000,000".

On page 6, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$334,900,000,000".

On page 6, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$298,400,000,000".

On page 7, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$359,600,000,000".

On page 7, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$321,400,000,000".
On page 7, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 7, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 7, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 7, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$25,300,000,000".
On page 7, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$18,000,000,000".
On page 7, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$11,500,000,000".
On page 7, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$10,300,000,000".
On page 7, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 8, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$21,000,000,000".
On page 8, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$17,800,000,000".
On page 8, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$8,200,000,000".
On page 8, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 8, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 8, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$20,200,000,000".
On page 8, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$17,100,000,000".
On page 8, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$7,800,000,000".
On page 8, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 8, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 8, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$20,500,000,000".
On page 8, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$16,600,000,000".
On page 8, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$7,900,000,000".
On page 8, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 9, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$9,100,000,000".
On page 9, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".
On page 9, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 9, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".
On page 9, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$9,000,000,000".
On page 9, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$8,800,000,000".
On page 9, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 9, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$9,300,000,000".
On page 10, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$9,000,000,000".
On page 10, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 8, strike the figure and insert '$0".
On page 10, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$1,600,000,000".
On page 10, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 10, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 10, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 10, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 10, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$5,200,000,000".
On page 10, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$5,100,000,000".
On page 10, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 11, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$4,100,000,000".
On page 11, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$5,200,000,000".
On page 11, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$4,600,000,000".
On page 11, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$1,400,000,000".
On page 11, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$4,900,000,000".
On page 11, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$4,200,000,000".
On page 11, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$1,000,000,000".
On page 11, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 11, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$12,700,000,000".
On page 12, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$13,100,000,000".
On page 12, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$12,100,000,000".
On page 12, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$12,400,000,000".
On page 12, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$12,500,000,000".
On page 12, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$12,200,000,000".
On page 12, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 12, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 12, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$12,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".
On page 13, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$24,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$21,000,000,000".
On page 13, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$13,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$5,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 13, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$16,500,000".
On page 13, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$13,800,000,000".
On page 13, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$11,700,000,000".
On page 13, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$16,400,000,000".
On page 14, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$14,500,000,000".
On page 14, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$10,200,000,000".
On page 14, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$13,600,000,000".
On page 14, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$11,500,000,000".
On page 14, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$9,100,000,000".
On page 14, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".
On page 14, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 14, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$12,600,000,000".
On page 14, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$5,600,000,000".
On page 15, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$27,000,000,000".
On page 15, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$7,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$2,600,000,000".
On page 15, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$2,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$25,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 15, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,900,000,000".
On page 15, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 15, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$2,500,000,000".
On page 15, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$26,700,000,000".
On page 15, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 16, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$4,300,000,000".
On page 16, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".
On page 16, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$2,700,000,000".
On page 16, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$28,400,000,000".
On page 16, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".
On page 16, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$29,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$26,100,000,000".

On page 16, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 16, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 16, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 16, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$26,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$25,600,000,000".
On page 16, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 16, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$27,100,000,000".
On page 17, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$27,000,000,000".
On page 17, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 17, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 17, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$26,500,000,000".
On page 17, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".
On page 17, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 17, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 17, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$8,400,000,000".
On page 17, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".
On page 18, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 18, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$5,400,000,000".
On page 18, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$7,600,000,000".
On page 18, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$800,000,000".
On page 18, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 18, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$6,800,000,000".
On page 18, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$700,000,000".
On page 18, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 18, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$6,200,000,000".
On page 19, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$6,200,000,000".
On page 19, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$800,000,000".
On page 19, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 19, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$31,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$30,300,000,000".
On page 19, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 19, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$8,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 19, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$28,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$29,800,000,000".
On page 19, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$8,900,000,000".
On page 20, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$29,400,000,000".
On page 20, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$28,700,000,000".
On page 20, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$9,200,000,000".
On page 20, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$29,800,000,000".
On page 20, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$29,000,000,000".
On page 20, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$9,400,000,000".
On page 20, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$33,600,000,000".
On page 21, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$33,500,000,000".
On page 21, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 21, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$34,900,000,000".
On page 21, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$35,000,000,000".
On page 21, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 21, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$37,100,000,000".
On page 21, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$36,700,000,000".
On page 21, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 21, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$39,200,000,000".
On page 21, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$38,700,000,000".
On page 22, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 22, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$71,800,000,000".
On page 22, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$65,200,000,000".
On page 22, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$81,600,000,000".
On page 22, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$68,000,000,000".
On page 22, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$90,500,000,000".
On page 22, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$74,100,000,000".
On page 23, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$93,300,000,000".
On page 23, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$81,600,000,000".
On page 23, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$162,800,000,000".
On page 23, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$128,600,000,000".
On page 23, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$14,300,000,000".
On page 23, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$156,300,000,000".
On page 24, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$118,100,000,000".
On page 24, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 24, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$166,500,000,000".
On page 24, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$121,900,000,000".
On page 24, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$2,300,000,000".
On page 24, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$174,700,000,000".
On page 24, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$125,600,000,000".
On page 24, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 25, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$195,500,000,000".
On page 25, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$189,300,000,000".
On page 25, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$207,600,000,000".
On page 25, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$197,700,000,000".
On page 25, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 25, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$225,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$206,500,000,000".
On page 26, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$266,200,000,000".
On page 26, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$216,100,000,000".
On page 26, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$27,200,000,000".
On page 26, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$1,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$16,800,000,000".
On page 27, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$1,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$15,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$1,200,000,000".
On page 27, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$17,400,000,000".
On page 27, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$26,400,000,000".
On page 27, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,200,000,000".
On page 28, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$20,100,000,000".
On page 28, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$6,600,000,000".
On page 28, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 28, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$6,800,000,000".
On page 28, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$6,700,000,000".
On page 28, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$6,900,000,000".
On page 28, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$6,900,000,000".
On page 28, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$7,000,000,000".
On page 29, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$7,000,000,000".
On page 29, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 29, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 29, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 29, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 29, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$5,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 30, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$5,600,000,000".
On page 30, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$5,500,000,000".
On page 30, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 31, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 31, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".
On page 31, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$3,200,000,000".
On page 31, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 31, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 31, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$129,700,000,000".
On page 32, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$129,700,000,000".
On page 32, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$142,300,000,000".
On page 32, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$142,300,000,000".
On page 32, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$153,000,000,000".
On page 33, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$153,000,000,000".
On page 33, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$155,200,000,000".
On page 33, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$155,200,000,000".
On page 33, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 33, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 33, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 5, strike the figure and insert "−$1,400,000,000".
On page 34, line 6, strike the figure and insert "−$1,400,000,000".
On page 34, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 14, strike the figure and insert "−$1,200,000,000".
On page 34, line 15, strike the figure and insert "−$1,200,000,000".
On page 34, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 34, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 34, line 23, strike the figure and insert "−$200,000,000".

On page 34, line 24, strike the figure and insert "−$100,000,000".

On page 34, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 8, strike the figure and insert "−$32,400,000,000".

On page 35, line 9, strike the figure and insert "−$32,400,000,000".

On page 35, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 17, strike the figure and insert "−$35,000,000,000".

On page 35, line 18, strike the figure and insert "−$35,000,000,000".

On page 35, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 35, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 2, strike the figure and insert "−$37,800,000,000".

On page 36, line 3, strike the figure and insert "−$37,800,000,000".

On page 36, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 11, strike the figure and insert "−$41,100,000,000".

On page 36, line 12, strike the figure and insert "−$41,100,000,000".

On page 36, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 36, line 19, strike the date and insert "June 30, 1985".

On page 37, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$3,899,000,000".

On page 37, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$4,610,000,000".

On page 37, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$3,773,000,000".

On page 37, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$6,540,000,000".

On page 37, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$4,258,000,000".

On page 37, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$10,326,000,000".

On page 37, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 37, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$376,000,000".

On page 37, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 37, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$894,000,000".

On page 37, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 37, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "$1,424,000,000".

On page 38, line 10, strike the first figure and insert "$10,122,000,000".

On page 38, line 10, strike the second figure and insert "$4,213,000,000".

On page 38, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$11,353,000,000".

On page 38, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$7,416,000,000".

On page 38, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$12,509,000,000".

On page 38, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$9,566,000,000".

On page 38, line 24, strike the first figure and insert "$2,622,000,000".

On page 38, line 24, strike the second figure and insert "$2,216,000,000".

On page 38, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,416,000,000".

On page 39, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$1,077,000,000".

On page 39, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "$1,633,000,000".

On page 39, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "$1,368,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, strike the first figure and insert "$2,962,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, strike the second figure and insert "$2,253,000,000".

On page 39, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$2,723,000,000".

On page 39, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$2,579,000,000".

On page 39, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$2,720,000,000".

On page 39, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$2,814,000,000".

On page 40, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "$719,000,000".

On page 40, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "$306,000,000".

On page 40, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$1,208,000,000".

On page 40, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$1,451,000,000".

On page 40, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "$1,720,000,000".

On page 40, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "$2,112,000,000".

On page 40, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$8,117,000,000".

On page 40, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$18,934,000,000".

On page 40, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "$28,137,000,000".

On page 41, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 41, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$47,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "$275,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "$109,000,000".

On page 41, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$282,000,000".

On page 41, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$140,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$375,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,101,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "$1,325,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$7,332,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$1,370,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$9,097,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "$3,404,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "$1,299,000,000".

On page 42, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$3,826,000,000".

On page 42, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$3,446,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$4,291,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$4,231,000,000".

On page 42, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$882,000,000".

On page 42, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$1,258,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the first figure and insert "$2,034,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the second figure and insert "$2,101,000,000".

On page 42, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$2,594,000,000".

On page 42, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$2,275,000,000".

On page 43, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$858,000,000".

On page 43, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$791,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$1,332,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$1,496,000,000".

On page 43, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$1,725,000,000".

On page 43, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$1,987,000,000".

On page 43, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 43, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$87,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "$201,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "$151,000,000".

On page 43, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$211,000,000".

On page 43, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$181,000,000".

On page 44, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$3,899,000,000".

On page 44, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$4,610,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "$3,773,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "$6,540,000,000".

On page 44, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$4,258,000,000".

On page 44, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$10,326,000,000".

On page 44, line 19, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 19, strike the second figure and insert "$376,000,000".

On page 44, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$894,000,000".

On page 44, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "$1,424,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the first figure and insert "$9,159,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the second figure and insert "$4,028,000,000".

On page 45, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$9,730,000,000".

On page 45, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$6,870,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$10,379,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$8,550,000,000".

On page 45, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$2,838,000,000".

On page 45, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$1,316,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "$3,183,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "$3,202,000,000".

On page 45, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$3,549,000,000".

On page 45, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$3,865,000,000".

On page 46, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$5,188,000,000".

On page 46, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$8,187,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$3,871,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$10,159,000,000".

On page 46, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$3,958,000,000".

On page 46, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$13,539,000,000".

On page 46, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 46, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$47,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "$275,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "$109,000,000".

On page 47, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$282,000,000".

On page 47, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$140,000,000".

On page 47, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "$64,000,000".

On page 47, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$3,699,000,000".

On page 47, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$5,203,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "$540,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "$292,000,000".

On page 48, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$559,000,000".

On page 48, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$402,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "$634,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "$526,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$401,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$379,000,000".

On page 48, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$293,000,000".

On page 48, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$352,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "$394,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "$450,000,000".

On page 49, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$375,000,000".

On page 49, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "$3,037,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the first figure and insert "$1,325,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$7,183,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "$1,370,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$8,850,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "$1,895,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "$469,000,000".

On page 49, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$3,091,000,000".

On page 49, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$1,950,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$4,170,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$3,161,000,000".

On page 50, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$882,000,000".

On page 50, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$1,258,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "$2,034,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "$2,101,000,000".

On page 50, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$2,594,000,000".

On page 50, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$2,275,000,000".

On page 50, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$858,000,000".

On page 50, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$791,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$1,332,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$1,496,000,000".

On page 50, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$1,725,000,000".

On page 50, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$1,987,000,000".

On page 51, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "$7,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$14,456,000,000".

On page 51, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$21,809,000,000".

On page 51, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$313,500,000,000".

On page 51, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$335,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$360,400,000,000".

On page 52, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$136,700,000,000".

On page 52, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$138,200,000,000".

On page 52, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$143,100,000,000".

On page 54, line 20, strike the figure and insert "8".

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment. Who yields time?

Neither side having yielded time, the time runs equally against both sides.

FORTY-MINUTE RECESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 40 minutes, the time to be equally divided on the amendment, 20 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon, at 3:46 p.m., the Senate recessed until 4:26 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. GORTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on amendment No. 42.

Who yields time? If neither side yields time, time will be charged equally against both sides.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, speaking on the resolution, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. CHILES. I yield time off the resolution.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY BRITISH PARLIAMENTARIANS

RECESS

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, we have a distinguished group of British parliamentarians who are visiting us today. I should like to ask, with time taken off of the resolution, equally divided, that we stand in recess for several minutes so we may greet the parliamentarians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How many minutes is the Senator asking?

Mr. CHILES. Five minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:43 p.m., recessed until 4:48 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. GORTON].

FIRST BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

The Senate continued with consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Neither side having yielded time, it will be charged equally against each side on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A motion to recommit S. Con. Res. 32, with instructions to report forthwith as follows:

On page 36, line 19, strike the date and insert "June 18, 1985".

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? If neither side yields time on the motion, the time will be charged equally against both sides.

(Later the following occurred:)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on the motion has expired.

The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 43

(Purpose: Amendment to Motion to Recommit)

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] for himself and Mr. DOMENICI proposes an amendment numbered 43.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike the instructions and insert the following: that the resolution be reported forthwith with the following language in lieu of the language of the resolution:

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 is revised and replaced, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986 is established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1987 and 1988 are set forth.

(a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, October 1, 1986, and October 1, 1987:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $736,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $793,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $866,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $955,900,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $0.
Fiscal year 1986: $900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $2,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $3,400,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $44,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $51,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $56,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $61,300,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $186,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $200,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $216,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $248,300,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $1,055,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $1,076,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $1,139,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $1,216,100,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $949,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $969,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $1,013,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $1,055,700,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits in the budget which are appropriate in the light of economic conditions and all other relevant factors are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $212,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $175,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $146,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $99,800,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $1,849,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $2,088,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $2,316,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $2,529,300,000,000.

and the amounts by which the statutory limits on such debt should be accordingly increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $25,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $238,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $228,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $213,100,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, October 1, 1986, and October 1, 1987, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $52,900,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $69,200,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $30,000,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $74,500,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $27,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $74,400,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $25,600,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $79,000,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1985 through 1988 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $292,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $252,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $312,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $276,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $334,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $298,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $359,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $321,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $25,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $21,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $20,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $20,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $9,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $1,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $5,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $4,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $5,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $4,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $24,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $16,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $7,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $3,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $4,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $28,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $29,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $25,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $27,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $26,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $5,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $31,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $28,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $29,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $29,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $33,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $34,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $37,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $39,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medical Insurance (570):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $71,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $81,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $90,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $93,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $162,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $156,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $166,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $174,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $195,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $207,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $197,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $225,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $206,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $266,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $216,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $27,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $17,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $6,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $7,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $5,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $6,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $2,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $2,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $129,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $142,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $153,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $155,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $155,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, −$35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2. (a) Not later than June 19, 1985, the committees named in subsections (b) through (bb) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the Budget shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SENATE COMMITTEES

(b) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $3,899,000,000 in budget authority and $4,610,,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,773,000,000 in budget authority and $6,540,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $4,258,000,000 in budget authority and $10,326,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(c) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to achieve savings of $0 in budget authority and $376,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $894,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $1,424,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(d) The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $10,122,000,000 in budget authority and $4,213,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $11,353,000,000 in budget authority and $7,416,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $12,509,000,000 in budget authority and $9,566,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(e) The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $2,622,000,000 in budget authority and $2,216,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,416,000,000 in budget authority and $1,077,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,633,000,000 in budget authority and $1,368,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(f) The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined

in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $2,962,000,000 in budget authority and $2,253,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $2,723,000,000 in budget authority and $2,579,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,720,000,000 in budget authority and $2,814,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(g) The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $719,000,000 in budget authority and $306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,208,000,000 in budget authority and $1,451,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,720,000,000 in budget authority and $2,112,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(h) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in budget authority and $8,117,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $18,934,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $28,137,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(i) The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $192,000,000 in budget authority and $47,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $275,000,000 in budget authority and $109,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $282,000,000 in budget authority and $140,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(j) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, or (3) any combination thereof, sufficient to achieve increases in contributions and savings in budget authority and outlays as follows: $375,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $3,101,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,325,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $7,332,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,370,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $9,097,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(k) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $3,404,000,000 in budget authority and $1,299,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,826,000,000 in budget authority and $3,446,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $4,291,000,000 in budget authority and $4,231,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(l) The Senate Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $882,000,000 in budget authority and $1,258,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $2,034,000,000 in budget authority and $2,101,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,594,000,000 in budget authority and $2,275,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(m) The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $858,000,000 in budget authority and $791,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,332,000,000 in budget authority and $1,496,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,725,000,000 in budget authority and $1,987,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(n) The Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $192,000,000 in budget authority and $87,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $201,000,000 in budget authority and $151,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $211,000,000 in budget authority and $181,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

HOUSE COMMITTEES

(o) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $3,899,000,000 in budget authority and $4,610,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,773,000,000 in budget authority and $6,540,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $4,258,000,000 in budget authority and $10,326,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(p) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to achieve savings of $0 in budget authority and $376,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $894,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $1,424,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(q) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $9,159,000,000 in budget authority and $4,028,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $9,730,000,000 in budget authority and $6,870,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $10,379,000,000 in budget authority and $8,550,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(r) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $2,838,000,000 in budget authority and $1,316,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,183,000,000 in budget authority and $3,202,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $3,549,000,000 in budget authority and $3,865,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(s) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $5,188,000,000 in budget authority and $8,187,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,871,000,000 in budget authority and $10,159,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $3,958,000,000 in budget authority and $13,539,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(t) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $192,000,000 in budget authority and

$47,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $275,000,000 in budget authority and $109,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $282,000,000 in budget authority and $140,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(u) The House Committee on Government Operations shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in budget authority and $64,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $3,699,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $5,203,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(v) The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $540,000,000 in budget authority and $292,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $559,000,000 in budget authority and $402,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $634,000,000 in budget authority and $526,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(w) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $401,000,000 in budget authority and $379,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $293,000,000 in budget authority and $352,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $394,000,000 in budget authority and $450,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(x) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, or (3) any combination thereof, sufficient to achieve increases in contributions and savings in budget authority and outlays as follows: $375,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $3,037,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,325,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $7,183,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,370,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $8,850,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(y) The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,895,000,000 in budget authority and $469,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,091,000,000 in budget authority and $1,950,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $4,170,000,000 in budget authority and $3,161,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(z) The House Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $882,000,000 in budget authority and $1,258,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $2,034,000,000 in budget authority and $2,101,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,594,000,000 in budget authority and $2,275,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(aa) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $858,000,000 in budget authority and $791,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,332,000,000 in budget authority and $1,496,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,725,000,000 in budget authority and $1,987,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(bb) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in budget authority and $7,600,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $14,456,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $21,809,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective Committee on Appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $313,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; aggregate total budget authority to exceed $335,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and aggregate total budget authority to exceed $360,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(b) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective Committee on Appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for nondefense discretionary activities to exceed $136,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; aggregate total budget authority to exceed $138,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and aggregate budget authority to exceed $143,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(c) The provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting, a quorum being present, or by unanimous consent of the Senate.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 4. If the Congress has not completed action by October 1, 1985, on the concurrent resolution on the budget required to be reported under section 310(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal year 1986, then, for purposes of section 311 of such Act, this concurrent resolution shall be deemed to be the concurrent resolution required to be reported under section 310 of such Act.

SEC. 5. It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate during fiscal years 1986 and 1987 to consider any bill, resolution, or amendment, except proposed legislation reported in response to reconciliation instructions contained in this resolution, authorizing new direct loan obligations or new loan guarantee commitments unless that bill, resolution, or amendment also provides that the authority to make or guarantee such loans shall be effective only to such extent and in such amounts as are contained in appropriation acts.

SEC. 6. It is the sense of the Congress that the previous distinction between "unified budget" and "off-budget" spending be ended, and that budget authority and outlays for the so-called "off-budget" agencies be included in the budget totals.

SEC. 7. (a) The Senate finds that—

(1) the existing tax structure of the United States distorts economic activity, leading to an inefficient use of national resources and a weakening of our domestic economic vitality and competitive posture in international markets;

(2) the relative tax burdens among various taxpayer categories are manifestly unfair insofar as they arise from differences in the capabilities of taxpayers to take advantage of complicated tax laws;

(3) the ability of the Federal Government to plan and conduct rational fiscal policy is frustrated by elaborate schemes to avoid taxation and the unintended effects of tax incentives and penalties;

(4) progressive erosion of voluntary compliance threatens the fiscal integrity of our public finances and the confidence of our citizens in the Federal Government's capacity to govern; and

(5) a number of plans, each designed to simplify and reform the Tax Code, have been before the Congress for a time sufficient to allow for extensive analysis and evaluation.

(b) It is therefore the sense of the Senate that tax reform should be adopted as soon as possible, and that it should incorporate the following principles and objectives:

(1) efficiency and responsiveness to market conditions in the economic activities of American businesses and consumers;

(2) simplicity of structure and lower marginal tax rates;

(3) a fair and equitable distribution of the tax burden among all taxpayers, with relief

for those below the poverty level, and incentives to bring them into the work force;

(4) a broader tax base, with deductions essential to avoid genuine hardship or to protect the economic security of the American people; and

(5) increased incentives for work, saving, and investment.

SEC. 8. It is the sense of the Senate that because the Senate requires timely reporting of legislative action on spending bills, and because the Senate requires continual control over the budget, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall issue a weekly report during periods when the Senate is in session detailing and tabulating the progress of congressional action on bills and resolutions providing new budget authority and changing revenues and the public debt for a fiscal year, including, but not limited to the requirements set forth in Public Law 93-344, section 308(b).

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, speaking on the resolution——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. DOLE [continuing]. Let me indicate that this takes us about as far as we wish to go on the amendment process this evening. It is my hope that we can have a period for the transaction of routine morning business at this time.

We are still working on the Ortega resolution and hope we can dispose of that this evening and then recess until 9:30 or 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Mr. President, speaking on the resolution, at the appropriate time I will make a request that the Senate recess until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond 6:30 p.m., with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I should like to take a few short moments of the Senate's time today to discuss the upcoming, all-important first major vote on the budget this year.

The term I used—"all important"—was chosen with great care.

For the last week, the Senate has accomplished very little, except for last Tuesday, when we debated and passed the Nicaragua resolution. Ever since then, we have been treading water—first to kill time until the President's Wednesday evening speech on the budget and, after that, to give the Republican leadership time to cultivate the seeds which the President supposedly sowed.

What is the difficulty? Why the inaction? Could it be that all of the "zeros" in the President's plan accurately reflect the enthusiasm of many of our Republican colleagues, and the American people, for this latest "grand scheme" of Government destruction cloaked in the garb of "deficit reduction?"

Setting aside the merits or lack thereof, of this budget proposal, Mr. President, I want to get to the heart of the matter before us and the big vote ahead.

For days, "secret" negotiations during quorum calls have been the Senate's real pending business. All the stops have been pulled out. Senators who have special interests in one budget item or another have been hustled into secret conclaves. Bones have been thrown out and eagerly scooped up by those who have sought to reclaim their little slivers of the "pie." The "White House-Senate leadership plan" has been a slow moving train ever since it left the station on April 4. It never makes a stop to be fully considered and voted upon. It just slows down long enough to hope to pick up a passenger here and there as they run along the tracks. Pretty soon it will run out of fuel and then will be forced to stop and be voted upon.

I want to make one thing clear to each of my colleagues. This upcoming major vote which is likely to take place tomorrow, after all the secret conclaves and procedural meetings, is not a "procedural" vote by any usual explanation. It is not just a vote to "get the plan out on the table" for further amendment. No, indeed, Mr. President. We did that several days ago when the measure was brought up for consideration.

It is, pure and simple, a vote on the President's overall budget plan—nothing more, nothing less, and any other interpretation that would be placed on the vote tomorrow is an erroneous one.

I know that there is all kinds of talk about "Just give us a vote on this plan of the President. It's a procedural plan. Nobody will ever remember how you voted. Then you will have a chance to offer amendments to change that plan, and it will be voted up or down."

Essentially, Mr. President, I fear that if the so-called procedural vote is taken tomorrow as is envisioned, it will set the course, and it will be very difficult, if not impossible, to make the changes in that plan that many of us think are necessary. Many of us would like to join in the effort and be part of the effort to bring some sanity to the President's spending schemes of the Federal Government.

I ask of my colleagues, especially those on the other side of the aisle—in all good faith—to weigh the consequences of what the majority of this body may be about to do. If the Senate votes to approve this disastrous budget blueprint now before us, the die may very well be cast. If it is approved, subsequent amendments will be very, very difficult to pass, as I have just mentioned. As in warfare, he who claims the high ground usually wins the battle.

If we approve this plan, those who support amendments to it after the fact will be picked off like "ducks in a row."

There is no sanctity to what we're being asked to approve. Just look at the changes which have come down from the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue during the last few weeks and indeed probably the last few days. The "bottom line" is really the "latest line." Take defense, for example. First, there was a 6 percent real growth figure below which the Russians would be marching on the Capitol. Now, with "only" 3 percent, they'll only make it to the banks of the Potomac but not across. I venture to say that the final figure will be below 3 percent and that the Sun will rise the very next morning, and the Russians will not launch their attack.

So I beseech each and every Senator. We all know the issues. Let's vote our consciences. If you want crippling cuts in agriculture, vote for the President's plan tomorrow on a procedural vote or anything else that is so determined. If you want to see Amtrak down the tubes forever, vote with the President.

And if you want to see, Mr. President, in the year 1990 an annual deficit of over $100 billion—that is 5 years from now—all of $100 billion, I can confidently predict if that blueprint is voted in tomorrow, that is what will happen.

In short, if you want everything the President wants—everything—go ahead and vote as he asks whether it is a procedural vote or anything else.

I just suggest that there should be no false move. There should be no trickery. There should be no designs to create a fake here and then go around the other end.

If you want to address fairness and as you know deep in your heart that this budget or a major part of it is deeply flawed, then vote to defeat it and then let the Senate work its collective will on a fair and a workable budget to get the finances of this country in shape.

We can do the job. We will cut the deficit just as much as the President and all of us want to do. There is no argument about that point. The key is how do we do that job?

Let us be serious and let us be deliberate and not engage in "press release" legislating. Let us not be fooled by the politics of calling this just a

"procedural vote." I know the pressure is strong all around. Let us detach ourselves from all of that and get to work in a businesslike fashion to reach our goal.

The country will be better off for our efforts if we do so, in the opinion of this Senator.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF FREE TRADE AREA BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ISRAEL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 40

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying papers; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to you, pursuant to section 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2112(e)(2)), the text of the Agreement on the Establishment of a Free Trade Area between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Israel entered into in Washington on April 22, 1985.

This historic Agreement was negotiated under the terms of Title IV of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1984 (P.L. 98-573) and provides for the creation of a Free Trade Area between the United States and Israel in order to strengthen and develop the two nations' economic relations and to further the friendship between them.

With the Agreement I am transmitting the proposed United States-Israel Free Trade Area Implementation Act to be considered by the Congress in accordance with the procedures of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974; and a statement of administrative action that is proposed to implement the Agreement. Section 102 also requires a statement of reasons, first, as to how the Agreement serves the interest of United States commerce, and second, as to why the implementing bill and proposed administrative action is required or appropriate to carry it out. The second of these requirements is met by the statement of administrative action. This letter shall meet the first.

The signing of this Agreement on April 22, 1985 marked the end of lengthy negotiations with Israel. The passage of the proposed implementing legislation, I believe, will mark the beginning of a strong new trading relationship with our friends in Israel. This Agreement, the first of its kind for the United States, provides for the elimination of substantially all the trade barriers between the United States and Israel and will be instrumental in the development of bilateral trade for our mutual benefit.

This Agreement serves the interests of United States commerce because it will create significant expansion of our trade with Israel. For the United States, the Agreement will provide duty free access to an $8 billion market in which we currently face relatively high duties and certain nontariff barriers and in which we face a tariff disparity resulting from an Israeli agreement with the European Community. This Agreement will ensure that American firms can compete fairly and competitively in the Israeli market.

I would like, in closing, to express my appreciation for the close cooperation between the Congress and the Administration that has been the hallmark of our joint effort to make the U.S.—Israel Free Trade Area a reality. Our success in this undertaking should be a matter of pride for us all and a model for future trade initiatives.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 29, 1985.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 5:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

H.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution designating the month of May 1985, as "National Child Safety Awareness Month."

The enrolled joint resolution was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 1029. An original bill to authorize appropriations for the military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe personnel levels for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1986, to authorize certain construction at military installations for such fiscal year, to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for national security programs for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (with additional views) (Rept. No. 99-41).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

Martha Graham, of New York, to be a member of the National Council on the Arts for the remainder of the term expiring September 3, 1986;

Jacob Neusner, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 1990; and the following candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

For appointment: Philip E. Coyne, Jr., Freddie R. Guyer, II.

To be assistant surgeon

Noreen A. Hynes.

(The above nominations were reported from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources with the recommendation that they be confirmed, subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, for the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, I also report favorably a nomination list in the Public Health Service which appeared in full in the RECORD of January 24, 1985, and ask unanimous consent that this list lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. EAST):

S. 1027. A bill for the relief of Kenneth David Franklin; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PRESSLER (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. EXON, Mr. ZORINSKY, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. PRYOR):

S. 1028. A bill to require the United States International Trade Commission to investigate and report on the effects of honey imports and to require the President under certain conditions to take action based on such report; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GOLDWATER, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1029. An original bill to authorize appropriations for the military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe personnel levels for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1986, to authorize cer-

tain construction at military installations for such fiscal year, to authorize appropriations for the Department of Energy for national security programs for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

S. 1030. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration for fiscal year 1986; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. ZORINSKY):

S. Res. 148. Resolution commemorating the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BOREN, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. HELMS, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. NICKLES):

S. Res. 149. Resolution to condemn the actions of the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DOLE:

S. Res. 150. Resolution to authorize testimony in the case of *State of Delaware* v. *Roger Smith*, Crim. No. 85-03-0232; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. EAST):

S. 1027. A bill for the relief of Kenneth David Franklin; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

RELIEF OF KENNETH DAVID FRANKLIN

● Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, today Senator EAST and I are introducing a private relief bill for Kenneth David Franklin of Raleigh, NC. Mr. Franklin has suffered a serious injustice in connection with the termination of his employment with the Federal Government because of a health disability. He has exhausted his administrative remedies and pursuing his claim in court would be a futile act.

The essence of Mr. Franklin's plight is that he relied on an erroneous representation of a Federal personnel officer about the availability of disability retirement benefits. He then did not discover that the representation was erroneous until the 1-year statute of limitations had run. In effect, he was led into a serious financial mistake for himself and his family because of erroneous factual information given by an agent of the Federal Government whose job it was to provide the correct information.

Mr. President, Senator EAST and I urge the governmental affairs Committee and the Senate to act expeditiously to correct the injustice Mr. Franklin has suffered.●

By Mr. PRESSLER (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BOREN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. EXON, Mr. ZORINSKY, Mr. DECONCINI, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1028. A bill to require the United States International Trade Commission to investigate and report on the effects of honey imports and to require the President under certain conditions to take action based on such report; to the Committee on Finance.

BEEKEEPER PRESERVATION ACT

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation requiring the International Trade Commission to conduct a section 22 investigation of honey imports and their impact on the domestic honey price support program. Senators ABDNOR, BOREN, BINGAMAN, BURDICK, MCCLURE, EXON, ZORINSKY, DECONCINI, MELCHER, BAUCUS, GRASSLEY, ANDREWS, COCHRAN and PRYOR are joining me in sponsoring this legislation.

For several years now, we have encouraged the administration to request a section 22 ITC investigation. Numerous letters have been received on this issue and many meetings have been held. The Senate also passed a resolution urging the President to request an ITC investigation. Unfortunately, the administration has not taken any action on this matter. Rather than investigating the impact of honey imports, the administration has, for all practical purposes, proposed to eliminate the domestic honey price support system. This would mean disaster for American beekeepers and for our entire agricultural system.

In 1976, the beekeeping industry petitioned the ITC for relief from honey imports. At that time, the ITC recommended that actions be taken to limit honey imports and prevent damage to the domestic industry. Unfortunately, the recommendations of the ITC were never implemented by the President. Since 1976, honey imports have continued to increase and the amount of honey forfeited to the Department of Agriculture under the honey loan program has increased at almost the same rate. While imports increased, domestic production actually declined. Until 1980, the honey loan program was still administered at no cost to the government. However, since 1980 the cost of the honey program has increased dramatically. To illustrate the growth in imports and honey forfeited to the CCC, I ask unanimous consent that the following table and accompanying text be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HONEY—COLONY NUMBERS, YIELD, SUPPLY, DISPOSITION, AND PROGRAM ACTIVITY

[Supply, disposition, and program activity in millions of pounds]

	Production factor:		Supply				Disposition			Program activity		
	Colony numbers	Yield per colony (pounds)	Production	Carryin	Imports	Total supply	Domestic use	Exports	Total use	Carry over	Load made	CCC takeover
Calendar (crop) year:												
1955	5,252,000	48.6	255.2	41.1	9.9	306.2	229.1	20.5	249.6	56.6	1.8	0
1956	5,195,000	41.2	214.0	56.6	4.8	275.4	207.7	18.2	227.9	49.5	1.6	0
1957	5,199,000	46.4	241.2	49.5	4.8	295.5	211.7	19.8	231.5	64.0	2.9	0.1
1958	5,152,000	50.6	260.5	64.0	3.9	328.4	234.9	22.4	257.3	71.1	5.6	2.0
1959	5,109,000	46.3	236.6	71.1	4.5	312.2	259.7	12.5	255.2	60.0	1.3	0
1960	5,009,000	48.5	242.8	60.0	12.4	315.2	253.6	9.4	263.0	52.2	1.1	0
1961	4,992,000	51.3	255.9	52.2	9.0	317.1	241.8	7.2	249.0	68.1	4.2	1.1
1962	4,900,000	50.9	249.6	68.1	7.1	324.8	255.3	13.6	268.9	55.9	3.4	0
1963	4,849,000	55.0	266.8	55.9	2.6	325.3	245.1	25.1	270.2	55.1	3.2	0
1964	4,840,000	51.9	251.2	55.1	4.9	311.2	236.5	8.9	245.4	65.8	9.5	2.2
1965	4,718,000	51.3	241.8	65.8	13.3	320.9	249.4	13.8	263.2	57.7	17.3	3.3
1966	4,646,000	52.0	241.6	57.7	9.5	308.8	239.1	14.4	253.5	55.3	33.9	4.1
1967	4,635,000	46.6	215.8	55.3	16.8	287.9	219.5	11.7	231.2	56.7	31.0	5.4
1968	4,539,000	42.2	191.4	56.7	16.9	265.0	215.9	8.1	224.0	41.9	24.9	.1
1969	4,433,000	60.3	267.5	41.0	14.7	323.2	250.6	9.9	260.5	62.7	45.7	3.5
1970	4,285,000	51.7	221.7	62.7	8.9	293.3	234.6	8.1	242.8	50.6	40.6	(1)
1971	4,107,000	48.2	197.8	50.6	11.4	259.8	219.9	7.6	227.5	32.3	22.9	0
1972	4,085,000	52.8	215.6	32.3	39.0	286.9	252.7	4.1	256.8	30.1	19.8	0
1973	4,124,000	58.0	239.1	30.1	10.7	279.9	224.9	17.6	242.5	37.4	12.1	0
1974	4,210,000	44.6	187.9	37.4	26.0	251.3	212.3	4.6	216.9	34.4	13.9	0
1975	4,206,000	47.4	199.2	34.4	46.4	280.0	242.8	4.0	246.8	33.2	(2)	0
1976	4,269,000	46.4	198.0	33.2	66.5	297.7	258.7	4.7	263.4	34.3	(2)	0
1977	4,323,000	41.2	178.1	34.3	63.9	276.3	240.8	5.5	246.3	30.0	14.1	0

HONEY—COLONY NUMBERS, YIELD, SUPPLY, DISPOSITION, AND PROGRAM ACTIVITY—Continued

[Supply, disposition, and program activity in millions of pounds]

	Production factor:		Supply				Disposition			Program activity		
	Colony numbers	Yield per colony (pounds)	Production	Carryin	Imports	Total supply	Domestic use	Exports	Total use	Carry over	Load made	CCC takeover
1978	4,090,000	56.6	231.5	30.0	56.0	317.5	277.3	8.0	285.3	32.2	40.5	0
1979	4,163,000	57.3	238.7	32.2	58.6	329.5	282.7	8.8	291.5	38.0	49.1	0
1980	4,141,000	48.2	199.8	38.0	49.0	286.8	226.2	8.5	234.7	52.1	41.1	6.0
1981	4,213,000	44.1	185.9	52.1	77.3	315.3	232.0	9.2	241.2	[2] 74.1	55.2	38.7
1982 [4]	4,250,000	54.1	230.0	74.1	92.0	396.1	250.8	8.5	259.3	[3] 136.8	88.4	74.5
1983 [4]	[5] 4,275,000	48.0	205.0	136.8	109.8	451.6	277.9	7.5	285.4	[3] 165.2	113.5	114.9
1984 [4]	[5] 4,350,000	[5] 38.0	[5] 165.0	166.2	120.0	451.2	275.8	8.0	283.8	[3] 171.4		

[1] 5,900 pounds.
[2] Loan program discontinued.
[3] Includes Government loan and inventory stocks and estimate of free stocks.
[4] Data other than imports, exports and price support program activity are estimated.
[5] Projected.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, the table shows an estimate of 120 million pounds of honey imports. The actual figure for calendar year 1984 was 128.7 million pounds and imports for January and February 1985 are ahead of the record 1984 levels. At the same time, very little domestic honey is being sold. Ironically, the United States does not produce enough honey to meet domestic needs. Due to the nature of the honey industry, it is virtually impossible to substantially increase honey production. For many years now, the United States has produced an average of 190 to 200 million pounds of honey, while domestic consumption has remained relatively stable at approximately 250 million pounds. The honey industry realizes that imports are needed, but some limit must be placed on the amount imported. We believe that if a section 22 ITC investigation were conducted, a recommendation on import relief would be made. If implemented, this would protect domestic producers and significantly reduce the cost of the Honey Loan Program to the Government.

If the study is not conducted and the Honey Loan Program is based on a market average price, many beekeepers would be forced out of business. This could threaten the production of nearly 100 crops in the United States. These crops rely on honey bees for pollination and, without proper pollination, crop production would be significantly reduced. In 1981, USDA estimated the value of crops pollinated by bees at 143 times the value of honey produced. The crops pollinated by honey bees had an estimated value of $18.9 billion. In California, nonirrigated pasture production increased fourfold with the presence of clovers pollinated by honey bees. Without an abundance of honey bees, the stands of clover declined and production was reduced.

Many plants essential to the survival of various forms of wildlife also depend on honey bees for pollination; 60 percent of the plants and 80 percent of the trees valuable to wildlife depend on honey bee pollination. Genetic enrichment through cross-pollination of these plants also depends to a large extent of honey bees. Genetic enrichment is a critical process through which plants adapt to changes in their ecosystems. Without an adequate number of honey bees, certain plants could simply disappear.

It is undeniable that the value of the honey bee goes far beyond the honey produced. The loss of pollination benefits would be devastating. We believe that the best way to preserve the honey bee in the U.S. economy is through an ITC investigation on the impact of honey imports and implementation of the Commission's recommendations. Along with this action, the Honey Loan Program must be continued. The cost of the loan program would be reduced and might even be eliminated by the imposition of some type of import restrictions.

I urge our distinguished colleagues to join us in support of this critical legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Beekeeper Preservation Act of 1985."

SEC 1. (a) The Congress finds that—

(1) in 1976 the International Trade Commission found that honey imports threatened serious injury to the domestic honey industry and recommended action to control honey imports,

(2) the domestic honey industry is essential for production of many agricultural crops,

(3) a significant part of our total diet is dependent directly or indirectly on insect pollination,

(4) it is imperative that the domestic honey bee industry be maintained at a level sufficient to provide crop pollination,

(5) honey imports have increased dramatically in recent years,

(6) the amount of domestic honey production forfeited to the CCC under the honey loan program has increased proportionately with the increase in imports.

(b) no later than ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States International Trade Commission shall conduct an investigation, and report to the President, in accordance with section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (7 U.S.C. 624), on the effects of honey imports on any program or operation referred to in subsection (a) of such section and on the amount of products processed in the United States from honey.

(c) If, on the basis of such investigation, the Commission recommends to the President in the report required under subsection (a) that fees or limitations be imposed on the importation of honey, no later than sixty days after the date of the issuance of such report, the President shall by proclamation—

(1) impose fees or limitations on honey imports in accordance with such section; or

(2) deny the existence of the facts justifying such fees or limitations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

S. 46

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 46, a bill to amend the Civil Rights Act to protect the lives of unborn human beings.

S. 49

At the request of Mr. MCCLURE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] was added as a cosponsor of S. 49, a bill to protect firearm owners' constitutional rights, civil liberties, and rights to privacy.

S. 635

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] was added as a cosponsor of S. 635, a bill to express the opposition of the United States to the system of apartheid in South Africa and for other purposes.

S. 729

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 729, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make permanent the rules relating to imputed interest and assumption of loans, and for other purposes.

S. 758

At the request of Mr. WALLOP, the name of the Senator from Louisiana

[Mr. JOHNSTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 758, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the capital gains tax on disposition of investments in U.S. real property by foreign citizens, to repeal the provisions providing for withholding of, and reporting on, such tax, and for other purposes.

S. 885

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] were added as cosponsors of S. 885, a bill to establish a moratorium during the fiscal years 1985 and 1986 on the testing of antisatellite weapons against objects in space.

S. 925

At the request of Mr. HUMPHREY, the names of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS] were added as cosponsors of S. 925, a bill to deny most-favored-nation trading status to Afghanistan.

S. 964

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 964, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the provision establishing the 10-year delimiting period for educational assistance under the Veterans' Educational Assistance Program and to eliminate related provisions.

S. 982

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 982, a bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 regarding international trade in softwood lumber, and for other purposes.

S. 983

At the request of Mr. MCCLURE, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 983, a bill to provide for limited extension of alternative means of providing assistance under the school lunch program and to provide for national commodity processing programs.

S. 984

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 984, a bill to provide two additional members of the Prospective Payment Assessment Commission.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 78

At the request of Mr. SYMMS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 78, a joint resolution to provide for the designation of June 10 through 16, as "National Scleroderma Week".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 104

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 104, a joint resolution to proclaim October 23, 1985, as "A time of remembrance" for all victims of terrorism throughout the world.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 107

At the request of Mrs. HAWKINS, the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 107, a joint resolution to designate the month of May 1985 as "Older Americans Month".

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 111

At the request of Mr. DIXON, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. ABDNOR], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. LAXALT] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 111, a joint resolution to designate the month of October 1985 as "National Spina Bifida Month".

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 41, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that corporate income tax rates should remain graduated.

SENATE RESOLUTION 148—COMMEMORATING THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. ZORINSKY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:

S. RES. 148

Whereas on May 11, 1935, the Rural Electrification Administration was established, thereby providing jobs and Federal financing to assist rural Americans in bringing electricity to their farms and homes;

Whereas in 1935 only 11 percent of rural American had available electric power, with efforts to bring electric power into rural areas from established utility systems being generally unsuccessful;

Whereas rural residents, unwilling to continue living under the laborious and burdensome conditions brought about by the lack of electric power, formed rural electric cooperatives that—with assistance provided through loans from the Rural Electrification Administration—constructed power lines to their farms and homes and to businesses located in rural communities;

Whereas in the decades following 1935, rural electrification brought about immeasurable benefits to rural Americans in increased productivity, jobs, comfort, health, and safety, and rural electric systems gained in strength and stature and made significant contributions to the economic development of the areas they serve; and

Whereas rural electric systems now constitute a strong, reliable industry, which continues to build on a half century of accomplishment while adapting to the changing needs of rural America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Rural Electrification Administration is to be commended for its contributions to the progress made by the Nation during the past 50 years in achieving the electrification of rural America.

SEC. 2. It is further the sense of the Senate that all individuals who helped in achieving the electrification of rural America are to be commended for their dedication, vision, and untiring support of this successful effort.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, on May 11, 1985, our Nation will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Over the past half century, the programs administered by this agency have made untold contributions to the quality of life for our rural families. Today, millions of rural residents are able to enjoy the same standard of living as their city counterparts due in large measure to the REA. Farms, rural businesses, and small communities alike have grown and prospered because of our commitment to bring stable, affordable electric and telephone service to the people in these areas.

The REA was created by Executive Order on May 11, 1935, when only 10.9 percent of the farms in the United States had electricity. Today that figure stands at 99 percent. The authority to make loans for telephones was granted to REA in 1949 when less than 4 of every 10 of our farms and ranches had this service. Currently, over 95 percent of rural residents have telephones. The proliferation of these necessary facilities is testimony to the success of the REA.

The incredible advances American agriculture has made over the past 5 decades can be attributed to the efficient electrification of essentially the entire country during that time. Unquestionably, our farmers are the most productive in the world and our consumers spend considerably less for food than those in other countries. The productivity of our farmers is a direct result of the contributions of the programs of REA to provide affordable electric service to producers of our food and fiber.

Mr. President, the story of rural electrification is one of cooperation. Cooperation between Government and people who recognized a need and worked to meet it. Millions of men and women have joined in this effort to bring electricity and telephones to areas that would otherwise have found it exceedingly difficult to provide these essential services. I vividly remember the days of my youth employed digging post holes for the REA. Certainly not glamorious work, but I shall never forget the satisfaction of my small contribution in helping to bring electricity to Union County, NC. This cooperative spirit of so many people over 50 years is symbolic of the highest ideals of our Nation and this spirit continues to this day to burn bright.

It is with a sense of pride in the accomplishments of the Rural Electrification Administration and the people who have contributed to its success that I offer a resolution commemorating its 50th anniversary. I urge all Senators to join with me in recognizing these efforts.

● Mr. ZORINSKY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in cosponsoring a resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the rural electrification movement.

The Rural Electrification Administration programs are of vital importance to Nebraska. Without the credit assistance provided under the REA programs, many of the sparsely populated areas of Nebraska would still be without dependable electric and telephone service.

It is difficult for many of us to imagine what it was like in the years before 1935, when there was no Rural Electrification Administration and little prospect for bringing electricity or telephone service to rural America.

Because we take the convenience of electricity for granted, it is difficult to appreciate the joy felt by a farmer who, while still amazed by the novel experience of having electricity on his farm, said: "The greatest thing on Earth is to have the love of God in your heart, and the next greatest thing is to have electricity in your house."

Rural America had little access to electricity prior to 1935 and the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

That was all changed by the Rural Electrification Administration programs—programs fathered by Nebraska's own Senator George Norris. By providing loans to finance distribution, generation, transmission of power, and—more recently—telephone service in rural areas, REA brought about a tremendous increase in productivity and in the quality of life for rural citizens.

In a half century, more than $20 billion in REA loans helped finance construction of rural utility systems that today serve more than 34 million people in 47 States.

The REA programs are some of the most successful, if not the most successful, Government programs. The Rural Electrification Administration programs have made it possible for nearly everyone to enjoy the benefits of electric and telephone service. That accomplishment was achieved not with handouts or grants but with loans repaid with interest.

After having met its original objective, REA continues to make it possible for rural utilities to keep up with changes in technology and provide rural consumers a level of service comparable to that available in urban areas. This is being accomplished with a credit performance by borrowers that is outstanding. The Government's investment is safe and sound.

There has been an additional benefit of the REA programs—a social and political consequence of tremendous value to the strength of our democracy. The REA programs foster local ownership and control. They encourage local management, local initiative, and the development of local leadership.

The member-owners of the rural electric and telephone cooperatives are not functionaries of some colossal, impersonal corporate giant. They are responsible leaders of an enterprise they own and control. This independence provides an opportunity for unlimited development and achievement and for initiative and experimentation. This is a unique and vital byproduct of the REA programs.

Although the challenge of bringing electricity and telephone service to rural areas has been successfully met by the Rural Electrification Administration programs, the job of the agency is not done. Like the utility systems in large cities where utility services have been available for decades, rural utility systems continue to need financing to replace obsolete facilities and equipment, extend service to new customers, and repair damaged equipment.

Without viable REA programs, for many rural utilities there would be no investment for the future and utility rates would be increased to prohibitively high levels. In addition, without viable REA programs, high quality affordable electric and telephone service would once again become a luxury not available to our rural citizens.

I commend the members of our Nation's rural electric and telephone cooperatives and I am proud to cosponsor this resolution.●

SENATE RESOLUTION 149—CONDEMNING THE ACTIONS OF THE SANDINISTA REGIME IN NICARAGUA

Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BOREN, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. HELMS, MRS. HAWKINS, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. NICKLES) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 149

Whereas the Sandinista regime has suppressed the democratic opposition, the press and the Church in Nicaragua; and

Whereas the Sandinistas have engaged in a massive military build-up in Nicaragua, far out of proportion to their legitimate self-defense needs, thereby nearly bankrupting the country; and

Whereas Sandinista President Ortega has just travelled to Moscow, seeking a multimillion dollar bail-out of the Sandinista regime; Be it therefore

Resolved that the Senate of the United States:

Condemns the actions of the Sandinistas described above; and

Condemns the action of Nicaraguan President Ortega in travelling to Moscow as clear evidence of a continuing Sandinista effort to strengthen ties with the Soviet Union, in support of Sandinista policies of militarization, repression and interference in the affairs of its neighbors.

SENATE RESOLUTION 150—AUTHORIZING TESTIMONY BY A SENATE EMPLOYEE

Mr. DOLE (for himself and Mr. BYRD) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 150

Whereas, in the case of *State of Delaware* v. *Roger Smith*, Crim. No. 85-03-0232, set for trial on April 30, 1985, in the Court of Common Pleas for Kent County, Dover, Delaware, a subpoena has been issued for the testimony of Barbara Evans, an employee in Senator Roth's Dover, Delaware office;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that production of documents and the testimony of an employee of the Senate is needful for use in any court for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Barbara Evans is authorized to appear and to testify in the case of *State of Delaware* v. *Roger Smith*, Crim. No. 85-03-0232.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FIRST CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

DOLE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 42

Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. BOSCHWITZ, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GARN, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HECHT, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LAXALT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. RUDMAN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TRIBLE, Mr. WALLOP, and Mr. WARNER) proposed an amendment in the nature of a substitute for amendment No. 41 proposed by Mr. DOLE (and Mr. DOMENICI) to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1986, 1987, and 1988 and revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1985; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

On page 2, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$736,200,000,000".

On page 2, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$793,600,000,000".

On page 2, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$866,300,000,000".

On page 2, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$955,900,000,000".

On page 2, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 2, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$900,000,000".

On page 2, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,400,000,000".

On page 2, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$44,800,000,000".

On page 2, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$51,000,000,000".

On page 2, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$56,100,000,000".

On page 2, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$61,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$186,200,000,000".

On page 3, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$200,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$216,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$248,300,000,000".

On page 3, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$1,055,600,000,000".

On page 3, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$1,076,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$1,139,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$1,216,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$949,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$969,000,000,000".

On page 3, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$1,013,100,000,000".

On page 3, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$1,055,700,000,000".

On page 3, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$212,900,000,000".

On page 3, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$175,400,000,000".

On page 4, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$146,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$99,800,000,000".

On page 4, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$1,849,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$2,088,000,000".

On page 4, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$2,316,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$2,529,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$25,500,000,000".

On page 4, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$238,700,000,000".

On page 4, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$228,300,000,000".

On page 4, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$213,100,000,000".

On page 4, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$52,900,000,000".

On page 4, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$69,200,000,000".

On page 4, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$30,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$74,500,000,000".

On page 5, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$27,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$74,400,000,000".

On page 5, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 5, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$25,600,000,000".

On page 5, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$79,000,000,000".

On page 5, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 6, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$292,600,000,000".

On page 6, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$252,000,000,000".

On page 6, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$312,800,000,000".

On page 6, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$276,100,000,000".

On page 6, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 6, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$334,900,000,000".

On page 6, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$298,400,000,000".

On page 7, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$359,600,000,000".

On page 7, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$321,400,000,000".

On page 7, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 7, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$25,300,000,000".

On page 7, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$18,000,000,000".

On page 7, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$11,500,000,000".

On page 7, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$10,300,000,000".

On page 7, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 8, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$21,000,000,000".

On page 8, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$17,800,000,000".

On page 8, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$8,200,000,000".

On page 8, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".

On page 8, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 8, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$20,200,000,000".

On page 8, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$17,100,000,000".

On page 8, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$7,800,000,000".

On page 8, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".

On page 8, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 8, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$20,500,000,000".

On page 8, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$16,600,000,000".

On page 8, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$7,900,000,000".

On page 8, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".

On page 9, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$9,100,000,000".

On page 9, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".

On page 9, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".

On page 9, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".

On page 9, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$9,000,000,000".

On page 9, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$8,800,000,000".

On page 9, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 9, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 10, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 10, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$9,300,000,000".

On page 10, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$9,000,000,000".

On page 10, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 10, line 8, strike the figure and insert '$0".

On page 10, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 10, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$1,600,000,000".

On page 10, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".

On page 10, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".

On page 10, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".

On page 10, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 10, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$5,200,000,000".

On page 10, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$5,100,000,000".

On page 10, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".

On page 11, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$4,100,000,000".

On page 11, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 11, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$5,200,000,000".

On page 11, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$4,600,000,000".

On page 11, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$1,400,000,000".

On page 11, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 11, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 11, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$4,900,000,000".

On page 11, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$4,200,000,000".

On page 11, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$1,000,000,000".

On page 11, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 11, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 11, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$12,700,000,000".

On page 12, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$13,100,000,000".

On page 12, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".

On page 12, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 12, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 12, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$12,100,000,000".

On page 12, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$12,400,000,000".

On page 12, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".

On page 12, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 12, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 12, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$12,500,000,000".

On page 12, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$12,200,000,000".

On page 12, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".

On page 12, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 12, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 13, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$12,700,000,000".

On page 13, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$12,300,000,000".

On page 13, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 13, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 13, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 13, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$24,800,000,000".

On page 13, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$21,000,000,000".

On page 13, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$13,800,000,000".

On page 13, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$5,700,000,000".

On page 13, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 13, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$16,500,000".

On page 13, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$13,800,000,000".

On page 13, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$11,700,000,000".

On page 13, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".

On page 14, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 14, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$16,400,000,000".

On page 14, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$14,500,000,000".

On page 14, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$10,200,000,000".

On page 14, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".

On page 14, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 14, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$13,600,000,000".

On page 14, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$11,500,000,000".

On page 14, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$9,100,000,000".

On page 14, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$8,000,000,000".

On page 14, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 14, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$12,600,000,000".

On page 14, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$5,600,000,000".

On page 15, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".

On page 15, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$27,000,000,000".

On page 15, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 15, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$7,200,000,000".

On page 15, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$2,600,000,000".

On page 15, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$2,500,000,000".

On page 15, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$25,200,000,000".

On page 15, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 15, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,900,000,000".

On page 15, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".

On page 15, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$2,500,000,000".

On page 15, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$26,700,000,000".

On page 15, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 16, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$4,300,000,000".

On page 16, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".

On page 16, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$2,700,000,000".

On page 16, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$28,400,000,000".

On page 16, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$68,200,000,000".

On page 16, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$29,600,000,000".

On page 16, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$26,100,000,000".

On page 16, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".

On page 16, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".

On page 16, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 16, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$26,600,000,000".

On page 16, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$25,600,000,000".

On page 16, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".

On page 16, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".

On page 17, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 17, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$27,100,000,000".

On page 17, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$27,000,000,000".

On page 17, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".

On page 17, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".

On page 17, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 17, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".

On page 17, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$26,500,000,000".

On page 17, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$100,000,000".

On page 17, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".

On page 17, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 17, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$8,400,000,000".

On page 17, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$8,700,000,000".

On page 18, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".

On page 18, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".

On page 18, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 18, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$5,400,000,000".

On page 18, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$7,600,000,000".

On page 18, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$800,000,000".

On page 18, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".

On page 18, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 18, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".

On page 18, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$6,800,000,000".

On page 18, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$700,000,000".

On page 18, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".

On page 18, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 19, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$6,200,000,000".

On page 19, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$6,200,000,000".

On page 19, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$800,000,000".

On page 19, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".

On page 19, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 19, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$31,600,000,000".

On page 19, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$30,300,000,000".

On page 19, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".

On page 19, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$8,600,000,000".

On page 19, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 19, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$28,600,000,000".
On page 19, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$29,800,000,000".
On page 19, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$8,900,000,000".
On page 20, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$29,400,000,000".
On page 20, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$28,700,000,000".
On page 20, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$9,200,000,000".
On page 20, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$29,800,000,000".
On page 20, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$29,000,000,000".
On page 20, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$1,100,000,000".
On page 20, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$9,400,000,000".
On page 20, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 20, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$33,600,000,000".
On page 21, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$33,500,000,000".
On page 21, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 21, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$34,900,000,000".
On page 21, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$35,000,000,000".
On page 21, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$200,000,000".
On page 21, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$37,100,000,000".
On page 21, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$36,700,000,000".
On page 21, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 21, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 21, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$39,200,000,000".
On page 21, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$38,700,000,000".
On page 22, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 22, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$71,800,000,000".
On page 22, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$65,200,000,000".
On page 22, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$81,600,000,000".
On page 22, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$68,000,000,000".
On page 22, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 22, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$90,500,000,000".
On page 22, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$74,100,000,000".
On page 23, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$93,300,000,000".
On page 23, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$81,600,000,000".
On page 23, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$162,800,000,000".
On page 23, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$128,600,000,000".
On page 23, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$14,300,000,000".
On page 23, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 23, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$156,300,000,000".
On page 24, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$118,100,000,000".
On page 24, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 24, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$166,500,000,000".
On page 24, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$121,900,000,000".
On page 24, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$2,300,000,000".
On page 24, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 24, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$174,700,000,000".
On page 24, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$125,600,000,000".
On page 24, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,800,000,000".
On page 25, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$195,500,000,000".
On page 25, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$189,300,000,000".
On page 25, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$207,600,000,000".
On page 25, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$197,700,000,000".
On page 25, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 25, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$225,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$206,500,000,000".
On page 26, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$266,200,000,000".
On page 26, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$216,100,000,000".
On page 26, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 26, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$27,200,000,000".
On page 26, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$1,300,000,000".
On page 26, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$16,800,000,000".
On page 27, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$1,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$15,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$26,300,000,000".
On page 27, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$1,200,000,000".
On page 27, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$17,400,000,000".
On page 27, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 27, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$26,900,000,000".
On page 27, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$26,400,000,000".
On page 27, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,200,000,000".
On page 28, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$20,100,000,000".
On page 28, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$6,600,000,000".
On page 28, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 28, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$6,800,000,000".
On page 28, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$6,700,000,000".
On page 28, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 28, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$6,900,000,000".

On page 28, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$6,900,000,000".
On page 28, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$7,000,000,000".
On page 29, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$7,000,000,000".
On page 29, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 29, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$5,800,000,000".
On page 29, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 29, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 29, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 29, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$5,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$5,300,000,000".
On page 30, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$5,600,000,000".
On page 30, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$5,500,000,000".
On page 30, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 30, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$6,400,000,000".
On page 30, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 31, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$6,500,000,000".
On page 31, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$2,000,000,000".
On page 31, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$3,200,000,000".
On page 31, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 31, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 31, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$2,100,000,000".
On page 31, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$129,700,000,000".
On page 32, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$129,700,000,000".
On page 32, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$142,300,000,000".
On page 32, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$142,300,000,000".
On page 32, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 32, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$153,000,000,000".
On page 33, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$153,000,000,000".
On page 33, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$155,200,000,000".
On page 33, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$155,200,000,000".
On page 33, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 33, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$300,000,000".
On page 33, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 33, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 5, strike the figure and insert "−$1,400,000,000".
On page 34, line 6, strike the figure and insert "−$1,400,000,000".
On page 34, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 14, strike the figure and insert "−$1,200,000,000".
On page 34, line 15, strike the figure and insert "−$1,200,000,000".
On page 34, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 34, line 23, strike the figure and insert "−$200,000,000".
On page 34, line 24, strike the figure and insert "−$100,000,000".
On page 34, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 8, strike the figure and insert "−$32,400,000,000".
On page 35, line 9, strike the figure and insert "−$32,400,000,000".
On page 35, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 17, strike the figure and insert "−$35,000,000,000".
On page 35, line 18, strike the figure and insert "−$35,000,000,000".
On page 35, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 35, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 2, strike the figure and insert "−$37,800,000,000".
On page 36, line 3, strike the figure and insert "−$37,800,000,000".
On page 36, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 11, strike the figure and insert "−$41,100,000,000".
On page 36, line 12, strike the figure and insert "−$41,100,000,000".
On page 36, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 36, line 19, strike the date and insert "June 30, 1985".
On page 37, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$3,899,000,000".
On page 37, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$4,610,000,000".
On page 37, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$3,773,000,000".
On page 37, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$6,540,000,000".
On page 37, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$4,258,000,000".
On page 37, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$10,326,000,000".
On page 37, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$0".
On page 37, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$376,000,000".
On page 37, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$0".
On page 37, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$894,000,000".
On page 37, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "$0".
On page 37, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "$1,424,000,000".
On page 38, line 10, strike the first figure and insert "$10,122,000,000".
On page 38, line 10, strike the second figure and insert "$4,213,000,000".
On page 38, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$11,353,000,000".
On page 38, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$7,416,000,000".

On page 38, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$12,509,000,000".

On page 38, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$9,566,000,000".

On page 38, line 24, strike the first figure and insert "$2,622,000,000".

On page 38, line 24, strike the second figure and insert "$2,216,000,000".

On page 38, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$1,416,000,000".

On page 39, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$1,077,000,000".

On page 39, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "$1,633,000,000".

On page 39, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "$1,368,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, strike the first figure and insert "$2,962,000,000".

On page 39, line 13, strike the second figure and insert "$2,253,000,000".

On page 39, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$2,723,000,000".

On page 39, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$2,579,000,000".

On page 39, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$2,720,000,000".

On page 39, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$2,814,000,000".

On page 40, line 2, strike the first figure and insert "$719,000,000".

On page 40, line 2, strike the second figure and insert "$306,000,000".

On page 40, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$1,208,000,000".

On page 40, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$1,451,000,000".

On page 40, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "$1,720,000,000".

On page 40, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "$2,112,000,000".

On page 40, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$8,117,000,000".

On page 40, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$18,934,000,000".

On page 40, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 40, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "$28,137,000,000".

On page 41, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 41, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$47,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the first figure and insert "$275,000,000".

On page 41, line 5, strike the second figure and insert "$109,000,000".

On page 41, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$282,000,000".

On page 41, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$140,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the first figure and insert "$375,000,000".

On page 41, line 16, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$3,101,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the first figure and insert "$1,325,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$7,332,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$1,370,000,000".

On page 41, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 41, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$9,097,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "$3,404,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "$1,299,000,000".

On page 42, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$3,826,000,000".

On page 42, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$3,446,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$4,291,000,000".

On page 42, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$4,231,000,000".

On page 42, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$882,000,000".

On page 42, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$1,258,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the first figure and insert "$2,034,000,000".

On page 42, line 21, strike the second figure and insert "$2,101,000,000".

On page 42, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$2,594,000,000".

On page 42, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$2,275,000,000".

On page 43, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$858,000,000".

On page 43, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$791,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$1,332,000,000".

On page 43, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$1,496,000,000".

On page 43, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$1,725,000,000".

On page 43, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$1,987,000,000".

On page 43, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 43, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$87,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "$201,000,000".

On page 43, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "$151,000,000".

On page 43, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$211,000,000".

On page 43, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$181,000,000".

On page 44, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$3,899,000,000".

On page 44, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$4,610,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "$3,773,000,000".

On page 44, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "$6,540,000,000".

On page 44, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$4,258,000,000".

On page 44, line 14, strike the figure and insert "$10,326,000,000".

On page 44, line 19, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 19, strike the second figure and insert "$376,000,000".

On page 44, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$894,000,000".

On page 44, line 22, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 44, line 22, strike the second figure and insert "$1,424,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the first figure and insert "$9,159,000,000".

On page 45, line 8, strike the second figure and insert "$4,028,000,000".

On page 45, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$9,730,000,000".

On page 45, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$6,870,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$10,379,000,000".

On page 45, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$8,550,000,000".

On page 45, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$2,838,000,000".

On page 45, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$1,316,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the first figure and insert "$3,183,000,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike the second figure and insert "$3,202,000,000".

On page 45, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$3,549,000,000".

On page 45, line 25, strike the figure and insert "$3,865,000,000".

On page 46, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$5,188,000,000".

On page 46, line 10, strike the figure and insert "$8,187,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the first figure and insert "$3,871,000,000".

On page 46, line 11, strike the second figure and insert "$10,159,000,000".

On page 46, line 12, strike the figure and insert "$3,958,000,000".

On page 46, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$13,539,000,000".

On page 46, line 23, strike the figure and insert "$192,000,000".

On page 46, line 24, strike the figure and insert "$47,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "$275,000,000".

On page 46, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "$109,000,000".

On page 47, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$282,000,000".

On page 47, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$140,000,000".

On page 47, line 11, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 12, strike the first figure and insert "$64,000,000".

On page 47, line 12, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 13, strike the figure and insert "$3,699,000,000".

On page 47, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 47, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$5,203,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the first figure and insert "$540,000,000".

On page 47, line 25, strike the second figure and insert "$292,000,000".

On page 48, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$559,000,000".

On page 48, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$402,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "$634,000,000".

On page 48, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "$526,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the first figure and insert "$401,000,000".

On page 48, line 14, strike the second figure and insert "$379,000,000".

On page 48, line 15, strike the figure and insert "$293,000,000".

On page 48, line 16, strike the figure and insert "$352,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "$394,000,000".

On page 48, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "$450,000,000".

On page 49, line 2, strike the figure and insert "$375,000,000".

On page 49, line 3, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 3, strike the second figure and insert "$3,037,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the first figure and insert "$1,325,000,000".

On page 49, line 4, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$7,183,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the first figure and insert "$1,370,000,000".

On page 49, line 6, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 49, line 7, strike the figure and insert "$8,850,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the first figure and insert "$1,895,000,000".

On page 49, line 17, strike the second figure and insert "$469,000,000".

On page 49, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$3,091,000,000".

On page 49, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$1,950,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$4,170,000,000".

On page 49, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$3,161,000,000".

On page 50, line 5, strike the figure and insert "$882,000,000".

On page 50, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$1,258,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "$2,034,000,000".

On page 50, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "$2,101,000,000".

On page 50, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$2,594,000,000".

On page 50, line 9, strike the figure and insert "$2,275,000,000".

On page 50, line 18, strike the figure and insert "$858,000,000".

On page 50, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$791,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the first figure and insert "$1,332,000,000".

On page 50, line 20, strike the second figure and insert "$1,496,000,000".

On page 50, line 21, strike the figure and insert "$1,725,000,000".

On page 50, line 22, strike the figure and insert "$1,987,000,000".

On page 51, line 6, strike the figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 7, strike the first figure and insert "$7,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 7, strike the second figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 8, strike the figure and insert "$14,456,000,000".

On page 51, line 9, strike the first figure and insert "$0".

On page 51, line 9, strike the second figure and insert "$21,809,000,000".

On page 51, line 17, strike the figure and insert "$313,500,000,000".

On page 51, line 19, strike the figure and insert "$335,600,000,000".

On page 51, line 20, strike the figure and insert "$360,400,000,000".

On page 52, line 1, strike the figure and insert "$136,700,000,000".

On page 52, line 3, strike the figure and insert "$138,200,000,000".

On page 52, line 4, strike the figure and insert "$143,100,000,000".

On page 54, line 20, strike the figure and insert "8".

DOLE AND DOMENICI AMENDMENT NO. 43

Mr. DOLE (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the motion to recommit the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32), supra, with instructions, as follows:

Strike the instructions and insert the following: that the resolution be reported forthwith with the following language in lieu of the language of the resolution:

That the Congress hereby determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1985 is revised and replaced, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986 is established, and the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1987 and 1988 are set forth.

(a) The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, October 1, 1986, and October 1, 1987:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $736,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $793,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $866,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $955,900,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $0.
Fiscal year 1986: $900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $2,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $3,400,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $44,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $51,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $56,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $61,300,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $186,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $200,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $216,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $248,300,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $1,055,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $1,076,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $1,139,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $1,216,100,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $949,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $969,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $1,013,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $1,055,700,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits in the budget which are appropriate in the light of economic conditions and all other relevant factors are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $212,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $175,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $146,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $99,800,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $1,849,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $2,088,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $2,316,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $2,529,300,000,000.

and the amounts by which the statutory limits on such debt should be accordingly increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985: $25,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986: $238,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987: $228,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988: $213,100,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1984, October 1, 1985, October 1, 1986, and October 1, 1987, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $52,900,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $69,200,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $30,000,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $74,500,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $27,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $74,400,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New direct loan obligations, $25,600,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $79,000,000,000.

(C) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.

(b) The Congress hereby determines and declares the appropriate levels of budget authority and budget outlays, and the appropriate levels of new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1985 through 1988 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $292,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $252,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $312,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $276,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $334,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $298,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1988:

(A) New budget authority, $359,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $321,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1985:

(A) New budget authority, $25,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $10,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1986:

(A) New budget authority, $21,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, $8,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

Fiscal year 1987:

(A) New budget authority, $20,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $20,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $7,900,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $12,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $9,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $8,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $9,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $9,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $1,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $5,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $4,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $5,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,400,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $4,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,000,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $12,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $12,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $12,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $24,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $13,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $5,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $16,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $11,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $16,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $10,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $13,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $9,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $12,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $6,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $27,000,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $7,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $25,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $3,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,500,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $26,700,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $4,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $28,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $68,200,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $29,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $25,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $27,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $26,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $8,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $5,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $700,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $6,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $31,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,600,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $28,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $8,900,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $29,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $29,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,100,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $9,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $33,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $34,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $200,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $37,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $39,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(12) Medical Insurance (570):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $71,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $81,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $90,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $93,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $162,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $128,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $14,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $156,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $166,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $2,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $174,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,600,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,800,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $195,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $189,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $207,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $197,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $225,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $206,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $266,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $216,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $27,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $16,800,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,300,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $15,300,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $17,400,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $26,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $1,200,000,000.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $20,100,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $6,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $6,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,900,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $7,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $5,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $5,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $5,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $5,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(18) General Purpose Fiscal Assistance (850):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $6,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $6,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,500,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $2,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $2,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(19) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $129,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $129,700,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, $142,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $142,300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, $153,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, $155,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $155,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(20) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, $300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $300,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,200,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 1985:
(A) New budget authority, −$32,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$32,400,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1986:
(A) New budget authority, −$35,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$35,000,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1987:
(A) New budget authority, −$37,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$37,800,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
Fiscal year 1988:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, $0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, $0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, $0.

RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2. (a) Not later than June 19, 1985, the committees named in subsections (b) through (bb) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committees on the Budget of their respective Houses. After receiving those recommendations, the Committees on the Budget shall report to the House and Senate a reconciliation bill or resolution or both carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

SENATE COMMITTEES

(b) The Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $3,899,000,000 in budget authority and $4,610,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,773,000,000 in budget authority and $6,540,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $4,258,000,000 in budget authority and $10,326,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(c) The Senate Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to achieve savings of $0 in budget authority and $376,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $894,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $1,424,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(d) The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $10,122,000,000 in budget authority

and $4,213,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $11,353,000,000 in budget authority and $7,416,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $12,509,000,000 in budget authority and $9,566,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(e) The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $2,622,000,000 in budget authority and $2,216,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,416,000,000 in budget authority and $1,077,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,633,000,000 in budget authority and $1,368,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(f) The Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $2,962,000,000 in budget authority and $2,253,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $2,723,000,000 in budget authority and $2,579,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,720,000,000 in budget authority and $2,814,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(g) The Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $719,000,000 in budget authority and $306,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,208,000,000 in budget authority and $1,451,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,720,000,000 in budget authority and $2,112,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(h) The Senate Committee on Finance shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in budget authority and $8,117,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $18,934,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $28,137,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(i) The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $192,000,000 in budget authority and $47,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $275,000,000 in budget authority and $109,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $282,000,000 in budget authority and $140,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(j) The Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, or (3) any combination thereof, sufficient to achieve increases in contributions and savings in budget authority and outlays as follows: $375,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $3,101,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,325,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $7,332,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,370,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $9,097,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(k) The Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $3,404,000,000 in budget authority and $1,299,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,826,000,000 in budget authority and $3,446,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $4,291,000,000 in budget authority and $4,231,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(l) The Senate Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $882,000,000 in budget authority and $1,258,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $2,034,000,000 in budget authority and $2,101,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,594,000,000 in budget authority and $2,275,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(m) The Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $858,000,000 in budget authority and $791,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,332,000,000 in budget authority and $1,496,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,725,000,000 in budget authority and $1,987,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(n) The Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $192,000,000 in budget authority and $87,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $201,000,000 in budget authority and $151,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $211,000,000 in budget authority and $181,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

HOUSE COMMITTEES

(o) The House Committee on Agriculture shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $3,899,000,000 in budget authority and $4,610,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,773,000,000 in budget authority and $6,540,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $4,258,000,000 in budget authority and $10,326,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(p) The House Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to achieve savings of $0 in budget authority and $376,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $894,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $1,424,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(q) The House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $9,159,000,000 in budget authority and $4,028,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $9,730,000,000 in budget authority and $6,870,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $10,379,000,000 in budget authority and $8,550,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(r) The House Committee on Education and Labor shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $2,838,000,000 in budget authority and $1,316,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,183,000,000 in budget authority and $3,202,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987,

and $3,549,000,000 in budget authority and $3,865,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(s) The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $5,188,000,000 in budget authority and $8,187,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,871,000,000 in budget authority and $10,159,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $3,958,000,000 in budget authority and $13,539,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(t) The House Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $192,000,000 in budget authority and $47,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $275,000,000 in budget authority and $109,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $282,000,000 in budget authority and $140,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(u) The House Committee on Government Operations shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in budget authority and $64,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $3,699,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $5,203,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(v) The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $540,000,000 in budget authority and $292,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $559,000,000 in budget authority and $402,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $634,000,000 in budget authority and $526,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(w) The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $401,000,000 in budget authority and $379,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $293,000,000 in budget authority and $352,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $394,000,000 in budget authority and $450,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(x) The House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, or (3) any combination thereof, sufficient to achieve increases in contributions and savings in budget authority and outlays as follows: $375,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $3,037,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,325,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $7,183,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,370,000,000 in contributions, $0 in budget authority and $8,850,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(y) The House Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $1,895,000,000 in budget authority and $469,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $3,091,000,000 in budget authority and $1,950,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $4,170,000,000 in budget authority and $3,161,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(z) The House Committee on Small Business shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $882,000,000 in budget authority and $1,258,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $2,034,000,000 in budget authority and $2,101,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $2,594,000,000 in budget authority and $2,275,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(aa) The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $858,000,000 in budget authority and $791,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $1,332,000,000 in budget authority and $1,496,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $1,725,000,000 in budget authority and $1,987,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

(bb) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report (1) changes in laws within its jurisdiction which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, sufficient to reduce budget authority and outlays, (2) changes in laws within its jurisdiction other than those which provide spending authority as defined in section 401(c)(2)(C) of the Act, sufficient to achieve savings in budget authority and outlays, or (3) any combination thereof, as follows: $0 in budget authority and $7,600,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1986, $0 in budget authority and $14,456,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1987, and $0 in budget authority and $21,809,000,000 in outlays in fiscal year 1988.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. (a) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective Committee on Appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for function 050, National Defense, to exceed $313,500,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; aggregate total budget authority to exceed $335,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and aggregate total budget authority to exceed $360,400,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(b) It shall not be in order to consider any measure making appropriations in the Senate or House of Representatives, if the enactment of such bill or resolution, as recommended by the respective Committee on Appropriations, would cause the aggregate total budget authority for nondefense discretionary activities to exceed $136,700,000,000 in fiscal year 1986; aggregate total budget authority to exceed $138,200,000,000 in fiscal year 1987; and aggregate budget authority to exceed $143,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1988.

(c) The provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section may be waived or suspended in the Senate by a majority vote of the Members voting, a quorum being present, or by unanimous consent of the Senate.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 4. If the Congress has not completed action by October 1, 1985, on the concurrent resolution on the budget required to be reported under section 310(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal year 1986, then, for purposes of section 311 of such Act, this concurrent resolution shall be deemed to be the concurrent resolution required to be reported under section 310 of such Act.

SEC. 5. It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate during fiscal years 1986 and 1987 to consider any bill, resolution, or amendment, except proposed legislation reported in response to reconciliation instructions contained in this resolution, authorizing new direct loan obligations or new loan guarantee commitments unless that bill, resolution, or amendment also provides that the authority to make or guarantee such loans shall be effective only to such extent and in such amounts as are contained in appropriation acts.

SEC. 6. It is the sense of the Congress that the previous distinction between "unified budget" and "off-budget" spending be ended, and that budget authority and outlays for the so-called "off-budget" agencies be included in the budget totals.

SEC. 7. (a) The Senate finds that—

(1) the existing tax structure of the United States distorts economic activity, leading to an inefficient use of national resources and a weakening of our domestic

economic vitality and competitive posture in international markets;

(2) the relative tax burdens among various taxpayer categories are manifestly unfair insofar as they arise from differences in the capabilities of taxpayers to take advantage of complicated tax laws;

(3) the ability of the Federal Government to plan and conduct rational fiscal policy is frustrated by elaborate schemes to avoid taxation and the unintended effects of tax incentives and penalties;

(4) progressive erosion of voluntary compliance threatens the fiscal integrity of our public finances and the confidence of our citizens in the Federal Government's capacity to govern; and

(5) a number of plans, each designed to simplify and reform the Tax Code, have been before the Congress for a time sufficient to allow for extensive analysis and evaluation.

(b) It is therefore the sense of the Senate that tax reform should be adopted as soon as possible, and that it should incorporate the following principles and objectives:

(1) efficiency and responsiveness to market conditions in the economic activities of American businesses and consumers;

(2) simplicity of structure and lower marginal tax rates;

(3) a fair and equitable distribution of the tax burden among all taxpayers, with relief for those below the poverty level, and incentives to bring them into the work force;

(4) a broader tax base, with deductions essential to avoid genuine hardship or to protect the economic security of the American people; and

(5) increased incentives for work, saving, and investment.

SEC. 8. It is the sense of the Senate that because the Senate requires timely reporting of legislative action on spending bills, and because the Senate requires continual control over the budget, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall issue a weekly report during periods when the Senate is in session detailing and tabulating the progress of congressional action on bills and resolutions providing new budget authority and changing revenues and the public debt for a fiscal year, including, but not limited to the requirements set forth in Public Law 93-344, section 308(b).

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the Subcommittee on Energy Research and Development of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources has postponed its hearing previously scheduled for Friday, May 10, 1985 at 9:00 a.m., on the Department of Energy's conservation and renewable programs. This hearing has been rescheduled for Tuesday, May 14, 1985 at 2 p.m. in room SD-366.

For further information regarding this hearing, please contact Mr. Paul Gilman of the subcommittee staff at 202-224-4431.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

SOVIET INTENTIONS TO MILITARIZE SPACE

● Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I have grown tired of hearing the constant harping of Soviet and Warsaw Pact propaganda attacking the United States for allegedly planning to "militarize" space by developing President Reagan's strategic defense initiative. The Soviets each year launch over three times as many military space missions as the United States, and the Soviets have maintained an operational antisatellite capability since 1971. Dr. Igor Lukes, a noted Sovietologist, recently brought to my attention an interesting statement about Communist intentions to militarize space dating back to 1966. This statement, by a Czechoslovak Army colonel, Frantisek Herfurt, appeared in a secret Communist Czechoslovak military journal. I ask that this statement be printed in the RECORD.

ON PROBLEMS OF MILITARY PARTY POLITICS IN THE LIGHT OF THE 13TH CONGRESS OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK COMMUNIST PARTY

[Page 6] "Revolution in the military sphere is not a completed process. On the contrary, according to the anticipated development of the VTR [scientific-technological revolution] one can expect further substantial changes and accomplishments which will not necessarily be of merely evolutionary character, only complementing current processes. Decisive for further development in the military sphere will probably be for us to secure the necessary amount of energy [resources] and *sufficient means for a reliable anti-rocket and anti-space defense of the whole territory of the state and the coalition [Warsaw Pact] as well as the possibility of conducting warfare in space.* New discoveries during the next 10 to 15 years may bring about further decisive changes in the development of the military applicability of chemical and biological weapons. Also solved will probably have become the military applicability of quantum generators." [Emphasis added]●

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH WOMEN'S GYMNASTICS TEAM WINS TOURNAMENT

● Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would like to pay special tribute at this time to the University of Utah women's gymnastics team for winning the NCAA Women's Gymnastics Tournament on April 12 and 13, 1985. It was the team's fifth consecutive national championship, and the State of Utah is extremely proud of the team's remarkable athletes and it's outstanding coach.

This was the last year of NCAA competition for Seniors Elaine Alfano and Celeste Harrington, and they can be proud of closing out their college gymnastics careers with all-American performances in vaulting for Elaine and balance beam for Celeste. Lisa Mitzel, a junior, took all-American honors in the floor exercise event.

These talented young women proved that they are accomplished athletes, but equally as noteworthy, during winter quarter, when the team does most of its traveling for meets, the team's average GPA was a stellar 3.11.

I would also like to recognize Coach Greg Marsden who was honored by receiving the National Coach of the Year Award, also for the fifth consecutive time. Coach Marsden started the program at the University of Utah 10 years ago with a few gymnasts and a very small budget. He brought the team from 10th place to 1st place in 5 years and hasn't relinquished his hold since. He and his teams have created a college sports dynasty that we Utahns are very proud of. The gymnastics team at the University of Utah owes much of its success to Coach Marsden for his enthusiasm and his relentless efforts in promoting the program.

For such outstanding accomplishments by the women of the University of Utah gymnastics team as well as the tremendous coaching efforts by Coach Greg Marsden, I wish to extend our warmest and most heartfelt congratulations.●

TENNESSEE RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WEEK

● Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, April 21-27 was designated as "Retired Federal Employees Week" in our State. I join the salute to those who have made important contributions to our country by dedicating their careers to Federal Government service.

The services that Federal employees perform are invaluable. They are responsible for carrying our mail, issuing our Social Security checks, aiding our farmers, and guarding our environment. They deserve our respect and our support. This is especially true of those who have retired from a lifetime career dedicated to Government service.

Many Tennessee retirees have contacted me to express their opposition to Reagan administration proposals that drastically reduce the benefits of retired Federal employees. I share many of their concerns.

The Reagan administration has in the past several years advocated numerous proposals that have been detrimental to Federal retirees. However, I think it is better to take constructive action to restore the health of our economy—without asking the Federal retirees to shoulder a disproportionate share of that burden.

I have consistently opposed many of the programs proposed by this administration since 1980 to erode full Federal pay and benefits. I have been pleased to have this recognition of my support by numerous organizations representing 28 Federal and Postal organizations.

Retired Federal workers in Tennessee may be assured that my interest in their right to a fair benefit system will continue in the 99th Congress.

I ask that the proclamation that declared April 21-27, 1985, "Retired Federal Employees Week" be printed in the RECORD.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

(By the Governor)

Whereas the United States Civil Service Act of 1883 was signed into law by then President Chester A. Arthur, thereby creating the United States Civil Service System; and

Whereas the United States Civil Service Retirement System was created in 1920 and signed into law by then President Woodrow Wilson; and

Whereas virtually all state, county and municipal civil service systems have derived from the United States Civil Service Act; and

Whereas untold thousands of United States Civil Service employees have worked diligently, patriotically, silently and with little notice to uphold the highest traditions and ideals of our country; and

Whereas thousands of Federal employees are retired in Tennessee and continue to devote inestimable time and effort toward the betterment of our communities and State;

Now, therefore, I, Lamar Alexander, as Governor of the State of Tennessee, do hereby proclaim the week of April 21-27, 1985, as "Retired Federal Employees Week" in Tennessee, and do urge all our citizens to join me in this worthy observance.●

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDING FOR SMALL CITIES

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, recently I joined as a cosponsor of legislation (S. 980) to provide continued assistance to small cities now scheduled to lose their entitlement under the Community Development Block Grant [CDBG] Program. This legislation is in response to a Federal administrative procedure that was applied to redefine and determine metropolitan statistical areas. The application of this procedure had an effect contrary to congressional intent, as expressed in the housing and community development laws. As a result, several cities will no longer be eligible as entitlement communities under the Community Development Block Grant Program.

In order for a city to maintain designation as a central city of a metropolitan area it must be the largest city within the statistical area, or have at least 250,000 population, or 100,000 jobs. Other cities of at least 25,000 must meet the following criteria: First, the city must have 75 jobs for each 100 residents employed; second, the city must have at least 40 percent of resident workers employed within the city; and third, the city must be at least one-third the size of the MSA's largest city. Small cities under 25,000 must meet criteria Nos. 1 and 2. Two cities in New York, Newburgh and Middletown, will lose their entitlement due to criteria No. 3.

This situation merits the review and consideration of the Banking Committee. We must be certain that community development block grant funds are being directed to communities like Newburgh and Middletown which need this assistance and have used it well. A statistical estimate should not be the sole criteria for determining whether there should be continued assistance to these communities. These cities and others throughout the country have exemplified efficient use of CDBG funds. Their programs have been aimed at providing necessarry streets, sewers, and other community facilities to their residents. For example, Newburgh developed a comprehensive economic job creation effort with their CDBG funds. Newburgh combined community development block grant funds with urban development action grant funds to create 755 new jobs over the past 3 years. This is an outstanding example of economic development and job creation, the intent of CDBF funding.

Approximately 17 cities throughout the country are scheduled to lose their entitlement due to the 1980 census redefinition of metropolitan areas. These cities are worthy recipients of community development block grant funds. They have used these funds for public works improvement and housing rehabilitation activities. They have built parks, playgrounds, and neighborhood facilities. They should not lose this vital funding, but should have every opportunity to continue community revitalization.

Mr. President, we should not destroy the economic development that has been inititated in our communities. Instead we should give them an opportunity to continue to expand and develop. I ask my colleagues, to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation. The efforts made by these cities in improving their communities and the lives of our citizenry makes them worthy of continuation.●

STRIPED BASS VERSUS WESTWAY

● Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the imperiled future of the Morone Saxatilis could ultimately save the American taxpayer from being swindled out of billions in highway trust fund money which are proposed to be used to build the Westway Highway project in New York.

Morone Saxatilis is also known as the striped bass. In Maryland and some other States it is called rockfish. When mature, the striper may reach 14 inches and weigh over 50 pounds. They find home along the entire Atlantic seaboard, north from North Carolina to the St. Lawrence River in Canada. The striped bass is an extremely popular fish among commercial and recreation fishermen, its tasty flavor has made it the basis of a $200 million per year industry.

But the striped bass is facing a crisis of momentous proportions. As an anadromous fish, meaning that it must return to fresh water to spawn, the species is particularly fond of the Chesapeake Bay area and the Hudson River. But, for reasons which are not clear, the populations of the fish are reaching critical levels. The eastern seaboard havest has dropped from 15 million pounds in 1973 to less than 2 million pounds in 1983. The problem is particularly critical in the Chesapeake region where the harvest has dropped by 90 percent. Scientists suspect that acid rain may be a key factor—making waters acidic to the point where striped bass eggs will not hatch and where the young stripers cannot survive.

In any case, it now appears that striped bass in the Hudson River are having a much better time reproducing than in the Chesapeake region, this despite the fact that fishing from the river was recently restricted by the State of New York because of concern over possible contamination by PCB. But Westway—the multibillion-dollar real estate and highway project in New York—threatens to wipe out the Hudson's striper population. While 220 acres are being filled into the river to accommodate luxury housing developments, a prime nursery area of the striped bass will be destroyed. The stripers have found the existing piers along the west side of New York to be an excellent shelter where they spend their first two winters before migrating up and down the eastern seaboard.

The effect on the striped bass by the Westway landfill is deemed to be so critical that three Federal agencies—the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the National Marine Fisheries Service—have opposed the project because it would needlessly destroy an invaluable wildlife habitat.

As the Poughkeepsie, New York Journal noted in an editorial earlier this year, the future of the striped bass is just one of the many reasons to oppose the Westway project. I think it is an important one, and I urge colleagues—particularly those from States where commercial fishing is an important element of the economy—to join in the effort to stop this onslaught on the striped bass. I ask that the editorial, "Striped Bass versus Westway," be reprinted in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

STRIPED BASS VS. WESTWAY

Let's hear it for that popular Hudson Valley resident, the striped bass. This spunky, and tasty, inhabitant of the Hudson River could end up saving the taxpayers of

New York—and the rest of the country—billions of dollars on the ill-advised Westway project in Manhattan.

According to environmentalists, a significant portion of the striped bass population spends its winters in the area of the river which developers plan to dredge as part of the $4.2-billion project. On Monday Christopher Daggett, regional administrator for the federal Environmental Protection Agency, came to the bass's defense. He recommended that the Army Corps of Engineers deny a dredging permit for the highway because of its potential impact on the striped bass population.

There are plenty of other reasons for opposing Westway, of course. During the 1982 gubernatorial campaign, Republican Lew Lehrman charged that the entire project is little more than a boondoggle for a handful of real estate developers, bankers, and lawyers in New York City. Environmentalists have suggested that the money be spent on mass transit instead of another highway. And fiscal conservatives have pointed out that $4.2 billion—and that's just an estimate from the developers themselves—is a lot of money to spend on a park and four miles of highway.

Nobody knows how many striped bass would be killed if the Westway project were permitted to go forward, but the EPA's own estimates range from 26 to 33 percent. That could have a significant effect on the Hudson River fishing industry.

Christopher Daggett and the EPA should be commended for intervening in the Westway case—and for coming to the defense of the Hudson Valley's most prized asset. We urge the Corps of Engineers to heed the EPA's advice and deny the dredging permit for Westway.●

COSPONSORSHIP OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 123, A JOINT RESOLUTION TO DESIGNATE DR. JONAS SALK DAY

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, Alexis de Tocqueville noted, some 140 years ago, that "America is a land of wonders, in which everything is in constant motion and every change seems an improvement. No natural boundary seems to be set to the efforts of man, and in his eyes, what is not yet done is only what he has not yet attempted to do."

Recently, I joined 15 of my colleagues in introducing legislation designating May 6, 1985, as a day to salute the efforts of one American who exemplifies this spirit: Dr. Jonas Salk. This resolution, which would designate May 6 as "Dr. Jonas Salk Day," will honor him in conjunction with ceremonies to be held by his alma mater, the City University of New York, in commemoration of the 30th anniversary of the introduction of his polio vaccine.

As the former mayor of San Diego, I can speak on behalf of a community which has been personally touched by this giant of medical research. The Salk Institute in La Jolla is a symbol of hope for others who seek to cross the natural boundaries which de Tocqueville referenced. We have had the opportunity to know personally this man whom the world knows as a great reseacher and humanitarian.

Dr. Salk has touched the lives of billions of people around the world in a way which few people can ever hope to match. For individuals who have not known the suffering and fear which diseases such as poliomyelitis have caused, the contribution of Dr. Salk may not be fully remembered or comprehended. In declaring a day in his honor, we are in a small way focusing national attention again on his contribution. In doing so, we wish to bring to mind not the suffering which diseases bring, but the exciting potential which human creativity has in overcoming such blights on the human condition.

In recognition of the great contributions which Dr. Salk has made through his research, as well as for the inspiration he provides in turning our sights to that which we have not yet attempted to do, I offer my name in support of this resolution and call for passage of this joint resolution.●

SOVIET JEWRY

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am honored to join my distinguished colleagues in a "Call to Conscience Vigil" on behalf of Soviet Jewry. In particular, I commend my colleague from Minnesota, Senator BOSCHWITZ, for taking initiative in this area during the 99th Congress.

Conditions for Soviet Jews have worsened alarmingly over the last year. Recently, the persecution of Jews has become more systematic and ominously more efficient. Anti-Semitism is not a new phenomenon in Russian history but, in this latest phase of oppression, the very survival of Judaism in the Soviet Union is threatened. The formal distinction once made by the Soviet Government between "anti-Semitism" and "anti-Zionism" is now openly disregarded. The regular malignment of Jews is no longer restricted to those who seek permission to emigrate, but includes any individual attempting to practice Judaism.

The rise in officially sanctioned anti-Semitism has been accompanied by a sharp decline in emigration. Between 1968 and 1981, approximately 260,000 individuals—nearly 10 percent of the Soviet Union's Jewish population—were allowed to emigrate, with a peak of 51,320 in 1979. Only 896 managed to get out last year. More than 380,000 Jews remain waiting for visas to leave the Soviet Union. They wait in a country that does not want them, but will not let them leave.

Let me relate the case of one courageous Soviet family, the Mark Terlitskys. Mark had a successful career as an architect with a leading government design firm in Moscow. He worked on a number of large projects, including historic restoration of ancient buildings in the Kremlin. In 1974, because Mark was going to apply for permission to emigrate to Israel, he transferred to another job where he worked on small residential and commercial projects and where he believed he would be viewed as less of a security risk. The entire Terlitsky family applied to emigrate in 1976. Mark was demoted to a draftsman and, shortly thereafter, lost his job. Mark's wife, Svetlana, an economics analyst, also lost her job.

Although Mark's brother and Svetlana's sister were given exit visas, Mark, Svetlana, their daughter and Mark's elderly mother were refused exit visas on the basis of Mark's alleged "possession of secret information." The family has reapplied for visas many times over the last 8 years without success. Neither Mark nor Svetlana have been able to find permanent jobs since they applied to emigrate. On several occasions they have been detained, harassed, and beaten by the KGB.

Jews who initiate application for emigration customarily face termination of employment and are ostracized. Their situation is desperate. The Soviet Government has undertaken a systematic campaign to disrupt all Jewish religious and cultural activities. Official anti-Semitism has spread to include regular malignment of Jews by newspapers and television. Jewish activists in particular face increasingly violent harassment.

Perhaps the best known case of persecution involves human rights activist Anatoly Shcharansky who was arrested by the KGB in 1977 and charged with anti-Soviet activity. He provides just one example of the courage of Soviet Jews. At the close of his trial, facing 13 arduous years in prison, Anatoly Shcharansky remained undaunted in his 5-year struggle to obtain a visa to Israel where his wife, Avital, waited. "It might appear that I have regrets about what has happened," he stated, "but this is not so. I am happy. I am happy that I have lived honestly, in peace with my conscience, and have never betrayed my soul, even when I was threatened with death. I am happy that I have helped people."

Like Anatoly Shcharansky, we must understand our responsibilities to those in the Soviet Union and around the world who face religious persecution. The question before us today is of neither small nor private concern. Four decades ago, the United States witnessed the horrifying annihilation of 6 million Jews and saw the contagiousness of cruelty. Tragically, the persecution of Soviet Jews continues today. We cannot remain indifferent.

We must utilize all means available to affect a real change in policy. The recent ascension of Mikhail Gorbachev to the position of General Secretary of the Communist Party must be

viewed as an opportunity to open new dialog regarding the status of Jews. Ongoing arms talks provide an opportunity to impress upon the Soviet Government the importance to Americans of Soviet actions in this single area.

In the absence of human commitment, the persecution of Soviet Jews will continue. We in Congress bear the responsibility of leading this Nation in the struggle for freedom for Soviet Jews.●

REPRESENTATIVE BILL FRENZEL

● Mr. BOSCHWITZ. Mr. President, many of my distinguished colleagues are familiar with the diligent work of Representative BILL FRENZEL of Minnesota.

Since 1970, BILL FRENZEL has labored with great dedication in the House of Representatives. He possesses a sharp eye for detail and a great seriousness of purpose. When BILL FRENZEL faces an issue, he explores every aspect of it. He digs into its details until he masters it.

He says he was "born perhaps over-conscientious." We are all fortunate that this over-conscientious man is serving his country.

I request that this article from the February 26, 1985, Minneapolis Tribune be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

BILL FRENZEL HAS EARNED WORKHORSE REPUTATION BY DEVOTION TO HIS JOB

(By Finlay Lewis)

WASHINGTON, DC.—Were the late Sam Rayburn to return to the House of Representatives he probably would tell Bill Frenzel to bed down with the nags.

It was Rayburn, the legendary speaker of an earlier era, who divided members of Congress into two categories: show horses and workhorses. In an institution increasingly dominated by staff and devoted to politics by press release, Frenzel appears to have earned his reputation—the old fashioned way.

For Frenzel, legislating is an often tortuous game of inches. It is also an enterprise he takes so seriously that, when asked about his continued service on one of the House's most minor committees, the Third District Republican said "What's happened is that House Administration has become sort of my hobby. It's fun."

Probably no other congressman has ever spoken quite so warmly about the House Administration Committee, which is widely viewed by members as one of the rock piles of public life.

But then quite possibly no other member has been as successful as Frenzel at using that committee as a springboard for drafting and passing major legislation—in particular, a set of bills enacted a decade ago that fundamentally altered the way presidents, senators and congressmen seek their offices.

That attitude may also help to explain Frenzel's willingness last year to spend nearly three months in almost daily negotiations with a partisan opponent to work out a compromise on a politically drab but enormously complicated trade issue affecting sensitive U.S. relations with the Third World.

Frenzel's counterpart was Rep. Donald Pease, an Ohio Democrat with a blue-collar constituency and a strong pro-labor voting record that is the opposite of Frenzel's. After the two congressmen resolved their deep differences sufficiently so that both could claim half a loaf, Pease paid a rare tribute on the House floor to his ideological adversary.

Not only was Frenzel instrumental in passing the huge trade bill, Pease said, but he also "is a genuine resource, a national treasure, if you will, in the area of trade policy."

Frenzel, 56, has been in the House since 1971 as the representative of a constituency that once was a Republican gold coast but that has now been intermixed through redistricting with more traditional Democratic neighborhoods.

In addition to the growing Democratic influence in his district, the Dartmouth College graduate also is coming under increasing fire from religious conservatives and new right Republicans who chafe at Frenzel's pro-choice, pro-equal rights amendment and anti-school prayer views. Yet, he was endorsed for reelection by acclamation at last spring's Third District convention and won the general election.

Frenzel's political successes last year were no accident.

Sharon Mueller of St. Louis Park, a leader in the district's anti-abortion movement, recalled being disarmed by Frenzel during a meeting in his district office last spring.

Mueller, who calls herself a pro-family Republican, recalled that Frenzel was unyielding in his support of the proposition that the question of abortion should be decided by the people involved and not by the state.

On that point, the meeting ended in an impasse.

But, to her surprise, she says he was open-minded on the matter of future discussions.

"He has an open-door. He hasn't tuned us out. Communications have not broken down, and he's not belligerent. He's strong on his points but he's not unpleasant or hostile," says Mueller.

While not all of her allies agree with her, Mueller said she can overlook their differences on abortion because of Frenzel's conservative stands on economic issues and what she regards as his demonstrated competency in office.

Frenzel's views on abortion are all the more puzzling to Mueller and others, since he was raised as a Roman Catholic, Indeed, Frenzel said he was pro-life until his service in the Minnesota Legislature two decades ago introduced him to the social and economic complexities that confront people forced to deal with unwanted pregnancies.

Frenzel is no longer a member of an organized denomination "because I am seldom in the same town on Sunday," But he describes himself as a Christian and says he is a regular member of the House prayer group.

Frenzel's work habits are legendary—12-hour days beginning at 7 a.m. on Capitol Hill are the norm. One casualty is his personal life.

"Is there a life other than this? Frenzel mused during an interview last week. "No, I have none—other than my family and a game of tennis, which is a family game. . . . My life is mostly the Congress. . . . What I say is that I'm not as quick as most people so I have to put in more time to do a good job. . . . I was born perhaps over-conscientious."

Aside from tennis, one amusement is gardening ("I love to mess in the roses") and another is reading science fiction on airplanes. Otherwise, his spare reading time is spent on what he describes as "economic treatises."

Pressed to describe what he would read had he more time, Frenzel replied, "I'd like to get deeper into economics and particularly international economics." He also considers himself an American colonial history buff.

As a result of his now seemingly unassailable political base, Frenzel has been elected and reelected enough times to qualify as dean of the Minnesota congressional delegation, thus assuming titular leadership of a group that once included such Democratic luminaries as Hubert Humphrey, Walter Mondale, Eugene McCarthy, Don Fraser and John Blatnik.

The passage of time has also helped to boost Frenzel's standing in the House at large. A turning point in his career occurred in 1975 when he assumed a seat on the House Ways and Means Committee, whose jurisdiction over tax and trade legislation makes it perhaps the most prestigious committee in Congress. Frenzel quickly came under the tutelage of Rep. Barber Conable, a New York Republican with a reputation as an expert in tax legislation and a conciliator able to make deals with Democrats.

Conable's retirement last year created the bipartisan expectation that Frenzel will now assume his mentor's role.

Rep. James Jones, an Oklahoma Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee, credited Frenzel, along with Conable and the late William Steiger, a Wisconsin Republican, with helping Jones pass major legislation six years ago that cut the capital gains tax rate and reduced personal income taxes to compensate for the tax-boosting pressures of inflation.

Jones, a moderate viewed by many as a future candidate for a major leadership role in the House, said in an interview: "I'm terribly impressed with Frenzel's ability. I think he is potentially the best partisan Republican that the Republicans have in the House. He's very good at partisan debate, yet he's essentially a builder of birpartisan coalitions.

Not everyone shares Jones'—or Pease's—enthusiasm, however.

Frenzel entered Congress after four terms in the Minnesota House as a member of Common Cause, a nationwide self-styled citizens' lobby to promote greater openness in government. In his early years, Frenzel worked closely with Common Cause. He was instrumental in passing laws requiring disclosure of contributions over of more than $100 to candidates for the House, Senate and the presidency and, later, creating the Federal Elections Commission (FEC) to oversee and police the way campaigns for those offices are conducted.

However, around 1976, Frenzel and Common Cause split over the issue of public financing of campaigns. Common Cause favored, and Frenzel opposed, the appropriation of taxpayer money for congressional and presidential races as a means of stemming the influence of private contributors.

The disagreement soon spread to political action committees (PACs)—entities legalized in the mid-1970s to funnel money from corporations, labor unions, trade associations and other interest groups to federal candidates. Common Cause favored greater, and Frenzel lesser, controls and restrictions on the amounts PACs could raise and spend.

David Cohen, former president of Common Cause and a Frenzel adversary in those and subsequent election law stuggles, recalled in an interview last week that "As time went on, it became harder to separate Frenzel's viewpoint from the viewpoint of organizational PACs, particularly those that were business-dominated I think he's counsel for the status quo."

Jay Angoff, staff attorney for Congress Watch, group founded by Ralph Nader, goes further.

I regard him as absolutely terrible—one of the most overrated members of Congress. . . . Rabidly anti-consumer. I just can't say anything good about him." Angoff said.

That Frenzel is pro-business in his outlook should surprise no one.

After receiving bachelor's and master of business administration degrees from Dartmouth and serving in the Korean War as a naval officer, Frenzel went to work for his father, who was vice president of the St. Paul Terminal Warehouse Co. A St. Paul native and a graduate of St. Paul Academy, Frenzel wound up in 1961 as president of the Minneapolis Terminal Warehouse Co., a wholly owned subsidiary of the St. Paul firm.

Married and with three daughters, Frenzel settled in Golden Valley, and became active in his Republican caucus and as a GOP fund riser. In 1962, Douglas Head, who later became Minnesota attorney general and an unsuccessful GOP gubernatorial candidate, recruited Frenzel to run for a newly created seat in the Minnesota House.

Successful in that race, Frenzel served a state legislative apprenticeship, making his mark on contentious metropolitan government issues. When Clark MacGregor announced an ill-fated Senate candidacy in 1970, Frenzel moved quickly to line up support for the Third District GOP's endorsement for McGregor's congressional seat, and he went on to narrowly defeat the DFL candidate, George Rice.

In 1974, as part of a "reform" move, the ruling Democrats in the House expanded the size of the Ways and Means Committee, and Frenzel, by dint of unceasing lobbying over a three-year period, captured the last available Republican seat.

Frenzel had also become chairman of the House Republican Research Committee, but, in 1978, when he ran for the chairmanship of the Republican Policy Committee—a post that would have made him a member of the party's leadership—he was beaten by a Pennsylvanian, U.S. Rep. Bud Shuster.

"I think Bud worked very hard," Frenzel said. "He probably outcampaigned me. I took the incorrect position that the caucus knew me and would just cast palm leaves at my feet."

That was an important year in another respect. Frenzel passed up not one but two chances to run for the U.S. Senate, paving the way for Republicans Rudy Boschwitz and Dave Durenberger to capture Minnesota's two seats from the DFL.

Frenzel has little good to say of the Senate. One-fourth the size of the House, the Senate forces its members to spread themselves too thin, he says. Specialization, Frenzel's forte, is not possible. Also, he adds that the clubby logrolling and legislative back-scratching in the Senate remind him of a city council.

Another problem, he says now, is the statewide scale of the job and a fear that he wouldn't get to know his constituents in the same way that he can know the editors, main street bankers and labor leaders of the Third District.

"Maybe it all means I was a coward, but I don't think so. I believe that I liked the work I was doing and was uncertain of the other job," Frenzel said. "In the final analysis, it probably was that my family and I . . . didn't have the fire burning in our guts to do the other."●

IKEY L. BALDWIN RETIRES

● Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, today, I wish to join with Senator PRYOR in paying tribute to Mr. Ikey L. Baldwin who will soon be retiring after 35 years of service to the people of Arkansas through his work with the Farmers Home Administration. Arkansas, and especially Arkansas farmers, have benefited greatly from his dedicated years of service, and although we are saddened by his retirement, we are honored to have this opportunity to recognize Ikey for his work.

Ikey is a decorated Army veteran of World War II. He enlisted 1 month after the attack on Pearl Harbor and was discharged 5 years later as a first lieutenant, after having served at Dutch Harbor, AK, and at Honolulu, Saipan, and Iwo Jima. Ikey continued to serve his country in the Officers' Reserve until December 1958.

Before the war, Ikey completed 2 years in general agriculture at what is now Arkansas Tech University and he completed his studies after the war at Mississippi State University, receiving a degree in agriculture in August 1947. Over the years Ikey has pursued graduate studies in several disciplines at Mississippi State, the University of Arkansas, and at Henderson State University.

After a 2-year stint as superintendent of the Jessieville, AR, High School and another 2 years as an agriculture instructor for World War II veterans at Fountain Lake, AR, High School, Ikey began his long service with the FmHA in 1951 as an assistant county supervisor. From 1951 to 1954 he worked in this capacity in Howard, Hempstead and Yell Counties, and from 1955 to 1961 he served as county supervisor in Lafayette County. He was promoted to the State office in 1962. In addition to his regular duties as a farmer program specialist, Ikey has served as the State appraisal trainer since 1969, a position that has gained him widespread recognition as an expert in farm tract appraisal techniques.

However, his crowning achievements are the hundreds of Arkansas farmers who are successfully in business because of his guidance and assistance. Add to this the countless numbers of FmHA employees whom he has tutored over the years, from State directors to county office assistants, and we can understand the tremendous impact he has had on our State. And, of course, you can also add the forthright assistance he has rendered to Senator PRYOR and myself, and others in the congressional delegation, as examples of his value to the farmers of Arkansas.

It is never easy to allow those with so many years of experience to retire, because they take a storehouse of knowledge with them. This is especially true in Ikey's case. We can only be grateful that those who have worked with Ikey have learned from him, and that his standards of excellence will continue. As a tribute to his spirit, Ikey has generated the rumor that he is leaving the FmHA to begin a cypress tree farm in the hill section of Garland County, AR, and that we are all invited to the first harvest 1 million or so years from now. Seriously, we will all miss Ikey, and we wish him the best.●

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMM). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 149—TO CONDEMN THE ACTIONS OF THE SANDINISTA REGIME IN NICARAGUA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader, Senator BYRD, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 149) to condemn the actions of the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua.

S. RES. 149

Whereas the Sandinista regime has suppressed the democratic opposition, the press and the Church in Nicaragua; and

Whereas they have engaged in a massive military build-up in Nicaragua, far out of proportion to their legitimate self-defense needs, thereby nearly bankrupting the country; and

Whereas Sandinista President Ortega has just travelled to Moscow, seeking a multimillion dollar bail-out of the Sandinista regime: Be it therefore *Resolved* That the Senate of the United States:

Condemns the actions of the Sandinistas described above; and

Condemns the action of Nicaraguan President Ortega in travelling to Moscow as clear evidence of a continuing Sandinista effort to strengthen ties with the Soviet Union, in support of Sandinista policies of militarization, repression and interference in the affairs of its neighbors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its immediate consideration.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader. I ask unanimous consent that Senator BOREN be added as a cosponsor of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in paragraph 2, where it reads "Whereas they have engaged" that we amend it by striking the word "they" and adding the words "the Sandinistas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, last week the rebels in Nicaragua were asking the United States for aid in their fight against the Sandinistas. Congress said no. This week the head of the regime they are fighting is also asking for aid—in Moscow. No doubt he will get a very different answer.

Daniel Ortega, president of the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua, could not have more graphically demonstrated his dependence on Soviet support and the importance of the struggle in which he is engaged.

Mr. President, we must recognize that our adversaries are very interested in scoring a strategic and political coup by establishing another client state in the Western Hemisphere. They do so with massive amounts of both military and economic aid, and now Mr. Ortega is back asking for more.

One of our colleagues was quoted in the New York Times as saying that Mr. Ortega's trip at this time indicates that he "is either naive, incompetent, or not as committed to negotiations as recent statements would indicate."

Let me suggest that the answer is (c). The Sandinistas not only are not committed to negotiations, they are openly dedicated to the opposite—to the expansion of Marxism through revolutionary means throughout Central America.

Our national interest clearly lies in the prevention of this disease among our friends and allies who have the misfortune to be located close to this source of infection. To do otherwise is to ignore our responsibilities as a great power and as the leader of the free world.

The events of the past week provide a clear contrast between Congress' policy toward Central America and the Soviet Union's. As Congress decides it wants out of Nicaragua, the Soviet Union demonstrates it wants in.

Last week Congress denied both military and humanitarian aid to the Contra forces in Nicaragua. This week we will see the Soviet's response to that action—a warm welcome and an open wallet for Comandante Ortega.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator DANFORTH, Senator GRAMM, Senator THURMOND, Senator HELMS, Senator HAWKINS, Senator SIMPSON, and Senator NICKLES be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 149), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 149

Whereas the Sandinista regime has suppressed the democratic oppositon, the press and the Church in Nicaragua; and

Whereas the Sandinistas have engaged in a massive military build-up in Nicaragua, far out of proportion to their legitimate self-defense needs, thereby nearly bankrupting the country; and

Whereas Sandinista President Ortega has just travelled to Moscow, seeking a multimillion dollar bail-out of the Sandinista regime; be it therefore, *Resolved*, That the Senate of the United States:

Condemns the actions of the Sandinistas described above; and

Condemns the action of Nicaraguan President Ortega in travelling to Moscow as clear evidence of a continuing Sandinista effort to strengthen ties with the Soviet Union, in support of Sandinista policies of militarization, repression and interference in the affairs of its neighbors.

The cosponsors of the resolution are: Mr. DOLE, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BOREN, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. THURMOND, Mrs. HAWKINS, Mr. HELMS, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. NICKLES.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader for his assistance and thank the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. PELL].

I indicate to my colleagues that we cleared the text of the resolution with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. LUGAR] and his staff, and did the same with the chairman of the Intelligence Committee. I believe the resolution is important. It indicates that the Senate is on record, as we properly should be, concerning the actions of the Sandinista regime.

I thank all my colleagues for permitting us to dispose of this this evening.

AUTHORIZATION OF TESTIMONY BY SENATE EMPLOYEE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have one additional resolution I failed to send up earlier. I send the resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A RESOLUTION (S. RES. 150)

To authorize testimony in the case of *State of Delaware* v. *Roger Smith*, Crim. No. 85-03-0232.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, this resolution would authorize testimony by Barbara Evans, an employee in Senator ROTH'S Dover, DE, office, in the case of State of Delaware versus Roger Smith, Crim. No. 85-03-0232, which is pending in the Court of Common Pleas for Kent County, Dover, DE. The defendant has subpoenaed Ms. Evans to testify at the trial, which is set for April 30, 1985. This case arises out of an eviction proceeding involving the defendant who had earlier sought assistance for Senator ROTH'S office concerning his housing. This resolution would authorize Ms. Evans to testify in this case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 150) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 150

Whereas, in the case of *State of Delaware* v. *Roger Smith*, Crim. No. 85-03-0232, set for trial on April 30, 1985, in the Court of Common Pleas for Kent County, Dover, Delaware, a subpoena has been issued for the testimony of Barbara Evans, an employee in Senator Roth's Dover, Delaware office;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by the judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that production of documents and the testimony of an employee of the Senate is needful for use in any court for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such action thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Barbara Evans is authorized to appear and to testify in the case of *State of Delaware* v. *Roger Smith*, Crim. No. 85-03-0232.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 1985

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until 9 a.m. on Tuesday, April 30, 1985.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN SENATORS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, there be special orders in favor of the following Senators for not to exceed 15 minutes each: Senators SYMMS, COCHRAN, PROXMIRE, and BAUCUS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, following the special orders just identified, if time permits, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business which will extend until the hour of 10 a.m. with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I would indicate to my colleagues that, following routine morning business, the Senate will resume the budget resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 32.

ORDER FOR RECESS FROM 12 NOON UNTIL 2 P.M.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess between the hours of 12 noon and 2 p.m. on Tuesday, April 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, when the Senate reconvenes at 2 p.m., it will resume consideration of the budget resolution and I would hope that we could have rollcall votes throughout Tuesday's session. We have been involved in a procedural matter getting to the first vote—whether or not that vote will come tomorrow—it is my hope it will come tomorrow; we will hopefully be on the final amendment sometime tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BYRD. Will the distinguished majority leader withhold?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, could we have an understanding that the 2 hours for the recess of the Senate tomorrow not come out of any time from either side?

Mr. DOLE. Yes; I ask unanimous consent that the recess period from 12 noon to 2 p.m. not be charged to either side on Senate Concurrent Resolution 32.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 9 A.M.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there being no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 9 a.m. on Tuesday, April 30.

The motion was agreed to and, at 6:26 p.m., the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 30, 1985, at 9 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 29, 1985:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Harry George Barnes, Jr., of Maryland, a career member of the senior Foreign Service, class of career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chile.

William Andreas Brown, of New Hampshire, a career member of the senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand.

David George Newton, of Virginia, a career member of the senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Iraq.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Ernest C. Cheatham, Jr., [redacted], U.S. Marine Corps.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Thomas R. Morgan, [redacted], U.S. Marine Corps.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Joseph J. Went, [redacted], U.S. Marine Corps.

The following-named brigadier general of the Marine Corps Reserve for promotion to the permanent grade of major general, under provisions of Title 10, United States Code, sections 5902 and 5912:

Constantine Sangalis.

The following-named colonel of the Marine Corps Reserve for promotion to the permanent grade of brigadier general, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 5902 and 5912:

George R. Omrod.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following Air National Guard of the United States officers for promotion in the Reserve of the Air Force under the provisions of section 593(a) title 10 of the United States Code, as amended:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. James H. Applegate, Jr., [redacted]
Maj. Robert D. Brink, [redacted]
Maj. Bobby L. Brittain, [redacted]
Maj. Dennis C. Clauson, [redacted]
Maj. William D. Clinton, [redacted]
Maj. Luther B. Copeland, [redacted]
Maj. James S. Craig, [redacted]
Maj. Ronald Eckhart, [redacted]
Maj. Harry W. Feucht, Jr., [redacted]
Maj. Richard M. Gooding, [redacted]
Maj. Richard P. Haines, [redacted]
Maj. Alan R. Heers, [redacted]
Maj. Leslie C. Jensen, [redacted]
Maj. Robert S. Kusterer, [redacted]
Maj. James F. Lacalle, [redacted]
Maj. Joseph F. Ladrigan, Jr., [redacted]
Maj. George T. Landers, [redacted]
Maj. Lawrence W. Markham, [redacted]
Maj. William V. Miller, [redacted]
Maj. Raymond P. Monacelli, [redacted]
Maj. David K. Pitman, [redacted]
Maj. Donald S. Powell, [redacted]
Maj. Eldred J. Rosenthal, [redacted]
Maj. Danny A. Stedman, [redacted]
Maj. Kenneth N. Szczepanski, [redacted]
Maj. Merle S. Thomas, [redacted]
Maj. Emmett R. Titshaw, Jr., [redacted]

MEDICAL CORPS

Maj. Irvin S. Benowitz, [redacted]
Maj. David L. Hudson, [redacted]

DENTAL CORPS

Maj. Michael R. Conners, [redacted]

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion to the grade indicated in the Reserve of the Air Force, under the provisions of section 307, title 32, United States Code, and sections 8363 and 593, title 10, United States Code:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be colonel

Barnhart, John H., [redacted]
Barrow, Robert W., [redacted]
Bowling, Charles J., [redacted]
Carroll, Paul L., Jr., [redacted]
Cohen, Paul G., [redacted]
Connor, Hubert J., [redacted]
Cramer, Francis D., [redacted]
Cunningham, Joseph D., [redacted]
Durgin, Nelson E., [redacted]
English, Loren J., [redacted]
Eremita, Nicholas, [redacted]
Farris, Banks H., [redacted]
Hall, Michael S., [redacted]
Henderson, Allen J., [redacted]
Hooks, William J., Jr., [redacted]
Horton, Roy E., [redacted]
Illies, Keith F., [redacted]
Ison, Maurice G., [redacted]
Katke, Gene A., [redacted]
Lachinski, George R., [redacted]
Lawrence, Robert A., [redacted]
Linebaugh, Billy S., [redacted]
Lotz, John M., [redacted]
McDaniel, Billy, [redacted]
McDonald, Charles H., [redacted]
McIntyre, Lester L., [redacted]
Mikkelsen, Scott A., [redacted]
Molini, John A., [redacted]
Moriguchi, Raymond J., [redacted]
Nichols, William L., Jr., [redacted]

Rees, David Y., [redacted]
Reid, John R., [redacted]
Roberson, John W., Jr., [redacted]
Schwartz, John C., [redacted]
Seely, Ronald L., [redacted]
Shepperd, Donald W., [redacted]
Shima, Ernest T., [redacted]
Simmons, Howell B., [redacted]
Smith, Byron L., [redacted]
Thomssen, Darrel D., [redacted]
Valdrighi, Nicholas P., [redacted]
Vankeuren, Edward T., [redacted]
Wallace, John M., [redacted]
Weber, Raymond D., [redacted]
Wylie, Frederick R., [redacted]
Zuick, Ernest R., Jr., [redacted]

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Gilbertson, Gary R., [redacted]

JUDGE ADVOCATE

Brody, Stuart A., [redacted]
Lipscomb, Albert D., [redacted]

MEDICAL CORPS

Brackett, Jerry W., [redacted]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, April 29, 1985*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. WRIGHT].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, *April 25, 1985.*

I hereby designate the Honorable JIM WRIGHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on Monday, April 29, 1985.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Enable us, O loving God, to see the glory of Your creation—the friendships that bring us together and the bonds that unite us, the gifts of liberty and freedom, the opportunities for justice and peace. With all the tasks about us, may we not lose sight of the vision that You have given—a vision where people help each other in respect and kindness and where no nation seeks war any more. In Your holy name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas, 158, nays 130, answered "present" 3, not voting 142, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—158

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
AuCoin
Barnard
Bates
Bedell
Bennett
Berman
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Byron
Chappell
Clay
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Cooper
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
de la Garza
DeLay
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
English
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frost
Gaydos
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gray (IL)
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hatcher
Hertel
Holt
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kildee
Kleczka
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Long
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McHugh
Mica
Mineta
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murtha
Natcher
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Olin
Panetta
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Rahall
Ray
Reid
Richardson
Robinson
Rose
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Sabo
Schumer
Sharp
Sisisky
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Solarz
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stratton
Swift
Synar
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Vento
Visclosky
Watkins
Wheat
Whitley
Williams
Wirth
Wolpe
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)

NAYS—130

Armey
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boulter
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Chappie
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Conte
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Daub
Davis
DeWine
Dickinson
DioGuardi
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gilman
Gradison
Green
Gunderson
Hammerschmidt
Hawkins
Hendon
Henry
Hiler
Hillis
Hopkins
Ireland
Kasich
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Lungren
Mack
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCain
McCandless
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McKernan
McMillan
Meyers
Molinari
Monson
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Myers
Nielson
O'Brien
Parris
Pashayan
Penny
Porter
Pursell
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rudd
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Slaughter
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solomon
Stangeland
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Tauke
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst
Whitten
Wolf
Wortley
Young (AK)
Zschau

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Gejdenson
Mitchell
Smith (FL)

NOT VOTING—142

Addabbo
Archer
Aspin
Atkins
Badham
Barnes
Beilenson
Bentley
Bevill
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Bustamante
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Coelho
Conyers
Coyne
Crane
Crockett
Dannemeyer
Dellums
Derrick
Donnelly
Durbin
Dymally
Eckert (NY)
Erdreich
Fields
Fish
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Franklin
Fuqua
Garcia
Gephardt
Gingrich
Goodling
Gordon
Gray (PA)
Gregg
Grotberg
Hansen
Hartnett
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hubbard
Hunter
Hyde
Jacobs
Jeffords
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Kemp
Kennelly
Kolter
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Leland
Lent
Lipinski
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
Lujan
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Martin (NY)
McCollum
McKinney
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Moakley
Moody
Murphy
Neal
Nelson
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Petri
Quillen
Rangel
Rinaldo
Ritter
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rostenkowski
Russo
Savage
Scheuer
Schneider
Seiberling
Shelby
Siljander
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Spence
St Germain
Stokes
Studds
Sweeney
Swindall
Tallon
Taylor
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walgren
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Whittaker
Wilson
Wise
Wylie
Young (FL)

□ 1220

Mr. WALKER and Mr. DREIER of California changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DELAY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO SUBMIT A PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution at the desk.

Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution that I sent to the desk.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. No; the gentlewoman cannot with a privileged resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. Did the gentlewoman ask for a privileged revolution or resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. One may lead to the other.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order.

The Chair had recognized the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], who has sent a privileged report to the desk.

Has the gentleman from California quite finished with his request?

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my motion has the highest privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will be recognized in due course, if the gentlewoman will——

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. But I believe my motion has precedence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman was not——

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe that my motion has precedence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will be recognized.

The gentlewoman will state her privileged motion.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. I thank the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman does state a privileged motion, and the question is on the gentlewoman's motion.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 124, nays 168, not voting 141, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—124

Armey
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boulter
Broomfield
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Burton (IN)
Callahan
Chappie
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Conte
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Daub
Davis
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gilman
Green
Gunderson
Hendon
Henry
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Horton
Ireland
Kasich
Kemp
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lowery (CA)
Lungren
Mack
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
McCain
McCandless
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McKernan
McMillan
Meyers
Monson
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Myers
Nielson
O'Brien
Parris
Pashayan
Penny
Porter
Pursell
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rudd
Saxton
Schaefer
Schuette
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Solomon
Stangeland
Strang
Sundquist
Tauke
Thomas (CA)
Vander Jagt
Vucanovich
Walker
Weber
Whitehurst
Wolf
Wortley
Young (AK)
Zschau

NAYS—168

Ackerman
Akaka
Alexander
Andrews
Annunzio
Applegate
AuCoin
Barnard
Bates
Bedell
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Brown (CA)
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Byron
Chappell
Clay
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Cooper
Darden
Daschle
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
English
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frost
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gray (IL)
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hertel
Hopkins
Howard
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kastenmeier
Kildee
Kleczka
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Long
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCurdy
McHugh
Mica
Mineta
Mitchell
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Nichols
Nowak
Oakar
Obey
Olin
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Perkins
Pickle
Price
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Reid
Richardson
Robinson
Rose
Roth
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Sabo
Schroeder
Schumer
Sharp
Sikorski
Sisisky
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Snyder
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stratton
Stump
Swift
Synar
Tauzin
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Vento
Visclosky
Walgren
Watkins
Wheat
Whitley
Whitten
Williams
Wirth
Wolpe
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (MO)

NOT VOTING—141

Addabbo
Anderson
Anthony
Archer
Aspin
Atkins
Badham
Barnes
Beilenson
Bentley
Bevill
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Bustamante
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Coelho
Conyers
Coyne
Crane
Crockett
Daniel
Dannemeyer
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Donnelly
Durbin
Dymally
Eckert (NY)
Erdreich
Fields
Fish
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank
Franklin
Fuqua
Garcia
Gephardt
Gingrich
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (PA)
Gregg
Grotberg
Hansen
Hartnett
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Hubbard
Hunter
Hyde
Jacobs
Jeffords
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Kennelly
Kolter
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Leland
Lent
Lipinski
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
Lujan
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Martin (NY)
McCollum
McKinney
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Moakley
Moody
Neal
Nelson
Oberstar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pepper
Petri
Quillen
Rinaldo
Ritter
Rodino
Roe
Roemer
Rostenkowski
Russo
Savage
Scheuer
Schneider
Seiberling
Shelby
Siljander
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Solarz
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Stokes
Studds
Sweeney
Swindall
Tallon
Taylor
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Volkmer
Waxman
Weaver
Weiss
Whittaker
Wilson
Wise
Wylie
Young (FL)

□ 1240

Mr. BATES changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PORTER, DREIER of California, KOLBE, THOMAS of California, BOULTER, and McCAIN changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained so as to miss rollcall votes 76 and 77. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 76 and "yea" on rollcall No. 77.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained earlier today and missed two recorded votes, Nos. 76 and 77.

On rollcall No. 76 on the Journal, I would have voted "no."

If I had been here on rollcall No. 77, a motion to adjourn, I would have voted "no" also.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Mr. PANETTA, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 99-58) on the resolution (H. Res. 146) relating to election of a Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA), laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 26, 1985.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5, Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit sealed envelopes received from the White House as follows:

(1) At 11:15 a.m. on Friday, April 26, 1985 and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a report on United States participation in the United Nations; and

(2) At 11:15 a.m. on Friday, April 26, 1985 and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits reports and recommendations on proposed inclusions and exclusions from the Wild and Scenic River System and Wilderness System.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

REPORT ON RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROPOSED INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS FROM THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVER SYSTEM AND WILDERNESS SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-59)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of Friday, April 26, 1985, at page 9602.)

□ 1250

REPORT ON COSTS AND BENEFITS OF U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of Friday, April 26, 1985, page 9603.)

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1612

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the gentleman from California, Mr. GLENN ANDERSON be taken off the cosponsor list for the bill, H.R. 1612.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that Senate Joint Resolution 106 entitled "Joint resolution to approve the obligation of funds available under Public Law 98-473 for supporting military or paramilitary operations in Nicaragua," passed the Senate.

LET US EDUCATE OURSELVES ON THE ISSUE AND THEN VOTE TO DECLARE INDIANA'S EIGHTH DISTRICT SEAT VACANT

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

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, by agreement announced last Thursday, it is expected that there will be a motion tomorrow made to declare the seat in Indiana's Eighth Congressional District vacant. On Wednesday, there will be a preferential motion from the House Administration Committee to declare candidate McCloskey the winner.

This is an important issue on which I hope all Members will make themselves informed. The committee report will be published. It is an extensive report.

I would like to invite the Members' attention to the minority remarks, which I think are compelling and persuasive. I hope that Members of the majority group, especially, will find their way that far through the account.

This is going to be one of the most important votes that we have ever had in the House. It deals with the foundations of representative government. I hope that all Members will make themselves aware of all of the facts, rather than read press releases, for their information on this vital issue.

I hope Members will vote to declare the seat vacant on Tuesday, and I hope they will have the opportunity to do so.

LET US NOT RULE OUT ANY FOREIGN POLICY OPTIONS IN REGARDS TO NICARAGUA

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

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I voted against military aid to the Contras because I did not believe that it is historically——

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is reading from a paper in violation of rule XXX.

Mr. GLICKMAN. The gentleman was not reading from the paper, but I will proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against military aid because I do not think it is consistent for the United States to engage itself in direct action to undermine another government by trying to overthrow it militarily. I do not think that the Sandinista regime should take any refuge in my votes or any other Members of Congress votes, and in fact most of the votes of the Democratic Party. When we saw Mr. Ortega visit the Soviet Union and embrace Soviet leaders in order to get significant support in that country, I think that that visit is going to be viewed very unfavorably by a majority of House Democrats. I personally would not object to us considering the imposition of trade sanctions or even considering the possibility of recalling our Ambassador if, in fact, it appears that the Sandinista regime is insistent upon interfering in the activities of other countries.

My only point in all of this, Mr. Speaker, is to say that while we have an Ambassador in Nicaragua, and while we recognize that country and have dealings with them, it should not in any way rule out the kind of foreign policy options to let the Sandinistas know that we expect them to honor the integrity of other nations.

LISTEN TO WHAT IS GOING ON

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is nice to see the previous speaker starting to backtrack on behalf of the Democrat Party after

their horrendous vote last week against aiding the Contras in any way in Central America.

This weekend, we all saw on national television Daniel Ortega being embraced by a member of the Communist Politburo in Moscow, kissing him on both cheeks, and asking for $200 million in economic aid. Of course, he wants that economic aid because he feels we might impose an embargo of some type in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I can hear him also whispering to the leadership in Moscow: "Will you give me a little military aid, too? We have all kinds of allies in the Congress; we have defeated the Yankees in the Congress of the United States. Now we have a clear field ahead of us, all I need is a little more military aid and we can expand that revolution into El Salvador, into Honduras, into Guatemala and ultimately into Mexico."

Mr. Speaker, if we do not do something in this House, if we do not watch what is going on on television and listen to the Communists, our boys are going to be involved in a military conflict in Cental America that is totally unnecessary.

Listen to what is going on, Democrats; listen to what is going on.

THEY MIGHT GET THE MESSAGE

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, today's newspaper editions reveal sordid facts of what may be repeat performances of questionable and inexcusable submission of claims against the Pentagon by defense contractors. A team of auditors uncovered $109.7 million in what was described as "absolutely inexcusable" claims against the Pentagon.

How many more of these exercises must be endured before the wrongdoers get the message that this sort of fun and games with taxpayers' money will not be eternally tolerated?

We need additional information in the event the media accounts are inaccurate but if these reports do reflect accuracy my conclusion is, enough is enough. Let us do more than gently slap the hands of these greedy grabbers of taxpayer's money. Perhaps if they heard the slamming of a prison cell door, they might get the message.

ONE OF THE GREATEST SHOWS ON EARTH

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, you are ringmaster over one of the greatest shows on Earth, one that has brought a great deal of entertainment to the American public over the last several months.

The great sleight of hand that has occurred in this body in failing to recognize the proper Representative from the Eighth District of Indiana would have P.T. Barnum and the Ringling Brothers standing in awe at the kind of activities that the House has conducted.

Tuesday, we will have the opportunity to give the citizens of the Eighth District of Indiana a chance to select in a fair and honest election process, as they did once upon a time ago, a Representative.

I think the citizens of that district deserve an opportunity to be represented in this Congress. Mr. Ringmaster, I hope the Members of the Democratic Party recoginze that also.

□ 1300

ORTEGA PILGRIMAGE TO MOSCOW

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

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, no sooner did the U.S. Congress vote to deny aid to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua, than the Marxist leader of the country, Daniel Ortega, began preparing a victory pilgrimage to Moscow. While the ink was still drying on news reports of this dramatic display of ostrich-like behavior by the Congress in voting to deny $14 million in humanitarian aid to the Contras, Ortega was boldly announcing his plans to visit the Soviet Union and Eastern bloc countries in a quest for an additional $200 million in aid for his Communist regime.

I have lived and worked in Central America. During my recent visit to the region, the people repeatedly told me that aid to the Contras was vital to their free survival. Apparently, the Congress did not heed their strongly expressed desires.

These neighboring peoples to Nicaragua are convinced—as I am—that if we permit the Ortega government to consolidate its position, the export of communism to the rest of Central America will be inevitable.

No one won last week on the vote to deny aid to the Contras, including the majority who wished it.

In the wake of this defeat for freedom and democracy in our hemisphere, and to help prevent the establishment of a second Communist beachhead—or another Cuba—in the region, I strongly suggest this administration and the Congress reassess its ties and relations and favorable trade with Nicaragua, recall our Ambassador and discountinue trade with Nicaragua.

CREDIBILITY OF CONGRESS IS ON THE LINE

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

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have not looked forward to this week. I have not looked forward to returning to a Chamber filled with so much partisanship. I have not looked forward to watching as the majority party steamrolls the minority and tells a half million of my fellow Hoosiers that they have no right to decide who should represent them in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the impact a decision to seat Mr. McCloskey will have on the future of the 99th Congress and our efforts to pass badly needed deficit-reduction and tax reform legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I propose that the House convene a nonpartisan blue ribbon commission comprised of some of America's top educators and political scientists to study the handling of the eighth district race and supply this body with recommendations which will avoid such occurrences in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there are lessons to be learned and precedents which have been set which need to be reviewed in a nonpolitical atmosphere. Clearly, we need to establish a set of rules to govern unfortunate situations such as this. These rules should be known in advance, not constructed in the heat of a political battle for the purpose of swelling the ranks of the majority at the expense of the minority.

The threat our actions will have this week on our democratic system is apparent and this is all the more reason to look at this situation closely.

Our credibility is on the line, Mr. Speaker. Will we act to protect it?

NINTH ANNUAL SWEET POTATO AFFAIR

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

Mrs. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on April 25 congressional Members held our Ninth Annual Sweet Potato Luncheon. Senator RUSSELL LONG and I cohosted this luncheon and it has been our privilege in the Louisiana delegation to do this for 9 years.

Thanks to our fine farmers, we have a bumper sweet potato harvest, and as a result, the Government is using great quantities of sweet potatoes in its programs for the military and for schoolchildren. Since the major concern of these programs is to provide food with a high nutritional value and tasty flavor, the Louisiana yam is custom made.

I encourage the Department of Agriculture to continue to purchase yams for their programs and to give us adequate time so that we can make decisions on purchasing and have our planning done correctly.

The Louisiana yam is one of the most nutritious foods there are, and we are very proud in Louisiana and the other Southern States which grow them of the wonderful job that our farmers do in providing our country with such a wonderful product.

PRESIDENTIAL VIOLATIONS OF WAR POWERS ACT

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. During these 1 minute opportunities I have been discussing the violations of the War Powers Act by the President.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman is reading from a paper in violation of rule XXX.

Ms. OAKAR. Will the gentleman yield on that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). The gentleman from Texas may proceed without reading.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Absolutely. Frankly, I prefer it that way. I just cannot guarantee the gentleman 1 minute, if the gentleman will join me in a unanimous-consent request to address the House for anything up to 1 hour.

Mr. Speaker, seriously speaking, I think this is a matter of such grave import that I have been rising periodically weekly to specifically point out the violations by the President of the United States of the War Powers Limitation Act of 1974.

□ 1310

I think every Member of us always wants to cooperate with a President, be he who he might. But I have from the beginning maintained the independence that I think the Constitution gives this branch of the Government, and whether it is John Kennedy or Lyndon Johnson or Richard Nixon or Jerry Ford or Jimmy Carter or President Ronald Reagan, if I believe they are wrong, I say so and I will not vote in accordance with their wishes.

In this case the President has, I submit, in act after act violated the War Powers Limitation Act. I will respect him and follow him when he stops violating the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] has expired.

AMERICA'S NEW POOR: CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed about the emergence——

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The gentleman is using a script, but I will not object because I think it is rather petty to do that. You may proceed and use your notes.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her permission.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed about the emergence of a new economic under class—America's new poor. I speak of our children and young people.

Senator MOYNIHAN recently observed that Government programs have virtually eliminated poverty among the Nation's aged. He labeled this "the extraordinary achievement of the era." I agree. But, in the meantime, what has been happening to our children?

Who lives in extreme poverty—in households which last year had incomes of less than $3,600? Just 2.5 percent of all senior citizen households fit this description. But 12 percent of the households headed by young people, under age 25, suffer incomes this low. Many of these families include small children.

One would think Federal means-tested cash benefit programs would reflect these numbers. They don't. Young families may have an extreme poverty rate five times that for senior citizens, but their percentage of households receiving these funds—supposedly targeted on the poor—is exactly the same: 11 percent.

What we have done for the elderly is indeed an extraordinary achievement. What we are doing to our children is an extraordinary tragedy.

VIEWING OF TASK FORCE PROCEEDINGS ON INDIANA ELECTION CONTEST SCHEDULED

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, beginning this afternoon at 2 o'clock over the House of Representatives in-house television system, the House Broadcasting System will begin showing the first half of approximately 9 hours and 6 minutes of videotapes of the elections task force meeting in Evansville, IN.

The tapes will not constitute an official record of the task force or committee proceedings, and the proceedings were actually filmed by and the tapes provided by the National Republican Congressional Committee. These tapes will be about 9 hours and 6 minutes of a total of 28 hours and 43 minutes of public task force and committee deliberations. They do not contain a full record of all the discussion of any of the issues decided. The Speaker of the House has agreed that these tapes will be shown, as he was requested by the minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

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

Mr. ROSE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

We on the minority side are delighted that this broadcast will begin. At the Speaker's request, there will be a disclaimer showing that the films were indeed made by and are the property of the National Republican Congressional Committee. The gentleman from North Carolina has graciously guaranteed that this videotape, which is the property of its owner, will not be copied by the Architect or the House Broadcasting System.

I would take this time to remind the Members that those of you who have VCR equipment in your offices got it under the rules that any use of it will be for your own personal use exclusively, and that any transfer to other parties by lease, sale, or gift or for any other purposes is expressly forbidden. It is the desire of the owners of these tapes, and in accordance with the House rules, as nearly as I can figure, that they be used for the education of House Members exclusively, and I would ask the gentleman from North Carolina whether that is his understanding in this matter.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, that is my understanding. The gentleman has stated it correctly.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSE. I will be happy to yield in just 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, just to repeat, we will begin at 2 o'clock this afternoon on channel 6 of our in-house cable system the first 4½ hours, and then at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning we will begin the last half of approximately 4½ hours.

I now yield briefly to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I am wondering, just as a matter of curiosity, why on Earth would anyone object to taping something that is purported to be a full and accurate representation of those meetings?

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the campaign committee, but they have spent a lot of money making these things, and I guess they want to sell them. They just do not want to give them away to anybody, and if you would like to copy them and look at them for your own use, that is OK, but it is not OK for you to use them commercially without the

permission of the Republican Campaign Committee.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROSE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, our rule, of course, applies to everything.

Mr. ROSE. Absolutely.

Mr. FRENZEL. It does not apply just to this venture. But because the owner was concerned in this case, I thought it was appropriate to remind the House of the general House rule with respect to the use of VCR.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, my curiosity dealt with the motive of the owner. Why would the owner object to the taping?

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman to pursue that at another time. I am simply trying to comply with the Speaker's request as it was worked out with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], and the gentleman has correctly stated our agreement.

THE QUEST FOR TRUTH IN THE INDIANA ELECTION CONTEST

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

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, the facts in the case in Indiana's Eighth Congressional District are clear. The citizens of that sovereign State sent a certified winner here. No contest or protest was registered in Indiana, even by the loser, Mr. McClosky. No evidence of fraud or voting irregularity has been claimed.

Yet Mr. Speaker, this House has chosen to trash Indiana law, disenfranchise its voters, ignore its own procedures, and seat one who never contested his loss.

In its quest for truth, this body has prosecuted its pledge "to count all the votes" by counting only some of the votes, by not counting some absentee votes, some cast by the military, and in at least, one instance, counting more votes than there were voters in the precinct.

Mr. Speaker, truth, justice, honor, and respect for the citizens have been cast aside by reckless partisan power politics.

Mr. Speaker, let us turn back from this shameful travesty.

MONROE DOCTRINE TO BE CITED ON INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much concerned as a Member of Congress who comes from an area where the Monroe Doctrine had its beginnings that we are not really doing what we should be doing with regard to that announcement and what it implies in our day. Therefore, I have constructed a resolution on this matter and will be introducing it today or tomorrow.

McCLOSKEY-McINTYRE DISPUTE HINGES ON PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN POLITICAL PARTIES

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

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the debate over seating Rick McIntyre or Frank McCloskey is the classic example of the difference between the two parties' philosophies.

One, the Democrats believe that all direction, all power, and all decisions emanate from Washington. That Washington is the center of the Nation. So it is natural for the Democrats to fill the vacant seat by appointing Frank McCloskey as Washington representative to Indiana.

The other philosophy, the Republicans, believe that all direction, all power, and all decisions emanate from the people. That Washington exists only by permission of the people. So it is natural for Republicans to fill the vacant seat by accepting the peoples representative from Indiana to Washington.

So go ahead, make your appointment from on high. But remember what our great President Abraham Lincoln said:

> If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem. It is true that you may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all the time; but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

You haven't fooled the people of Indiana. Rick McIntyre will eventually be seated in this House.

□ 1320

MR. PRESIDENT, FOR YOUR SAKE AND OURS, CANCEL BITBURG

(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, our Nation's leader should exemplify its highest morality. Sadly, Ronald Reagan appears to have lost his moral bearings, but the American people have not. They can distinguish readily between Hitler's Nazi Germany and the West Germany of today. They remember clearly who were the executioners and who the victims as clearly as they know the difference between good and evil.

It is truly ironic that in this sad season of remembrance, those careless, and unmindful of history would diminish the slaughter of millions.

I do not doubt that the President is genuinely anguished over the furor set off by his scheduled visit to Bitburg Cemetery. There is still time to ease that anguish. Mr. President, for your sake and ours, cancel Bitburg.

CAULDRON BUBBLE TO THE TOP

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, let justice be done. If you will not seat Rick McIntyre, please use your sense of integrity and that spirit of fair play that you respect, and the reputation that you have built up over three decades of public service to make sure that there is a new election, a free election held again in the Eighth District of Indiana. Let's fight it out in the precincts, the way you like, fair and square.

I will be joining most of the Members at 2 o'clock to watch the Evansville, IN, "Voters Chainsaw Massacre," courtesy of the majority party.

For those of you who think there is any humor in the McIntyre affair, or believe our hurt and rage is not deeply felt, I invite you, including you, Mr. Speaker, to come over to our Cloakroom, to talk to us in the spirit of camaraderie and comity. You must come to understand that we truly are outraged over here on this side and that this affront to fairness will poison this House for 1 year and 5 months. Until we adjourn on or about October 1, 1986, this Congress will be a needlessly bitter Chamber. So senseless, when justice cries out for a new eighth district election in Indiana.

A change of subject, Mr. Speaker. "Round about the cauldron go; in the poisoned entrails throw. * * * double, double, toil and trouble; fire burn and cauldron bubble. * * * Like a hell-broth boil and bubble." That's what we have here, Mr. Speaker, double toil and trouble.

Daniel Dillinger Ortega, the famous bank robber from Central America, is now openly soliciting protection money from the Soviets and virtually all the Communist countries of East Europe. The rumor in the discos of Leningrad and Moscow, all two of them, is that he is asking not for $200 million in lethal aid, but rather for $214 million of Communist money. Get the symbolism, $200 million plus $14 million, so that he can derisively sneer all the way to the bank. It will

not be so humorous, for many in this Congress, when the freedom fighters that we set in motion, the Contras, or Contra-tyranos, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] boldly refers to them, are massacred by Soviet "Mi-24D "Hind" gunships. There will be another song sung around here if that slaughter takes place, a dirge of mourning over betrayal. If that betrayal befalls the democratic resistance in Nicaragua, then the majority party will truly have ordained a new mascot for themselves—an ostrich with its head buried in the sands of dishonor.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. See you in the Cloakroom.

CONDEMNING PRESIDENT ORTEGA'S TRIP TO SOVIET UNION

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, to the State Department authorization bill, I will be introducing a resolution as an amendment which would strongly condemn President Ortega's trip to the Soviet Union, as well as his insufficient gesture of reducing Cuban advisers from 2,500 by approximately 100. He released 100 advisers and I think that is clearly insufficient.

It shows, first of all, an act of bad faith on his part, especially to those Members of Congress that voted against military aid to the Contras. In addition to that, it shows a lack of understanding of the American political process.

The message to Mr. Ortega is that we want peace in Central America through negotiations, not through more ties with the Soviets and Cubans.

I believe this provision will strongly state from the Congress of the United States to Mr. Ortega that we want peace, that we do not like his actions, that there will be some options that this country and this Congress, along with the President, will consider if he continues this course of militarizing the area and of doing exactly the things that many Members of Congress here thought were inappropriate.

THE F-16 AND THE F-20

(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, there are two jet airplanes that are quite comparable, the F-16 and the F-20. Both have very modern radar, both have avionic systems that are quite similar. They both have excellent performance in air-to-air fighter combat capability modes. They have accurate air-to-ground bombing systems.

There are differences between the two planes, between the F-16 and the F-20. The F-16 probably has a greater range and also can carry more ordnance.

The F-20 apparently is better in the reliability and maintainability area.

I believe and a lot of other people believe that it is important that the Department of Defense and the Air Force procure some F-20's in order to have a year-by-year competition between these two planes.

There was, a couple of years ago, a second source for fighter engine aircraft. The Air Force made the determination that that competition on a yearly basis is going to save taxpayers about $4 billion.

I believe that a similar competition between the F-20 and the F-16 will lead to significant savings for the American taxpayer. In that regard, I will be introducing an amendment in the subcommittee in the Armed Services Committee today in order to procure some F-20's. If unsuccessful there, I hope that the Congress will support our endeavor on the floor of the House when the authorization bill comes forward.

VACATING EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL SEAT IN INDIANA

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow there is going to be a resolution before this House to vacate the congressional seat of the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana.

In a letter dated April 29, task force chairman LEON PANETTA has outlined pros and cons of the situation as he sees it in Indiana.

□ 1330

I would ask that each Member of this House review that document before deciding what to do tomorrow. On page 2 of that document, under the headline, "Counting Rules," it says one of the primary goals of the task force was to disenfranchise the smallest number of voters possible.

It is a sad state of affairs in this Nation's history when, as a primary goal, we have to disenfranchise anybody.

If we vote not to vacate that seat and then, on Wednesday, vote to seat Mr. McCloskey, in all probability we have set a precedent where we could disenfranchise every voter in this country.

I would urge the Members to review the Panetta document, to review the tapes, and then tomorrow let us vote to vacate the seat and let the voters of the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana decide for themselves who they want to be their Congressman.

THE ELECTION IN INDIANA'S EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, several times during the debate to seat Rick McIntyre over the last 4 months, the issue has been raised whether this body has the right to seat its own Members. Mr. Speaker, I question this right as it pertains to an election contest in the Eighth District of Indiana.

Our Founding Fathers wrote article I, section 5, subsection 1, into our Constitution to protect this body from extraordinary circumstances. I do not believe that extraordinary circumstances exist in this case.

These extraordinary circumstances that our Founding Fathers tried to anticipate were circumstances such as a State refusing to send a Representative, or election fraud, or a Member that does not meet the moral standards of this body.

There are no extraordinary circumstances in this case, Mr. Speaker. There are no charges of election fraud. There are no charges of moral turpitude on the part of Rick McIntyre.

The people of Indiana have sent a Representative to this body. Indiana election laws were followed, not only on election night but in the subsequent recount.

The right to seat our Members was never intended and should never be intended to write election laws for our States. Our Founding Fathers wrote the Constitution to provide us with a set of rules to be governed by, not a set of rules to be ignored for convenience and for the theft of a seat.

THE ELECTION IN INDIANA'S EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. COBEY. Mr. Speaker, count the rhetoric and count the ballots. That was the cry of Democrats in Congress last January when they refused to seat the certified winner of Indiana's Eighth Congressional District, Republican Rick McIntyre.

Instead, they appointed a task force controlled by Democrats to conduct their own recount.

Last week, the recount stopped when Democrat Frank McCloskey reached a 4-vote lead, although there were 32 votes left to count. Even the Democratic-appointed recount supervisor, James Shumway, testified that the ballots not counted were indistinguishable on a legal or security basis from

the ballots the task force had previously counted.

Now the Democrats find themselves with a historic decision. They can be fair and count all of the ballots or they can be fair and let the people of Indiana decide who won through a special election. Or they can simply seat the Democrat on the basis of a four-vote margin that they handed him in their recount.

Around the country, editorial voices are calling on Congress to put fairness above politics.

THE ELECTION IN INDIANA'S EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the Members of the House today that even in Mobile, AL, 1,021 miles from Washington, DC, it is becoming very, very well known of the tactics that are being used in this House by the Democratic majority. In a blistering editorial this morning, let me tell you that they mention in part that at least one Democrat indicates to the news media that he is not going along with this because it is right or wrong, but because it is the macho thing to do.

Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen of the House, that you indeed can do the macho thing and vote with your leadership on this ridiculous movement. But let me tell you, with your tactics you might win this battle but you are going to lose the war.

I urge you to join with me and support an election to decide this factor, a fair election in the State of Indiana.

STRIKES AGAINST FREEDOM

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

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, last week, we voted against $14 million to the freedom-fighting Contras in Nicaragua. Daniel Ortega then hopped a plane on his way to Moscow to pick up $200 million.

Strike one against freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the task force, as it is called by the Democrats, then voted not to seat the individual from the Eighth District of Indiana, Mr. McIntyre, who won an election, and now are going to throw that election out and put somebody else in who did not win.

Strike two.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are the managers of this team, and I know they are not going to tolerate those of us in this body striking out when it comes to freedom.

Mr. Speaker, freedom is not a game. It is time for some pinch-hitters.

AID TO THE CONTRAS IN NICARAGUA

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am anguished by the turn of events as to Nicaragua. The aid to the Contras can readily be seen as applying a tourniquet to the bleeding arm of the U.S. national security; that is, Central America.

Those of us who supported the Contras wanted to keep the pressure on with this tourniquet to prevent further bleeding of our interests in that region. But failure to render aid to the Contras is loosening that tourniquet and, you know, when Ortega visits the Soviet Union, we are in even greater danger of having that sole pressure point allow the bleeding of our special interests and of the interests of democracy in that Central American region.

The stakes are high. Costa Rica is in danger. The Hondurans are in danger. Democracy recently established in El Salvador is in danger. Mexico is in danger.

Therefore, the United States of America, our country, is in danger.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Tuesday, April 30, 1985.

ACCEPTING A STATUE OF JEANNETTE RANKIN

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 37) providing for acceptance of a statue of Jeannette Rankin presented by the State of Montana for placement in National Statuary Hall, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 37

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of Jeannette Rankin, presented by the State of Montana for the National Statuary Hall collection in accordance with the provisions of section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 187), is accepted in the name of the United States, and the thanks of the Congress are tendered to the State of Montana for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent personages, the first woman elected to the United States Congress, known for her courage and convictions regarding equality and peace.

SEC. 2. The State of Montana is authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol the statue of Jeannette Rankin referred to in the first section of this concurrent resolution, and to hold ceremonies on May 1, 1985, in the rotunda on that occasion. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

SEC. 3. (a) The proceedings in the rotunda of the Capitol at the presentation by the State of Montana of the statue of Jeannette Rankin for the National Statuary Hall collection, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such document shall be prepared under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library.

(b) There shall be printed five thousand additional copies of such document which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, of which one hundred and three copies shall be for the use of the Senate and eighteen hundred and ninety-seven copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of Montana, and four hundred and sixty-three copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and two thousand five hundred and thirty-seven copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Montana.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the Governor of Montana.

□ 1340

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the ordering of the second, and on that I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, will a second be ordered?

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker pro tempore appointed as tellers Ms. OAKAR and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

The House divided, and the tellers reported that there were—yeas 21, nays 10.

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 318, nays 0, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—318

Ackerman	Atkins	Bereuter
Addabbo	AuCoin	Berman
Akaka	Barnard	Bevill
Alexander	Bartlett	Biliraki s
Andrews	Barton	Bliley
Anthony	Bateman	Boland
Applegate	Bates	Boner (TN)
Armey	Bedell	Bonior (MI)
Aspin	Bennett	Bonker

Boulter
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Burton (IN)
Byron
Callahan
Chappie
Cheney
Clay
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Collins
Combest
Conte
Cooper
Coughlin
Courter
Craig
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
DeLay
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Dixon
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
English
Evans (IA)
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Feighan
Fiedler
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gray (IL)
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hayes
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Howard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Ireland
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McKernan
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mitchell
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Monson
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Owens
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Robinson
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Sabo
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skeen
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Stratton
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wirth
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NOT VOTING—115

Anderson
Annunzio
Archer
Badham
Barnes
Beilenson
Bentley
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Bustamante
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chappell
Coelho
Conyers
Coyne
Crane
Crockett
Dannemeyer
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Donnelly
Durbin
Dymally
Eckert (NY)
Edwards (OK)
Erdreich
Fazio
Fields
Fish
Ford (MI)
Franklin
Fuqua
Garcia
Gephardt
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (PA)
Gregg
Grotberg
Hansen
Hawkins
Hefner
Heftel
Horton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Hunter
Hyde
Jacobs
Jeffords
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Jones (TN)
Kennelly
Kolter
Lantos
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Lipinski
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
MacKay
Martin (NY)
McCollum
McKinney
Mikulski
Moody
Nelson
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Petri
Rinaldo
Ritter
Rodino
Roe
Rostenkowski
Russo
Savage
Scheuer
Schneider
Seiberling
Shelby
Siljander
Skelton
Smith (NE)
St Germain
Stokes
Strang
Studds
Taylor
Towns
Traxler
Udall
Volkmer
Waxman
Weaver
Wilson
Wise
Wylie
Young (FL)

□ 1400

So a second was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STRANG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 78, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as you know, each State is permitted to have two statues in Statuary Hall, and the State of Montana has wisely decided as their second statue to honor the memory of Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin, who was first elected to Congress in 1916. She was the first woman ever to be elected in Congress. And, interestingly enough, she was elected before we had the 19th amendment, which did not take place until 1920. So Montana was progressive enough to allow all of its citizens the right to vote in 1916.

Jeannette Rankin was extraordinarily well known for her work on issues related to children, very well known for issues related to equal rights for women and certainly well known for her views concerning world peace.

I think it is very fitting and appropriate that we pass this legislation. I want to applaud the people from the State of Montana and certainly the Members from the State, particularly my colleague, Mr. WILLIAMS, for promoting this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the minority has no objection to this routine resolution. It urges that in fact it be swiftly adopted.

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

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and I applaud her for her patience in attempting to bring this concurrent resolution to the floor.

I do not know what it is about the name of Jeannette Rankin that causes so much raucous confrontation in this Chamber. Perhaps there is a different issue than that which Jeannette used to raise when she served in this Chamber so many years ago that has caused the consternation here today. But, nonetheless, I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join with my colleague on the Republican side, Mr. MARLENEE, and myself, in supporting this concurrent resolution which calls for the installation of Montana's second statue here in the Capitol on May 1, to honor Jeannette Rankin.

This May 1 ceremony, this acceptance of a statue to honor Jeannette Rankin, is of tremendous significance to the people of this country because Jeannette Rankin was the first woman in the United States elected to serve in the Congress. Her first term was in 1917-18. Her second term was 1941-42. Jeannette was involved in the women's suffrage movement, out on the streets in New York City, to California and back again, to North Dakota.

When she ran for Congress in Montana, campaigning in the district which I now am pleased and proud to represent, she did so in much the same way that she first campaigned across this Nation for women's suffrage. She did so on horseback, in the kitchens of her friends, and with a direct-mail postcard effort which in those days was virtually unheard of. We Montanans shall be forever proud that we sent the first woman to Congress, a Republican, before most States had even granted women the right to vote.

Four days after Jeannette arrived here in 1917, she had to cast a vote on whether or not this Nation should enter World War I. Jeannette and 55 others that day voted "no." The next time Jeannette returned to Congress it was 1941, and one of her first duties was to vote on whether or not to agree to declare World War II. Jeannette voted "no." But this time she was not

joined by several dozen of her colleagues. Instead, she had to stand and vote "no" alone. She later noted that no one ever said it would be easy serving in this body. No one ever said it would be easy to cast these votes. I do so only because I believe it is right.

And in that first session, her best friend was Fiorello LaGuardia. The press had it that day that when Jeannette cast that first vote "no" she retired from this Chamber in tears, and so it went out across the daily newspapers that the first woman in Congress cast a difficult vote and then broke down in tears. That turned out not to be true. That evening, when the press found Fiorello LaGuardia, they said, "Congressman LaGuardia, is it true that your friend, Jeannette Rankin, was in tears after casting that vote?" And Fiorello said, "I don't know. I couldn't tell. My eyes were filled with tears."

Both between and following those votes, Jeannette spent all of her years at the grassroots lobbying for peace, for women's rights, for better working conditions for men and women, better education for children all across this country. In other words, in her words, she began to prepare America for peace.

This concurrent resolution is neither controversial nor partisan. The resolution before the Montana Legislature asking this Congress and this House to accept this second statue of Jeannette Rankin was introduced in a bipartisan fashion and was received and passed with a strong bipartisan vote. I am delighted to come to the well today and ask this House to take this historic step in again fully recognizing Jeannette Rankin, the first woman in Congress, with whom, whether we agreed or disagreed, we understood as a leader, with courage unlike that displayed by any other who ever served in this body.

□ 1410

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

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude the debate by stating that Jeannette Rankin is one of six women so honored in Statuary Hall. There are also six States who have not taken their total number of two statues who are allocated it, and Mr. Speaker, at this point, I do not have any more requests for time, but I hope that the values that Jeannette Rankin stood for; namely, world peace, equal rights for women, and fairness to American workers are the same values that we will have today.

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I support Senate Concurrent Resolution 37 which provides for acceptance of a statue to Jeannette Rankin. I would like to express my appreciation and deep respect for this courageous woman from Montana who broke so many barriers for women in politics. As the first woman elected to the House of Representatives, she began the march of women into the U.S. Congress.

Her tireless campaigning for women's suffrage serves as a strong example for women concerned with justice. Women's suffrage was an important part of the platform that brought her to Congress in 1917. She crossed the entire country convincing Americans that women deserved the right to vote alongside of men. On January 10, 1918, Jeannette Rankin introduced the suffrage amendment, the year in which it finally passed the House.

She continually championed unpopular causes. She supported children's protective legislation at a time when children were considered a viable and exploitable labor source. Jeannette Rankin was the only Member of Congress who voted against America's entry into both World Wars. Even though both these votes probably led to her defeat in running for office again, she stood by her principles. She had the personal satisfaction of knowing she had remained true to herself.

Her persistence and her dauntless spirit serve as a strong example for all who believe in civil rights for all Americans.●

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 37), as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY IN MAY 1985

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con Res. 130) expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the President's visit to the Federal Republic of Germany in May 1985.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 130

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

(1) the United States Government should pay honor to the memories of the millions of innocent civilians and hundreds of thousands of American and Allied soldiers who suffered and died at the hands of the Nazis;

(2) on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War it is fitting and appropriate for the President, in a gesture of reconciliation, to visit the Federal Republic of Germany, a country which has taken its place among the community of democratic nations and which is now a friend and ally of the United States;

(3) the President should recognize the importance of the relationship between our Nation and the Federal Republic of Germany by paying tribute to appropriate symbols of that nation's current democracy; and

(4) the President should reconsider the inclusion of the Bitburg Cemetery in his forthcoming trip to the Federal Republic of Germany.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the ordering of the second and on that I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will a second be ordered?

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker pro tempore appointed as tellers Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. FASCELL.

The House divided, and the tellers reported that there were—yeas 37, nays 10.

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 325, nays 1, answered "present" 1, not voting 106, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—325

Ackerman	Broomfield	Darden
Addabbo	Brown (CA)	Daschle
Akaka	Brown (CO)	Daub
Alexander	Broyhill	Davis
Anderson	Bruce	de la Garza
Andrews	Bryant	DeLay
Annunzio	Burton (IN)	DeWine
Anthony	Byron	Dickinson
Applegate	Callahan	Dicks
Armey	Campbell	Dingell
Aspin	Chappell	DioGuardi
Atkins	Chappie	Dixon
AuCoin	Cheney	Dorgan (ND)
Barnard	Clay	Dornan (CA)
Bartlett	Clinger	Dowdy
Bateman	Coats	Downey
Bates	Cobey	Dreier
Bedell	Coble	Duncan
Bennett	Coleman (MO)	Dwyer
Bereuter	Coleman (TX)	Dyson
Berman	Collins	Early
Bevill	Combest	Eckart (OH)
Biliraki s	Conte	Edgar
Bliley	Cooper	Edwards (CA)
Boland	Coughlin	Edwards (OK)
Boner (TN)	Courter	Emerson
Bonior (MI)	Craig	English
Boulter	Daniel	Evans (IA)

Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank
Frenzel
Frost
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hall, Sam
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hayes
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Horton
Howard
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Ireland
Jones (NC)
Jones (TN)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Latta
Leach (IA)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Lujan
Luken
Lundine
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McKernan
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Monson
Moody
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
O'Brien
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Owens
Panetta
Parris
Pashayan
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Pickle
Porter
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Robinson
Roemer
Rogers
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Sabo
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NH)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny
Smith, Robert
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stark
Stenholm
Strang
Stratton
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauke
Tauzin
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Walgren
Walker
Watkins
Weber
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Williams
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wright
Wyden
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (MO)
Zschau

NAYS—1

Kindness

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Miller (CA)

NOT VOTING—106

Archer
Badham
Barnes
Barton
Beilenson
Bentley
Biaggi
Boehlert
Boggs
Bonker
Borski
Bosco
Boucher
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Burton (CA)
Bustamante
Carney
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Coelho
Conyers
Coyne
Crane
Crockett
Dannemeyer
Dellums
Derrick
Donnelly
Durbin
Dymally
Eckert (NY)
Erdreich
Fields
Fish
Franklin
Fuqua
Garcia
Gephardt
Goodling
Gordon
Gray (PA)
Gregg
Grotberg
Hansen
Hawkins
Hefner
Heftel
Hubbard
Hyde
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (OK)
Kennelly
Lantos
Leath (TX)
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Lipinski
Loeffler
Lott
Lungren
Martin (NY)
McCollum
McHugh
McKinney
Mikulski
Mitchell
Montgomery
Murphy
Nelson
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pepper
Petri
Price
Rinaldo
Ritter
Rodino
Roe
Rostenkowski
Russo
Savage
Scheuer
Schneider
Seiberling
Shelby
Siljander
Smith (NE)
St Germain
Stokes
Studds
Taylor
Traxler
Udall
Volkmer
Waxman
Weaver
Wilson
Wylie
Young (FL)

□ 1430

Mr. GUNDERSON and Mr. MOAKLEY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So a second was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WRIGHT). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 130.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is simple and straightforward. It is to express the sense of Congress that the President should not go to the Bitburg Cemetery during his scheduled trip to the Federal Republic of Germany.

The resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that:

It is U.S. policy to honor the millions of innocent civilians and hundreds of thousands of American and allied soldiers who suffered and died at the hands of the Nazis;

On the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II it is fitting that the President visit the Federal Republic, a nation with which we are now allied;

The President should pay tribute to relations between our countries through symbols of the Federal Republic's current democracy; and

The President should cancel his scheduled visit to the Bitburg cemetery.

I respect the President and Chancellor Kohl and their desire to demonstrate the fact that the United States and Germany are now friends and allies and that we share a common commitment to human rights and to parliamentary democracy. All of us in this Chamber applaud the achievements the Federal Republic has made since World War II. The proudest of these has been the firm establishment of the rule of law based on respect for the dignity and worth of the individual.

But at the same time many in Congress and many more across our country and around the world are deeply concerned that during the President's visit to the Federal Republic, the reconciliation between our two countries is to be carried out in a ceremony which would leave the impression, correct or incorrect, that the United States is honoring those responsible for the darkest moment in human history and for the deaths in combat of our own soldiers and the murder of American prisoners of war. Surely we can find a more appropriate and acceptable way to mark the reconciliation of our two countries.

Mr. Speaker, I wish it were not necessary for the House to express itself on this issue but the President has been deaf to the chorus of calls from around the Nation for him to reconsider his visit to the Bitburg Cemetery. I hope that Chancellor Kohl and the German people understand our concerns and will respect the wishes of the Congress that the President change his itinerary.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] for the leadership they have shown regarding the subject of this resolution. They are each sponsors of their own resolution and I appreciate having their support for the legislation we are now considering. I also want to express my gratitude to the minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East, Mr. GILMAN, for their contribution to this initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise not only in support of the resolution, but also I would go even a step further and urge the President to call off his visit to the Bitburg Cemetery. Surely, there are other more appropriate cemeteries, monuments, or localities that could serve as an appropriate symbol of the end to intolerance, ruthless exploitation and brutality, and disregard for the dignity of the individual human being so characteristic of the Nazi era.

This President is very keenly aware of the significance of symbols and symbolism. He understood very well the importance to the Chinese people of his visit to the Great Wall, a symbol of China's greatness and endurance as a civilization throughout millenia. He understood very well the symbolism of his visit to Normandy Beach as one of the greatest monuments to Western civilization's determination to maintain freedom, even at great human cost. So also should he understand the symbolism—no, let me say the biting, bitter irony of his proposed visit to a cemetery which includes the remains of SS soldiers, the perpetrators of genocide and whose hated image motivated so many young Americans to make that ultimate sacrifice of their own lives.

A recent letter to the editor, published in the Washington Post best sums up the cruelty of the Nazi era and the disservice our President does, both to the history of the millions of Jews who lost their lives at the hands of the Nazis and the SS troopers, and to the memory of those allied forces who died trying to liberate western Europe from the Nazi yoke.

Jan Karski lived through that era; saw the brutal extermination of Jewish lives; he was a sensitive, caring, eyewitness to the atrocities, but also one who tried to bring to the allied governments the message of what was happening to Jews with a plea for help. It tortured his soul then that the help did not come and 40 years later it still pains this noble and peace-loving man, for whom I have such profound admiration.

I know Jan Karski personally and well—he was my graduate school professor at Georgetown University. He reminds us that we cannot succeed in our quest for peace, for integrity of nations or individuals unless we remember past cruelties so as not to relive them. In his own gentle way, Jan Karski reminds us powerfully that the Presidential visit to Bitburg in some sense exonerates what the SS and the Nazis did to Jews and to humanity and in another sense it diminishes the gallant fight for peace carried by our Allied forces.

Jan Karski has a brilliant command of history, coupled with a personal understanding of its lessons. I hope our generation will be as sensitive to those lessons as he. I hope this President will heed his voice of wisdom and cancel Bitburg.

I submit Dr. Karski's letter for my colleagues' review:

In November 1942—on my fourth secret trip between the Polish Anti-Nazi Underground and the Polish government-in-exile—I brought information on the fate of the Jews in Nazi-dominated Poland as well as desperate requests for help from Jews, addressed to the Allied governments, to save those who still could be saved. I saw the Jewish ghetto in Warsaw. I saw the Belzec death camp. I was an eyewitness.

In London, I reported to the Polish government-in-exile as well as to four members of the British War Cabinet, Foreign Secretary Eden included. In the United States, I personally reported to the highest government and Catholic Church officials, including President Roosevelt, Apostolic Delegate Cardinal Cicognani, Rabbis Wise and Goldman, and Justice Frankfurter.

The Jewish requests for help came to naught—the inactivity of the powerful Allied governments having been determined by war priorities, self-controlled ignorance, self-imposed disbelief or soulless rationality. Thus, 6 million Jews, helpless and abandoned by humanity, perished in agony.

Today, some 40 years later, as an old man coming to the end of his earthly journey, I cannot but raise my voice. We must pursue peace, cooperation, justice and freedom. But our pursuit cannot be based on self-imposed forgetfullness of what happened to the Jews during World War II.

JAN KARSKI.

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

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I support this resolution. I intend to vote for it because I agree with the first three paragraphs, but I do not agree with paragraph 4, which would tie the President's hands and make the decision of where he should go while he is in Europe.

I think that someday we are going to have to recognize that this generation of West Germans who are living are not responsible nor should they be hung with the guilt of Adolf Hitler and the SS and all the other horrible people that involved themselves with Hitler in World War II. We should recognize that now.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I commend our chairman and the ranking member for bringing it forward.

Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 130, expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the President's visit to the Federal Republic of Germany.

As we prepare to mark the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, I commend President Reagan for his sincere and noble effort to focus his visit as a symbol of reconciliation with our German ally. However, I share the belief that the President's itinerary should be revised to exclude the proposed visit to the Bitburg Cemetery, and I so indicated to the President in a personal letter I wrote earlier this month.

The President's sincerity of intentions are above reproach. Nevertheless, he is misguided in this matter. It is as Elie Wiesel has said, "That place, Mr. President, is not your place."

Surely, the heads of state of these two great democracies can reach accommodation so that American and German soldiers can be dignified in a solemn ceremony away from a site that symbolizes such human tragedy and bitterness. Mr. President, we must restore both dignity and peace of mind for Americans and Germans alike.

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

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], who is the ranking member of the European Subcommittee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. This controversial issue has, unfortunately, grown worse rather than better as discussion has accelerated. The chairmen's resolution, of which I am pleased to be a cosponsor, goes to the heart of the matter, expressing the sense of Congress that the President should reconsider his visit to Bitburg Cemetery in light of recent disclosures that members of the infamous Nazi SS are buried there. I have personally expressed my serious concern on several occasions, and via several avenues, in opposition to the President's proposed visit to the Bitburg Cemetery.

We were privileged just a few days ago to hear the words of Elie Wiesel during the national civic commemoration of the 40th anniversary of the liberation of the concentration camps held in the Capitol's rotunda. He very eloquently stated our innermost thoughts. We have tried to convey to the President our opposition to this particular aspect of the President's trip by way of cosponsorship of resolutions similar to the one before us today and through letters and by personal appeals.

Our constituents have expressed their considerable anguish and dismay about the President's proposed visit to the Bitburg Cemetery and the opposition has come from many different segments of our population.

Mr. Speaker, not only are the survivors of the death camps horrified at the precedent-setting implications of a visit of this type, but many veterans and Jewish groups as well are proclaiming their deep and heartfelt concern. The SS were not victims, Mr. Speaker, they were the personification of evil. They were the most hated and feared of all the Nazis, because entry

into this corps was voluntary and most stringent. Each member had to submit the details of his family tree in order to prove that there was no Jewish blood in the family. And not just for a few years, but going back to the 1750's. It is apparent that anyone willing to go to those lengths to join that group did not hate just one people, they hated all people. They fought against our American soldiers who had committed themselves to the noblest principles of our Nation, among them freedom of word, deed and religion. Many of us in this body believe that our President should not represent the American people at a place which harbors the remains of SS soldiers when the remains of 6 million Jews are scattered ashes across Europe. As Elie Wiesel poignantly said of Bitburg, "Mr. President, this place is not your place."

Along with many others, I have suggested that a more appropriate site for the President to visit in Germany would be the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Indeed, press accounts this morning indictate that this option is supported by certain German leaders. For example, Franz Josef Strauss is reported as saying that "instead of going to Bitburg, Mr. Reagan could lay a wreath at the unknown soldier's monument in Munich."

Others have suggested a cemetery in Luxembourg where both American servicemen and German armed forces soldiers are buried. There are a number of options available to the President to pay homage to all the dead who fought with honor, but a visit to the Bitburg Cemetery should not be one of them. Mr. President, I join my concerned colleagues in urging you to revise your European agenda, omitting any visit to the Bitburg Cemetery.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass House Concurrent Resolution 130.

□ 1440

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this resolution, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Florida, Chairman FASCELL, in endorsing the resolution before us.

This resolution expresses the sense of the Congress on this important matter, while respecting the constitutional prerogatives of the President of the United States.

While it is fitting that our Government honor the memories of the millions of innocent civilians and Allied soldiers who died in that great conflict, the President should reconsider his visit to the Bitburg Cemetery.

As my colleagues well know, countless American and Allied soliders lost their lives at the hands of the Nazis. In a gesture of reconciliation, it is appropriate that President Reagan visit West Germany to pay honor to the fallen who gave their lives in the struggle against mindless nazism.

The Federal Republic of Germany has made great strides in many areas since that terrible war. That democratic country is now a respected friend of the United States, and relations between our two great nations are fourishing.

To highlight the major strides that Germany has made in building an open democratic society, the President should recognize progress in that area by visiting an appropriate symbol of modern democratic Germany, rather than visiting the cemetery, which is replete with so many memories of the tragic past.

With these thoughts in mind, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution urging the President not to visit Bitburg, probably the worst blunder of his Presidency. If the President goes, it will leave a permanent blot on history, on the United States of America.

I beseech the President, please, do not go to Bitburg in the name of Holocaust survivors, an extremely large concentration of which reside in the 10th District. These are people—we have all seen the pictures—who came to the United States with nothing. They love this country. This country has made them everything that they are. They are fervent patriots. And now the President is going to honor the very organization that brought them and their families death and destruction.

The idea of visiting a concentration camp, Bergen-Belsen, as an ameliorative gesture, is repugnant to them.

This is not an issue of equal time where the President first goes to a concentration camp and goes to honor the SS, giving each side its due. Has the moral relativism of our age so engulfed everything that there is no sense of proportion and no sense of values?

I speak from the point of view of American veterans who fought valiantly against Nazis.

It was the Waffen SS, that shot American POW's in cold blood and then stood their bodies up and used them as target practice.

Mr. President, is it appropriate to honor this organization? The specific unit of Waffen SS that is buried in this cemetery took 659 French men, women, and children at Oradour locked them in a barn and burnt the barn. When a few, including a young child, tried to escape, the Waffen SS of this unit brutally machinegunned them down. It was this unit of the SS, not another.

I speak from the point of view of diplomacy, Mr. President. It is ironic that the decision to visit Bitburg is not bringing postwar Germany and America closer together. It is pushing America and postwar Germany further apart.

Finally, Mr. President, and most importantly, I speak in the name of moral leadership. We love this country because the United States has stood as a beacon of moral leadership. This President is the President of the free world, of the greatest country in the world, of a country that prides itself on being above others in terms of what it must do, what it can do, and what it will do.

By honoring the graves of SS soldiers, Mr. President, what you are doing is dimming that beacon of moral leadership. You are leaving a permanent blot on this country's history, a blot no matter what you say, no matter what you do at the cemetery or afterward, that cannot be undone.

Mr. President, this resolution is a last plea. Do not visit Bitburg. Please, in the name of the United States, in the name of diplomacy, in the name of reconciliation and morality, do not visit Bitburg.

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's plans for his upcoming trip to West Germany and the comments he has made has caused me grave concern.

As one of the five Members of this House on the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council, I know that the President has shown the utmost sympathies for the victims of the Holocaust and their families, as well as for the American and allied troops who died in World War II; but as the Chairman of the Council, Elie Wiesel, has said, Bitburg is not the place of the President. His place is with the survivors.

If the President's desire was to put the war behind us and improve personal and official ties to the West German Government, the visit to Bitburg Cemetery has now made that impossible. One can and one must separate Nazi war criminals from the present West German leaders and citizenry, but the SS are surely among the war criminals; nor can one equate even the non-SS soldiers, even conscripts, to civilian victims of the Nazi war machine and the Holocaust.

Germany has been a reliable NATO ally during the last four decades; however, that in no way changes history.

If the President wants to commemorate 40 years of friendship with the present-day Government of West Germany, I suggest that there are other more appropriate ways to show this.

I urge the President not to go to Bitburg and I urge the House to approve this resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise with no anger, only the best interests of our President and our country.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is needed. A mistake has been made. There has been a serious error in judgment. What we have always admired about this President is that when he felt strongly and when he felt he was right, he let us know.

Well, now what we seek to admire in this President is that when he has made a mistake, when he has committed a wrong, that he admit it. This visit to Bitburg is a mistake of many dimensions.

We do not contend that this President and this Congress should not find a symbol of reconciliation, a place of friendship to visit, to build on a new relationship with Germany. We should, but Germany abounds with such symbols; the grave site of Adenauer; Dresden, the destroyed cities of the Rhine, places where America and Germany together can see the destruction, the hate of the Nazis.

Bitburg is not such a symbol. It is not a symbol for several reasons. The first occurred on December 18, 1944, when the soldiers buried at Bitburg, these innocent conscripts which the President would cite, led 86 American soldiers to a field, machinegunned them for 15 minutes and then walked to each and emptied their pistols.

It is not a symbol because the SS, not innocent conscripts which the President would cite, soldiers who according to the Nuremberg investigation belonged to a criminal association.

Third, it is not a symbol because this above all else is an opportunity for the Soviet Union. The pictures of this President at Bitburg will be shown on all corners of this Earth, distorted and misused for the purposes of the Soviet Union.

We know those who favor this visit. Some have spoken of it. Secretary Kissinger, President Nixon, they have found advantages in it, and we are not surprised. We know their morality. We know their purposes. They are not ours.

We ask this President not to make it his, either. President Reagan has stood for great good for our country and accomplished great good in the world; but this is a great wrong.

Mr. President, admit it, change it. Do not offend the good name of our country. There is no place for you at the tomb of the unknown Nazi. Find a better site to visit, Mr. President.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. FIEDLER].

□ 1450

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. Listening to the debate which was taking place just a few moments ago by my colleague from Brooklyn, NY, I was reminded of a recent incident in history, an incident very similar to the one that he described, where Jews were herded into a synagogue and it was set afire. This incident took place in Nicaragua, where the Jewish community, while at prayer, had the synagogue torched.

I raise this issue as we discuss this important historic fact to make certain that we remember that those elements that were responsible for what took place in Germany in the 1940's continue to exist today. It is our responsibility as citizens and as Members of Congress to be ever watchful and to make certain that not only does the Holocaust never happen again, but that we in no way contribute to support of a government that could be supporting continued anti-Semitism.

I might add one further note. Today in Nicaragua there is no Jewish community as a result of continuing discrimination which takes place there.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FOWLER].

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, as a U.S. veteran, I join with other veterans in opposing the President's trip. As we approach the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, it is altogether fitting that we remember the terrible events of those days, mourn those killed during the war, and rejoice in the victory over Fascism. It is also appropriate that we celebrate the accomplishments of our friend and ally, the Federal Republic of Germany, which arose from the ashes of defeat to become a democratic and valued member of the community of nations.

But it is neither fitting nor appropriate for the President of the United States to honor the SS graves at Bitburg. As a veteran, I am outraged that an American President should pay his respects at the graves of Nazi storm troopers who executed American POW's during the war.

As a human being, I am appalled that our Chief Executive is participating in ceremonies commemorating the graves of those who implemented the Holocaust, one of the darkest events in the history of humanity.

I join with my Democratic and Republican colleagues in support of House Concurrent Resolution 130 which urges President Reagan to reconsider his trip to the Bitburg military cemetery during his upcoming trip to West Germany. There are far better ways to serve the memories of the victims of World War II.

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

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. I rise in strong support of the resolution. I might add the point that what Mr. Kissinger and Mr. Nixon practiced was realpolitik. What is necessary here is a clear, simple statement on morality.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for offering this resolution and for his leadership on this important issue.

If I could send just one simple message to the President regarding his planned visit to the Bitburg Military Cemetery it would be this: It's not too late to do the right thing and cancel this trip.

West German Chancellor Kohl has described the President's planned visit to Bitburg as the "noble gesture of a friend." With all due respect to the Chancellor, I fail to see anything whatsoever that is noble about opening old wounds.

Likewise, a number of people have suggested that it would be a sign of weakness for the President to change his plans at this point. I couldn't disagree more. To change one's mind in the face of new evidence is, in my opinion, the mark of a strong man. Mr. Reagan has demonstrated such strength in the past.

There are three major reasons why I believe it is inappropriate for the President to go to Bitburg:

No. 1, the military cemetery at Bitburg is not just any cemetery. It is a cemetery where more than 40 members of the Nazi elite—the SS—are buried: and in a position of honor. According to an eyewitness who visited the cemetery at the request of the highly respected Simon Wiesenthal Center, the SS members are buried in a semi-circle around the memorial which the President plans to visit. In other words, if the President lays a wreath at the memorial, he will in essence be laying a wreath at the feet of the SS!

No. 2, the SS members buried at Bitburg are not just young recruits drafted against their will as some of the administration's remarks have suggested. According to an analysis of information supplied by the Wiesenthal Center, at least 14 of them were between the ages of 23 and 44 when they died. One of these individuals, SS Staff Sgt. Franz Otto Bengel, was awarded Germany's second highest medal, the German Cross in gold, for

killing 10 American soldiers, according to the Wiesenthal Center. (In response to a request for information from Jack Anderson, the German Embassy has confirmed that Bengel received this award.) No one knows how many total deaths—of Americans, European Jews, and other persons—for which the SS members buried there were responsible.

No. 3, and perhaps most important, there simply is no reason for the President to go to Bitburg. If he really wants to honor Germans involved in World War II, there are plenty of places he could go where he could achieve that task in a manner consistent with this Nation's role in the war and our longstanding commitment to freedom of religion, speech, and thought. A good example is Plötzensee prison outside of Berlin where non-Jewish German nationals who resisted Nazism were hung on meathooks by the Nazis.

The President's plans to go to Bitburg already have brought pain to millions of Americans.

I am thinking particularly of the thousands of World War II veterans who fought valiantly on the battlefields of Germany and Eastern Europe to end Nazi terrorism and preserve freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of thought—and the families of the thousands more who gave their lives in this noble endeavor.

Mr. President, don't prolong the pain of these brave Amercians any longer. Change your mind now and don't visit the Bitburg Cemetery.

Mr. AUCOIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I yield to my colleague from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN].

Mr. AUCOIN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Obviously this originally was an effort to put behind the two countries, in the name of reconciliation, a great wrong. But I would suggest to my colleagues, and particularly to this President, there are some things that should not be put behind us. There are some things that should be remembered. An unspeakable atrocity committed by some who lay in the graves that the President would now visit are wrongs that should always be remembered by humankind, lest they be repeated.

I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I hope very much this President, the leader of our country, does not honor these German dead.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYDEN. I now yield to the gentleman from New York,

Mr. ACKERMAN. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, the only thing that we need to fear is amnesia.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Bitburg episode has raised serious questions about the role of the United States and its moral leadership in the world.

Traditionally, the United States has conducted its foreign policy from a different set of values than those of the rest of the world. We have always considered ourselves to be different, to have the ability to look at the world from a position of higher moral leadership than other nations. Every President has called on our Nation and our people to exert this higher level of moral leadership that is expressed through our values, our national character, and our institutions such as the U.S. Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence.

Our ability to point to our moral leadership, however, has been seriously threatened by the President's decision to go to the cemetery at Bitburg. The decision to pay tribute to the internationally-recognized symbol of genocide goes beyond mere insensitivity or bad judgment. To anyone with a sense of history, this decision is a mistake. After decades of exerting moral leadership in world affairs, the symbol that is the United States—fairness, democracy, self-determination, and respect for the rights and liberties of all peoples, weak and strong alike—is suddenly, jarringly linked with everything that we stand against.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with our Nation's veterans and people everywhere who say "Never again" in opposing the President's decision to go to Bitburg. It is wrong, it threatens our ability to conduct a foreign policy based on moral leadership, and it should be canceled before further damage is incurred.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in strong support of this resolution, saying a week ago this last Monday that the White House ought to hire my mother to remind the President of the four most difficult words for a politician to say: "I made a mistake."

Don't go, Mr. President.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I joined in a letter to Chancellor Kohl asking him to be graceful enough to take the President off the hook. The response we got was a rather snarly response from the legislative body over there.

I think that illustrates how this whole matter is going to permanently damage, at least for this generation, the relationship between our countries. Chancellor Kohl has shown no signs of acceding to Congress' request that he intervene in this matter and extend an invitation to President Reagan to visit some other appropriate site to pay respect to the German people. As a matter of fact, the West German Government recently affirmed its intention not to release President Reagan from his commitment to visit the Bitburg Cemetery.

The decision to visit Bitburg Cemetery has become the most embarrassing incident of President Reagan's 4¼ years in office. It has awakened deep and bitter emotions among thousands of Holocaust survivors, and has elicited a wave of criticism from our Nation's largest veterans and Jewish groups. It has also brought pain to the thousands of World War II veterans who left their youth on the battlefields of Germany and Eastern Europe in the fight to end Nazi terrorism and preserve freedom of speech and freedom of thought.

Bitburg is not just any military cemetery. It is a cemetery where members of the SS and other Nazi officials who played a role in the deaths of American soldiers are buried. SS units provided the guards for concentration camps, participated directly in the murder of millions of persons during World War II, and were involved in the execution of American prisoners of war during the Battle of the Bulge. These SS members should not be the recipients of any tribute by the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I served in the U.S. Navy when the Battle of the Bulge occurred. I was safe—in Oklahoma. I watched avidly, shocked by the blatant atrocities committed by the Nazis. How could you forget the Battle of the Bulge and the American soldiers who lost their lives because of such acts perpetrated by Nazi officials .

Given the outrageous acts committed by the Nazi in World War II and the inappropriateness of the President of the United States memorializing the participants in these acts, the President should cancel his visit to the military cemetery in Bitburg. It is my hope that the President will reconsider this unfortunate decision and visit some other appropriate site to pay respect to the German people. Such action would certainly foster peace and understanding between our two nations, and resolve a controversy that threatens to have long and serious repercussions in the United States.●

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

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I think it is entirely appropriate on the occasion

of the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War for President Reagan, in a gesture of reconciliation, to visit the Federal Republic of Germany. Germany was once our enemy. It is now our friend, and it is an important part of the Western Alliance.

But I also believe it is entirely inappropriate for the President, during the course of his visit to the Federal Republic, to implicitly pay tribute to men who lie buried at Bitburg who fought in the service of a truly evil empire, and who were responsible for some of the most monstrous crimes in the history of the human race.

Let the President, during the course of his visit to the Federal Republic, pay tribute to the good Germany rather than the bad Germany. Let him lay a wreath, for example, on the tomb of Pastor Martin Niemoller who was executed by the Nazis because of his opposition to Hitler, as a way of demonstrating that we reject the doctrine of collective responsibility and that we recognize that not all Germans supported the Nazi regime.

Let him pay tribute to the new Germany rather than the old Germany by laying a wreath on the tomb of Konrad Adenauer, that great German statesman who did so much to help establish on a firm foundation the principles of political decency and democracy of the new Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to say that this is not a Jewish issue. It is an American issue. All Americans, black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Italo-Americans, Polish Americans, veterans' groups, and millions and millions of people throughout our country who understand that World War II was not the traditional conflict between nation states but a primordial struggle against the forces of unmitigated evil, believe that it would be terribly wrong for the President of the United States to go to the cemetery at Bitburg, and there to implicitly pay homage to men who were responsible not only for the murder of 6 million Jews but for the murder of American POW's and countless others.

And so, Mr. Speaker, at this last moment, shortly before the President is about to embark on his trip to Europe, this resolution expresses the hope of what I am sure will be the overwhelming majority of the Members of the House that he reconsider his plans and not proceed with his projected visit to the cemetery at Bitburg.

Mr. SHARP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it is an act of strength to correct this tragic mistake, and it is an act of wisdom to heed the moral call of Elie Wiesel.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARTNETT].

Mr. HARTNETT. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat reluctant to come here today, but I feel it somewhat my duty to come here today.

This is one Congressman who is not willing to condemn President Reagan for his planned trip to Bitburg. A mistake, Mr. Speaker? Yes. A blunder? Yes. Poor judgment? Yes.

I have joined with my colleagues, many of whom have offered a letter to the German Chancellor asking that he revoke the invitation to President Reagan to visit the cemetery at Bitburg.

□ 1500

But, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I would say to you that you do your country a great injustice when you try to imply that it is to honor SS troops that President Reagan visits Bitburg Cemetery. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, those horrible men who lie in Bitburg Cemetery have already faced a judgment far more critical and far more important than Members of this House of Representatives can pass on them. History and the world, indeed these United States, know the feeling of this Congress. They know the feeling of this President that none of us support what was done by those SS troops. None of us think it wise for President Reagan to visit Bitburg Cemetery if it is to be construed as some visit to honor those horrible men and their dastardly deeds. But the patriotism of President Reagan cannot be questioned. He is a man who hates evil but loves his country very much and sees his duty.

He is a man unlike most Members in this Congress willing to stand up and do what has to be done, the controversy notwithstanding.

Mr. President, I think you know and I think we know that you know it is probably a very poor public relations move, but I know, Mr. President, that no one in this world, be he Jew or Gentile, German or American, holds more hatred in their heart than you for what was done to a race of people in Germany 40 years ago.

You wore your country's uniform, Mr. President, in defense of this country and in opposition to that type of evil.

Mr. President, you are going to have a lot of flak in the months and weeks ahead. But I am confident, Mr. President, that you will weather this storm as you have weathered others. I do not think that you should make a visit to one place to offset another. The evil is a given that was done by those who are nameless and faceless but who are buried in that cemetery.

But the judgment that we pass on to them, my friends, will be pale and has been pale to the judgment that they have already faced, if you believe as most Jews and Christians do that there is a hereafter and that you will one day face a judgment.

We are not going to honor SS troops but the state of the German people. Evil existed in this world 40 years ago.

Where were you when we gave Germany the Marshall plan? I hear no one criticizing Marshall.

What the President is doing is diplomatic; what the President is doing has a lot more to do with foreign relations than any of you will ever be able to do. And I ask you, there is one prayer, my friends, uttered by Jews, Christians, Germans, and Americans alike. It goes something like, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us."

And let me say one more thing to you in closing: President Reagan, thank God, is one of the few men whom we know is a patriot. And I think you do him a great disservice when you try to make him to be some evil man because of the invitation of a head of state he is going to visit the final resting place of men who either did their duty willingly or were forced to do their duty; I cannot pass judgment onto them, nor will I.

But I say to you, Mr. President, you go to Germany, you meet the German Chancellor and the German people and you hold you head high, Mr. President, because there is no one in this country who would in any way whatsoever try to make you or anyone believe that we think you supported the type of activity that went on in Germany some 40 years ago. So you go to Germany, Mr. President, as the leader of the kindest, the greatest, and most benevolent country in the world, all of her people who love good and hate evil.

I can tell you this, Mr. President, I might stand alone in this well but I will not politicize the evil acts of horrible men and women of 40 years ago. I will stand here, Mr. President, in support of your visit and I wish you Godspeed.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE].

Mr. WOLPE. It is extraordinary, Mr. Speaker, that we should have had to offer this resolution today. Why is it so difficult for the President of the United States to understand as Elie Wiesel has said that his place is not at Bitburg at the graves of storm troopers but with the survivors? We understand that the President is a proud man and that he does not wish to back off of his commitment that he has extended to Chancellor Kohl. But he must be made to understand somehow, and I hope this resolution will help, to understand the enormous hurt and the enormous pain he causes to all of the Holocaust survivors, to all Ameri-

can veterans, and to Americans throughout our country.

Surely, there must be a better means of preserving a valued relationship with an ally than to undertake a symbolic act that will be understood as an attempt to erase the horrors that were perpetrated at the hands of the SS.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, no one is saying that the President of the United States is evil. I rise in support of this resolution because we want the President to represent the best interests of the people in this country who are sensivtive to the atrocities that have been committed in the past. Many of our Jewish friends throughout the world have said, "We shall never forget," and I think when you walk through the halls of Dachau as I did with the Speaker in the concentration camp or Yad Vashem in Jerusalem that you cannot help but wonder how people could possibly have treated each other in this way, and we would like to believe it could not happen again.

My colleagues, when you see what is going on today in South Africa, you wonder is there not a parallel in what is going on between the way the Nazis treated the Jews in Germany and the way the white minority are treating the blacks in Africa.

Did they not use the same racist policies and does not the President of the United States still believe that a constructive engagement in South Africa can stop the atrocities that are being committed against the blacks?

It seems to me that when people say that "We shall never forget" that we can understand today that it is a very thin threshold in what man can do against his fellow man.

It seems to me that we should be reminded that we should not pay tribute to those who committed those acts no matter how badly we want to make certain we are friends of the Germans, nor should we be friends to those people committing similar acts to those people in South Africa.

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

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think that most of the points with regard to the morality of the symbolism have been made and have been made very, very well and very eloquently.

One thing that I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, is in response to a prior speaker who spoke against this resolution. He argued that our President is making this trip with regard to issues pertaining to diplomacy and with regard to issues pertaining to foreign relations, and it is on that basis that I think that we should also look at the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, no action that this President has taken during the 4½ years of his Presidency has been more misguided on those two criteria, the criterion of diplomacy, and the criterion of foreign relations.

Our Soviet adversaries have been looking for an opportunity to embarrass the United States in Eastern and in Western Europe on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of V-E Day. We could not have given them a better opportunity than the symbolism of this trip.

We have tried with great success since World War II to be responsible leaders of the Western Alliance. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this visit will do more to divide us from our allies than anything that we have done during that time period.

□ 1510

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. I would like to associate my remarks with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARTNETT]. I think our President is on a mission of trying to heal the hurts that have happened in this world of ours, and I think that we make a mistake doing this resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let me just say briefly in response to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARTNETT] and those who agree with him, the ultimate test of our feelings is our actions, and the ultimate test of our actions is their morality.

If we cannot pass judgment on the actions of Nazi Germany, we can pass judgment on nothing.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

The idea of reconciliation is a good one, but there are some things with which we cannot be reconciled. We cannot be reconciled with Nazism and we cannot be reconciled with a holocaust.

We have reconciled with the Germans; we helped rebuild their country. That is the strongest symbol of what we have done; that is debased, that is affronted by what the President proposes to do.

Mr. President, please do not go to Bitburg. It is an insult to the veterans who died for this country. It is an insult to the Holocaust victims. It is an insult to all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida. [Mr. FASCELL] has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. President, close your eyes. Let your mind turn inward to your soul. What do you see, Mr. President? The Second World War, the tragedy that befell all humankind. The tragedy that befell concentration camp victims and survivors, families and people in many countries in all of Europe, and in America, even in the Soviet Union.

Close your eyes and let your mind go to your soul. Whose name do you honor? Whose memory do you honor by going to Bitburg? Those that perpetrated the very crimes that your soul reels from in recalling them.

These are not the people to do honor to. You have been described here as a patriot. What is a patriot? A patriot is a true lover of his country. If you truly love your country, Mr. President, then we believe, all of us, that you do.

You will honor the memory of those Americans who fought and died, of those concentration camp victims, and survivors, and families. You will honor the grief of Americans and people worldwide who suffered enormously, who suffered grievously at the hands of the people who are buried in that cemetery.

A true patriot, Mr. President, honors the memory of those in his country and those who fought for freedom and democracy. And as a true patriot, Mr. President, you do great disservice to those people whom you should honor by honoring those who visited on this century some of the most heinous crimes ever committed in recorded history.

Close your eyes, Mr. President. Turn your mind inward to your soul. If you do that, you will make the right decision, and you will not go to the Bitburg Cemetery, and then you will be doing justice not only to the Americans and to those that died in Europe, but also to those true Germans whose postwar Germany represents the true Germany.

● Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few words in support of House Concurrent Resolution 130.

Although I am pleased that President Reagan will include a visit to a Nazi concentration camp site on the itinerary for his forthcoming visit to West Germany, I object to his planned visit to the Bitburg Cemetery.

While I appreciate and support the themes of reconciliation and mutual friendship which the President is attempting to stress during his visit, I believe that we should pay tribute to symbols of the Federal Republic's cur-

rent democracy rather than to symbols of its unfortunate past.

Considering that the majority of those Germans buried at Bitburg fought against American servicemen at the Battle of the Bulge, in which 77,000 Americans died; considering that it is likely that some of the soldiers buried at Bitburg participated in the massacre of American prisoners at Malmedy, Belgium; and considering that many of those buried at Bitburg were members of the Waffen SS, an elite Nazi unit which is an internationally recognized symbol of the crime of genocide perpetrated by the Nazis against the Jewish people and humanity; I find it totally inappropriate that a President of the United States should pay tribute to German soldiers buried at Bitburg Cemetery.

In light of the aforementioned considerations I was an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 125 introduced by Congressman TORRICELLI, and I am in strong support of this House Concurrent Resolution 130 calling upon President Reagan to reconsider the inclusion of the Bitburg Cemetery on the itinerary for his upcoming visit to West Germany.●

● Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 130, which asks the President to reconsider his planned visit to the German war cemetery of Bitburg where Nazi soldiers including some members of the SS unit are buried.

Apparently, the original intent for laying the wreath at Bitburg was to symbolize the spirit of reconciliation that President Reagan in his visit to West Germany wants to stress. But let us stop for a moment and ask, "What are we reconciling ourselves with?" Are we making peace with the legacy of Hitler's Nazi forces and the atrocities that they committed?

When Hitler came to power and began his aggression against the countries of Europe, he had in his mind supreme victory and a new order for the world. He envisaged an order in which those that he considered "racially superior" would rule and those that he considered 'racially inferior" would perish. Hitler's new order wiped out religion, it wiped out free speech, free thought, almost every kind of freedom that we Americans know and enjoy. If the Allied forces had not won the war, Europe and many other nations of this world would have been enveloped in a nightmare under a racist militaristic political order that they might never have escaped. The concentration camps in which 6 million Jews and millions others died stands today as testimony to this evil.

Make peace with that kind of legacy, Mr. Speaker? I think not.

Let me make clear that we know that the sins of the last generation of Germans must not be held against the new generation of Germans. Those of us that protest the visit to Bitburg are not accusing the present Germany of atrocities that were committed by Hitler. A Presidential visit to a concentration camp will not signify accusation, but simply acceptance of history as it really was.

But I am wary of what a Presidential visit to Bitburg would achieve or what it will come to symbolize. At the very least, it may symbolize making peace with the Nazi legacy, which would be unacceptable, and at the worst, it could symbolize some sort of absolution for Nazi war criminals, which would be unspeakable.

At the end of World War II, I believe we made a promise not only to those who died a brutal death in the concentration camps, but also to posterity, indeed, to humanity. Never again, we promised, never again will we let such a holocaust take place. We promised that we would never forget the atrocities of Hitler, lest the world repeat such horror again. If President Reagan goes to Bitburg, we will be on the road to breaking that promise. We would be signifying that we are willing to forget and forgive acts that cannot ever be forgotten or forgiven.

I understand the President's desire to move forward and celebrate with the democratic Government of West Germany the joint pursuit of peace, cooperation, justice, and freedom. Let us move forward, but let us not forget the tragedy, let us not concede the horror in our haste to move on. Let us not reject the memories of those innocent millions who were brutally put to death in concentration camps.

I do not think the German people have forgotten this. I do not think the Jewish people have forgotten. I do not think those who fought in World War II have forgotten. I certainly do not think the President of our country should act as if he has forgotten. I urge my colleagues to adopt House Concurrent Resolution 130 which expresses the sense of this Congress that the President should cancel his visit to Bitburg. I believe a more suitable way can be found to commemorate the end of World War II and the friendship between West Germany and our country.●

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the subject of the apparent irreversible decision of President Reagan to visit a military cemetery at Bitburg, West Germany, on Sunday May 5. I am astounded over the fact that despite the tremendous outpouring of opposition from so many groups and individuals who would take personal offense from such a visit, that the White House is holding firm on their decision to have the President visit this cemetery.

On April 12 I sent the following telegram to the President, in which I urged him to cancel the visit. I said:

I understand that you are contemplating a visit to the Bitburg military cemetery in Germany as part of your upcoming European trip. I urge you to cancel this visit because it is both inappopriate and insensitive to the Jewish community of our nation and the world, and to American veterans of World War I and II.

When you chose not to visit the concentration camp at Dachau, as part of this same trip, you expressed concern that it might rekindle fears and anguish of this horrible era in world history. I contend that a visit to a cemetery where only German soldiers and civilians are buried presents a greater opportunity to reopen wounds in the Jewish community. It is impossible not to assume that among those in Bitburg cemetery would be German soldiers responsible for the murder of innocent Jewish men, women and children in the Nazi reign of terror. The very possibility of this should cause you to want to cancel this visit.

Further the absence of any U.S. military personnel in the Bitburg Cemetery lends further justification for canceling this visit. If we are to pay honor to the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, our primary tribute should be paid to the brave American soldiers who gave up their lives in defense of freedom.

(I hope you will act swiftly to cancel this visit.)

As mentioned, this telegram was sent on April 12. Subsequent events have indicated that indeed there are Nazi soldiers buried at Bitburg. Specifically, of the 1,800 German soldiers buried in Bitburg, 47 are members of the Waffen SS, the combat contingent of the elite Nazi unit that ran the death camps and presided over the murders of 6 million Jews.

The question one must ask is why? Why would the President of the United States proceed on this visit when such a hue and cry has been heard from so many different segments of our population. While one can understand the importance of maintaining good relations with Germany and for heads of state to maintain good relations, one must make the exception in this instance. The simple fact is Chancellor Kohl should do the honorable thing and withdraw the invitation at once.

It is my fervent hope that some solution can be developed which will lead to the President not setting foot in the Bitburg Cemetery. It is the wrong thing to do at a time in history when we need not be reminded about the atrocities committed by the Nazis in Germany. If the President's purpose on this trip is to help bring about reconciliation then let us not permit an action to be taken that can only reignite the horrors of an era in time when man's inhumanity to man was at its worst.●

● Mr. HERTEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is in support of the resolution asking the President to reconsider his visit to Bitburg Cemetery

during his trip to West Germany next month.

Since the purpose of the visit is to strengthen the bridges of mutual understanding and cooperation between a new generation of Germans and a new generation of Americans, the proposed visit to a cemetery to honor those who participated in the Nazi Holocaust has created a divisive issue, which if carried out, will do great harm to the goal and purpose of the overall exchange visit.

The magnitude of the controversy leaves no alternative measure but for the President to forthrightly declare that he will not participate in that function.●

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support House Concurrent Resolution 130 and urge its adoption by the House of Representatives.

President Reagan's decision to visit the Bitburg Military Cemetery in West Germany has touched a raw nerve in our country. No one denies the validity of the President's desire to mark the end of World War II in Europe in a way that demonstrates the bond of friendship that has developed between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany over the last 40 years. That is a good and proper purpose, and bespeaks the need for an appropriate ceremony which reflects the history of post-World War II Europe, while not forgetting the sacrifices of millions of soldiers and civilians who perished in that war. But, Mr. Speaker, the Bitburg Cemetery visit is not that kind of ceremony.

The Nazi SS troopers buried in Bitburg were members of an organization that perpetrated some of the worst atrocities of the Nazi era. American soldiers were among the victims of those actrocities, as were millions of people, of all religious faiths, who perished in the Nazi camps. It is the memories of these individuals that a President of the United States should honor; he should not be in a position where it appears that he is paying tribute to the memories of their tormentors.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the passage of this resolution will encourage the President to reconsider his trip to the Bitburg Cemetery. In so doing he will be acting in a manner consistent with what I believe to be the overwhelming sentiment of the American people, who want to commemorate the end of World War II while not forgetting its lessons.●

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolutions offered by the gentleman from Florida regarding the President's visit to Germany.

As this amendment states, it is indeed fitting and appropriate that the President visit Germany on the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II as an acknowledgment of our friendship and alliance with that nation today.

The 40 years which have passed since the end of the Second World War, however, have not dimmed the horrid memories of the atrocities committed by the Nazis in the Third Reich. These memories of a traumatized generation of Jews and of a shocked world will endure forever as a sign of, as Elis Weisel stated, "the fragility of the human condition."

The worst of these crimes were perpetrated by the SS, and they have overwhelmed the spirit of reconciliation which the President sought to bring with him to the Bitburg Cemetery. I truly believe that the President was not aware of the SS men buried in that cemetery when he made his decision, now that he is aware, however, another decision must be made, this time to forgo the Bitburg Cemetery.

If the President is to do so, yet still pay respect to the German people, we should seek the assistance of Chancellor Helmut Kohl, and ask that he withdraw his invitation to Bitburg and instead extend an invitation for the President to visit an appropriate site. I believe such an approach can preserve this visit as a concrete symbol of unity and reconciliation between the United States and Germany, rather than a divisive and painful moment for both nations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this amendment, but, more importantly, I urge the President to reflect on his commitment to humanity and cancel the visit to Bitburg.●

● Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is important that all sides are heard on the resolution to compel the President not to visit the Bitburg Cemetery. No one has argued or can argue that the visit is anything less than an unfortunate mistake, but we must remember that the President must have control of our foreign policy. We in Congress can and must let him know our feelings of the actions he takes, but we must not fall into the trap of having this legislative body—the Congress—make foreign policy.

It is for this reason that I take opportunity to express to the President that it is my opinion that he should not visit the cemetery if he thinks it is at all possible to cancel that part of his trip. The Nazi SS represent how base and immoral man can be and it would be a mistake to honor them in any way, even if unintended. I want to make it clear that my vote on this resolution does not mean that I feel the President should go to Bitburg, but instead it expresses my view of the function of Congress. While I express my personal disapproval as a Member of Congress, I believe that the President must make our foreign policy taking into account the feelings and counsel of individual Members of Congress and the people they represent, understanding that it is his decision to make.●

● Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the resolution which calls on the President to reconsider the inclusion of the Bitburg Military Cemetery on his agenda of his upcoming trip to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Despite intense and emotional opposition to the Bitburg Cemetery visit, the President remains firm in his judgment to carry out this function. Many veterans groups, as well as Jewish organizations have expressed their strong disapproval to this visit. This cemetery contains not only the remains of Nazi soldiers who fought against U.S. servicemen, but also some 30 members of the infamous SS, who were primarily responsible for the annihilation of some 12 million Jews and other innocent civilians.

I am outraged that the President will make such a visit. The President chooses to salute a very dark part of World War II history when thousands and thousands of innocent men, women, and children were selectively murdered, simply because they were Jews. The visit to the Bitburg Cemetery is a terrible mistake and its a decision which contradicts what this Nation stands for and represents throughout our 200-year-old history.

Instead, I believe the President should focus on the common goals of the German and American people and the cooperative relationship we have developed in the last 40 years. He should recognize what we have achieved today and what we can accomplish by working together for democracy in the future.

It is truly unfortunate that the President will visit Bitburg. Today, I join with the rest of my colleagues in the Congress in making a final plea to the President to remove the Bitburg visit from his agenda.●

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 130, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the President's upcoming trip to West Germany. I, like many other Members of Congress, had hoped that better judgment would have prevailed and the matter of Bitburg could have been resolved without the division and embarrassment caused by congressional resolutions and letters. As events have progressed, however, it is increasingly clear that a reassessment of the Bitburg visit will not be forthcoming without congressional pressure.

From the outset, let me make clear that I, like all Americans, applaud the trip's goal of reconciliation. Post-war Germany is a valued and trusted friend of the Western alliance, and the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II is an especially appropriate time to mark the deep friendship and

mutual respect that has developed between our great countries.

Reconciliation, however, must not be confused with the paying of homage to Waffen-SS, the military arm of Hitler's elite guard that was directly responsible for the horror of the Holocaust and the massacre of American soldiers. It is our responsibility to ensure that the Holocaust, the SS, and the reality that was Nazi Germany remain recorded and irreconcilable historical events so that they will not be repeated by future generations for whom they will be only a memory. In that vein, particularly on this 40th anniversary, the Bitburg visit is an especially unfortunate choice and sends, I believe, an inappropriate signal.

The justified concern and criticism surrounding the proposed Bitburg visit have already caused considerable harm to our relationship. For that reason, I recently joined with my friend from New York [Mr. MRAZEK] and 257 House colleagues in writing to Chancellor Kohl, urging that he withdraw his invitation to visit the Bitburg cemetery. I believe that such a gesture by Chancellor Kohl represented the most proper and diplomatic solution to the problem. Unfortunately, Chancellor Kohl's response to that urging makes it clear that we view the Bitburg visit from very different perspectives. As a result, the burden now rests with the President to reassess the Bitburg visit and, for that reason, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 130 as an expression of support for such as reassessment.

Mr. Speaker, there are better ways to express reconciliation and good will between our peoples, and several alternatives have been suggested to the President. Before we move further into a needless quagmire over this unfortunate error in judgment, I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 130 and call on the President to do the right thing, the only thing, that can bring about true reconciliation—cancel Bitburg.●

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my profound support for this amendment.

In the Second World War we and our allies struggled against some of the darkest forces the world has ever seen or experienced. The deeds and the ideology of the Third Reich was in its day and remains today utterly inimical to our principles of respect for human life and individual dignity.

It is true that many of the Nazi soldiers buried at Bitburg died simply following orders. What is more important for us, however, is that they died struggling to uphold the principles and defend the conquered territory of the Third Reich. To honor them by going to Bitburg would mock the sacrifice of those who died or lost loved ones in the struggle to destroy nazism, would cause tremendous anguish for those who suffered at the Nazis hands, and would give comfort to those who try to soften or deny the horror of the Third Reich. Finally, it would belittle ourselves by showing that we cannot distinguish between soldiers who died for freedom and those who died for nazism.

As we know, some of the soldiers buried at Bitburg were members of the dreaded SS units have organized and ran the extermination camps, performed political assissinations and even slaughtered American prisoners of war near the site of the Bitburg Cemetery. These unites were declared to be war criminals by the Nazi War Crimes Tribunal at Nuremberg. As far as I am concerned, the existence of these graves alone should be sufficient ground to keep the President away.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that honoring the memory of the Nazi dead in any way reflects honor on the citizens of persent-day Germany. Nor do I believe that not honoring these Nazis dishonors our present-day German allies. The horrors of the Nazi era are separate and distinct from the 40 years of peace and cooperation between the United States and Germany since 1945, and do not at all lessen the value of that partnership.

Should the President wish to emphasize the current friendship between our two countries, he could do so in innumerable ways that do not honor the memory of Nazi and SS soldiers. He could choose, for instance, to inaugurate a school or hospital, or even visit an installation of the present-day West German Armed Forces. Finally if he wished to pay tribute to Germans of the Nazi period, he could honor the memory of those who tried courageously to resist nazism, rather than those who died defending it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Second World War was unquestionably a tragedy for both sides. But it was also unique in world history in the extent of the moral divide that separated the two sides. Let us not acquiesce in the idea that because both sides lost many men, they each merit a tribute by our President. I urge your support for this amendment. Thank you.●

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 130).

The question was taken.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 130, the concurrent resolution just considered.

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

There was no objection.

AGREEMENT ON ESTABLISHMENT OF A FREE TRADE AREA BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 99-61)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Government Operations, and the Committee on Rules and ordered to be printed.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Monday, April 29, 1985.)

LET US NOT JEOPARDIZE THE LIVES AND SAFETY OF AMERICANS LIVING ABROAD

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the dilatory tactics that we have seen demonstrated today was reminiscent of last week's parliamentary shenanigans by the Republican side should send a——

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is reading from a paper in violation of rule XXX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the dilatory tactics of our Republican colleagues is reminiscent of the last week which resulted in the inability of this House to take under consideration the State Department authorization bill, which contained proposed language and authority to provide safety for our American diplomats living abroad. It further provided authority for antiterrorism training so that our Embassies could better provide safety for American diplomats abroad.

The Nation urgently needs this legislation and other bills that have been recommended by the administration in order to run the affairs of our Govern-

ment. I would suggest to our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, that if they wish to continue these dilatory tactics, they do them in ways that does not jeopardize the lives and safety of Americans living abroad.

Mr. Speaker, last week's parliamentary shenanigans by the Republican side should send a clear message to the President that the disarray in his own party now threatens his legislative program.

Because of the planned confusion inflicted by the Republicans last Thursday, we were unable to begin consideration of legislation—requested by the administration—to continue the operations of the Department of State in the next fiscal year. Every Member of this body should view these proceedings with concern. The bill held up last week would have provided much needed authorization for upgrading security at high diplomatic posts around the world, while providing additional authorization for a special antiterrorism training program the State Department is seeking to implement.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in urgent need of this legislation. If the Republican Party insists on going ahead with its plans to disrupt the working of the Congress, I suggest that they target their antics in a way that does not further jeopardize the lives and safety of American diplomats living abroad.

MARXIST ATTEMPT TO MANIPULATE AMERICAN MEDIA

(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, in the past few days, I have introduced a series of articles from Washington's leading newspaper the Times. These articles have exposed the Marxist Sandinista attempt to manipulate the American media and the American people against aid to the freedom fighters.

The very sanctuary of our churches is being violated by those who promote Marxist dictatorship over democracy.

Many well meaning people who are members of church congregations are being blatantly misled and coerced from behind the pulpit by those who advocate support for the Marxist Sandinistas.

Many clerics are preaching their politics, not their calling in a deliberate one-sided effort to disrupt U.S. policy in Central America. Several church organizations are, and I quote from the Washington Times, "Tightly woven into the network of leftists political groups whose primary goal is to seek radical change in U.S. policy."

I ask my colleagues and fellow church members, is this the kind of message we should be hearing from those to whom we look for spiritual guidance? A message of support for Marxist dictators whose basic ideology is that there is no God, and who use force to suppress religious freedom.

Today I want to include the last part of the "network" series entitled "Church Groups Bless Sandinista Cause" and appeal to every member of every congregation in America to read and find out the truth about our efforts to promote freedom and democracy in Central America.

The material follows:

"COERCIVE UTOPIANS": CHURCH GROUPS BLESS SANDINISTA CAUSE

(By John Holmes and Ed Rogers)

American church groups, many of which have long histories of involvement in national politics, are turning their attention to Central America in increasing numbers.

And while some church groups remain dedicated almost exclusively to promoting church extension, evangelism and the protection of human rights throughout Central America, others have become more involved in the movement to oppose U.S. foreign policy in the region.

Now, many church groups share common goals, projects, ideology and membership with some leftist political organizations. As a result, they are tightly woven into "The Network" of organizations whose primary goal is to seek radical change in Reagan administration policies in Latin America.

"Church groups in general, and leaders of the Catholic Church in particular, have become the most vocal and persistent opponents of the administration's anti-communist strategy in Central America," the Wall Street Journal reported in a 1983 news report.

Commenting on this church opposition, a senior administration official was quoted in the Journal as saying, "It's the toughest nut we have to crack."

The number of church and religious-affiliated organizations involved in these activities has grown in recent years. Some intelligence experts say that as much as 50 percent of the left-wing Latin American "Network" effort comes from groups and organizations manned, funded or coordinated by elements of some of the nation's major religious denominations.

And in many cases, they say, these groups are more radical, more active and much more heavily funded than their secular counterparts.

These church groups are "the most effective in lobbying . . . because they wear a cloak of legitimacy," said Michael D. Boggs, former director of international affairs at the AFL-CIO.

"They get folks to write letters who don't have the faintest idea what they're talking about," Mr. Boggs was quoted as saying in a 1982 article in Congressional Quarterly.

"The churches are the most active group and the most influential group lobbying against U.S. policy [in Latin America], without any doubt," concurred Kerry Ptacek, research director for the independent Institute for Religion and Democracy (IRD).

"I would say that the churches and their various executive groups were primarily responsible for the initial cutoff of aid to to the Contras," he said.

Perhaps most infuriating to critics is that some churches have provided money, credibility and an audience to a host of other groups critical of U.S. policy, ranging from "human-rights" organizations—such as the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA)—to a network of organizations openly sympathetic to guerrilla movements in Latin America.

"So many left activists are linked up with church groups that it's hard to know what is a real church group," IRD spokesman Penn Kemble said in the Congressional Quarterly story.

Few of the religious/political connections are overt but, in many cases, they are strong. And though some liberal churches maintain their own agenda, it bears strong resemblances to that pursued by many of their political counterparts.

One example of the tie-in between the church and political groups is the link between the National Council of Churches and the North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA). According to a 1984 study by the conservative Heritage Foundation, much of the research used by those who oppose Reagan policy in Central America is derived from NACLA.

NACLA was established in the NCC's offices in Washington in 1966, and receives financial support from numerous Protestant churches through the NCC's Latin American Division and through specific projects such as the Presbyterian hunger program, according to an IRD report.

Other groups, such as the Washington Office on Latin America, also benefit from church funding.

WOLA's 1983 Annual Report, for instance, lists $124,602 in contributions from religious organizations including the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; the American Lutheran Church; St. Luke Presbyterian Church; American Baptist Churches, U.S.A.; Board of Global Ministries (United Methodist Church); Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers; Maryknoll Sisters; Jesuit Missions; World Council of Churches; the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.; the Episcopal Church, and others.

The IRD also has documented mainline Protestant church support for radical political movements in the United States and in other nations, including Vietnam.

"Direct NCC involvement with the governments and Communist Party structures of the Indochina region is intense, conscious and on-going," IRD stated in a 1983 report titled, "A Time for Candor: Mainline Churches and Radical Social Witness."

The institute also has reported that the United Methodist Board funds the National Network in Solidarity with the Nicaraguan People, which was founded "to support and defend the Nicaraguan revolution," and other solidarity groups that assist the Salvadoran rebels.

"Support for the pro-Sandinista network in Nicaragua and the United States has come from money collected every Sunday in U.S. churches," the IRD commented in a 1984 report titled, "Church Support for Pro-Sandinista Network."

Primary among its examples is the controversial funding by church agencies of the Evangelical Committee for Aid to Development (CEPAD), which claims to represent Nicaragua's Protestant churches even though it supports the Sandinistas, according to the 1984 report.

Another Nicaraguan Protestant body known as the National Council of Evangelical Pastors (CNPEN), which doesn't support the Sandinistas, has received no funding from the U.S. mainline church agencies, the report states.

(This support for the Nicaraguan Sandinistas appears not to have declined over the years while other prominent supporters of the Sandinistas revolution, such as Robert S. Leiken, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment, have since become disillusioned.

(Mr. Leiken, writing in the October 1984 issue of New Republic, stated that a recent visit to Nicaragua had "convinced me that the situation is far worse than I had thought, and disabused me of some of the remaining myths about the Sandinistas revolution.")

In their 1983 book, "The Coercive Utopians," Rael Jean Isaac and Eric Isaac detail many examples of how church groups fund radical groups in Central America and elsewhere.

Among their accounts is that of David Jessup, an AFL-CIO official and member of the United Methodist Church who, they recount, read aloud in church a letter to President Carter asking for the cancellation of $5 million in aid to the Salvadoran military.

A subsequent killing of four Catholic churchwomen late that year sent shock waves through the church that have yet to subside.

Since then, many bishops repeatedly have opposed U.S. military aid to El Salvador and have called for negotiations with the communist rebels.

On many occasions, these clerics have preached their politics from the pulpits, and their remarks have been covered extensively in the Catholic press. This has helped to generate an outpouring of mail from priests, nuns and parishioners.

"We don't have a push button that turns on all the dioceses," said Mr. Quigley in the Congressional Quarterly article. But the USCC's Rev. Bryan Hehir noted in the same article, "When the bishops take that kind of leadership, there's bound to be a response."

Mr. Quigley is an example of the interconnection between the church and political groups. According to the Congressional Quarterly article, Mr. Quigley, along with his USCC duties, also has served on the boards of WOLA and the Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA), two of the better known groups in The Network that seek to change U.S. policy in Central America.

He also has worked with the Protestant National Council of Churches and helped start the Religious Task Force, which disseminates El Salvador information to a variety of Catholic clergy and laity, the article said.

Within the Catholic Church, the Maryknoll order of missionaries remains one of the most active segments. Maryknoll publications, which have a large Catholic audience in the United States, have for years emphasized El Salvador. The order also has contributed to several groups opposing U.S. policy.

Frequently on the cutting edge of this movement, the Maryknolls also are among the leaders in translating their beliefs onto film. They provided two grants to help produce a film titled "El Salvador: Another Vietnam" and they themselves produced a film called "Roses in December."

"Another Vietnam," which was nominated for an Academy Award in 1982, portrays the civilian-military regime as the culprit in El Salvador, and the message in "Roses," which tells the story of the four churchwomen killed in El Salvador in 1980 * * *. In the states, their letter-writing campaigns, teach-ins and demonstrations at some college campuses are a "mainstay" in Catholic opposition to U.S. involvement.

Some of the Catholic and Protestant church groups also are actively involved in sponsoring trips by American legislators, clerics and laymen to Central America. Though some of these trips have been highly publicized and apparently have had a strong impact on these who went, several groups have been sharply criticized for allegedly staging "slanted" tours.

The Boston-based Unitarian Universalist Service Committee has made "significant impact," according to the Congressional Quarterly story, by underwriting several congressional "study trips" to El Salvador, which usually include visits with rebels and other dissidents.

Reps. Gerry, Studds, D-Mass.; Thomas Petri, R-Wis.; and William Coyne, D-Pa., were among those who have gone on the trips.

Rep. Coyne later said the trip on which he went was a "political exercise" for his host and chided them for playing down abuse by the Latin American left, according to the Congressional Quarterly article.

Last month, two women who participated in a trip to Nicaragua sponsored by the American Lutheran Church Women complained in a written report to Rep. Vin Weber, R-Minn., that the trip had been turned into "two weeks of intensive anti-United States, pro-Sandinista indoctrination."

As many as 200 churches across the country also are involved in a "sanctuary" movement, in which illegal immigrants from Central America are clandestinely brought into the United States and hidden from Immigration and Naturalization Service agents who might seek their deportation, according to Elliott Abrams, assistant secretary of state for human rights and humanitarian affairs.

But wrote the Rev. Philip C. Cleary, chairman of the Association of Chicago Priests, "these refugees are quite literally fleeing for their lives. They are fleeing civil war and repressive governments that have been bolstered by the United States government."

"After fleeing such repression, to be sent back to their countries by the INS often means persecution, torture or death. For the INS to deport such refugees is completely immoral," Rev. Cleary wrote in 1982.

A study produced in January by the Washington-based Mid-Atlantic Research Associates states that the churches have been drawn into the movement by leftist groups whose real goal is overthrow of El Salvador's government.

"The national sanctuary movement is coordinated by supporters of Central America's Soviet- and Cuban-backed revolutionaries who have been engaged in a terrorist 'armed struggle' since the 1960s," the study said.

In a recent interview with The Times, Mr. Abrams cited a number of documents distributed by sanctuary movement organizations as "proof" that the movement's leaders "do not exclusively have human rights goals."

"They have political goals," he said, adding that their main target is to disrupt U.S. policy in Central America.

TIES BETWEEN FMLN, GUERRILLAS IN EL SALVADOR AND SANDINISTA REGIME IN NICARAGUA

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I made a 1-minute speech referring to a newspaper article describing documents captured by the Salvadoran Army on April 18, 1985. Since then, I have had the opportunity to see photocopies of those documents and read the translations of them. I am inserting into the RECORD a summary of those documents as well as the translation of one of those documents which is a letter from the Salvadoran guerrilla headquarters to the "Comrades of the National Directorate of the FSLN."

This letter is a clear indication of the direct ties between the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua and the FMLN guerrillas in El Salvador. In particular, I would like to quote several sentences from that document:

> The Sandinista popular revolution and the Salvadoran revolutionary movement are the most sensitive points in Central America and they could bog down the present Reagan administration. That is why we support the current diplomatic initiatives of the FSLN to gain time, to help Reagan's opposition in the United States, and to internationally isolate his aggressive plan towards Nicaragua and El Salvador.

It also states:

> We also consider that, given the level of our confrontation with imperialism and the puppet forces, our process requires a much higher level of logistic assistance. We believe that present circumstances are favorable to take daring steps in this direction.

ANALYSIS OF SOME OF THE DOCUMENTS CAPTURED BY SALVADORAN ARMY, APRIL 18, 1985

SUMMARY

We have analyzed a few of the documents captured from guerrillas of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) by the Salvadoran army on April 18, 1985. Even this small sampling confirms much of what we have been saying about the continuing mutual support between the Nicaraguan government and the Salvadoran FMLN. A letter from the top FMLN leaders to the National Directorate of the Sandinista Front for Nationa Liberation—FSLN refers to the logistical support given the FMLN by the Sandinistas. The letter also expresses support by the FMLN for decision by the Sandinista leadership to influence the United States electoral campaign by supporting President Reagan's opponents. Other documents refer to links to refugee camps in Honduras, to the Honduran Communist Workers Revolutionary Party (PRTC-H) to infiltration routes through Honduras to Nicaragua, Guatemala and Mexico, obtaining Honduran identity documents, and training courses for FMLN guerrillas in various communist countries.

The view of FMLN that the struggle in Central America is one between the forces of the democratic states led by the United States versus those of the communist world (they use "imperialism" vs. "socialist camp") emerges from the documents.

The impact of the United States success in Grenada is clear in several of the doucments as was their belief in late 1983 that the United States would take direct action

against Nicaragua. Plans were made to shift Salvadoran guerrilla military units to locations in the east (La Union) so that they could join in the fighting in Nicaragua and to transfer money and other materials (obviously from Nicaragua) to El Salvador so as not to lose them. One document indicated that this would be a joint decision of the FSLN and the FMLN.

PROOF OF NICARAGUAN COOPERATION WITH AND SUPPORT FOR THE SALVADORAN FMLN

The letter from the top leaders of the Salvadoran FMLN to the National Directorate of the Nicaraguan FSLN dated November 24, 1983 (in response to a report recieved from the FSLN) shows unmistakeably that Nicaragua has been providing logistical support for the FMLN in El Salvador, and states the need for a "higher level" of assistance. It also states that the FMLN leadership considers "that coordination and cooperation between us (the FMLN and FSLN) is of the highest priority. . . ."

INTERFERENCE IN THE U.S. ELECTIONS

The November 24, 1983 letter from the FMLN to the FSLN, states the FMLN's agreement with the Sandinistas that, in view of the electoral campaign in the United States, this was "the appropriate moment to influence the American electorate." The FMLN leaders stated that they would support the diplomatic initiatives of the FSLN government and the FSLN's help to "Reagan's opposition in the United States."

WAR WITHOUT FRONTIERS

The November 24, 1983 letter also pledges that in the event of an invasion FMLN guerrillas would fight anywhere in Central America "without regard to the territorial limits of our countries."

ACTIVITIES IN HONDURAS

We have numerous reports of FSLN and FMLN activities in Honduras, including the infiltration from Nicaragua into Honduras of Hondurans trained in Cuba and Nicaragua. Two of these attempts to send groups of 90-100 armed men into Hondurans were discovered by Honduran security forces occurred in July 1983 and in mid-1984. We also have reports showing the use of the Colomoncagua and Mesa Grand refugee camps in Honduras by Salvadoran guerrillas as sources of medical and food supplies and as rest and recreation centers for guerrillas who are rotated from combat to the camps for short periods. The Salvadoran army during raids on guerrilla encampments frequently finds caches of supplies bearing markings indicated they were provided by the United Nations High Commission on Refugees (UNHCR) to the refugee camps.

Among the documents captured on April 18 was an agenda for a "meeting with H of O" relating to operations and activities in Honduras. The Colomoncagua refugee camp is mentioned in it, but no details are given. Also "pasos ciegos" (infiltration routes) to Guatemala, Mexico and Nicaragua are mentioned, as is the subject of Honduran documentation. We have had previous reports of how Salvadoran guerrillas are able to obtain Honduran identification documents by bribing low-level officials, forgery or use of stolen documents. These documents enable some FMLN personnel to travel freely and organize in Honduras without attracting the attention of Honduran authorities. Also mentioned in the agenda is "Relations with the PRTC-H," an obvious reference to the FMLN's relations with the Revolutionary Communist Workers Party of Honduras.

SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE LAUNCHER

Among the documents captured is a diagram of a portable SAM-7 missile launcher, obviously used to instruct guerrillas in the use of the anti-aircraft missile launcher.

TRAINING IN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Also captured were lists of persons selected from the PRTC of El Salvador, one of the groups in the FMLN, for training in Vietnam, the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, and East Germany. There also were mini-biographic records of some PRTC militants, indicating, among other things, their training in Cuba.

[Translation]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
DIVISION OF LANGUAGE SERVICES,
El Salvador, November 24, 1983.

COMRADES OF THE NATIONAL DIRECTORATE OF THE FSLN: Fraternal and revolutionary greetings!

We have recently received from the FSLN Commission on Foreign Affairs a report on new diplomatic demarches you are carrying out.

Our evaluation is as follows:

1. We are in agreement in that the electoral period in the United States is the appropriate moment to influence the American electorate. The Sandinista Popular Revolution and the Salvadorean Revolutionary Movement are the most sensitive points in Central America and they could bog down the present Reagan administration.

That is why we support the current diplomatic initiatives of the FSLN to gain time, to help Reagan's opposition in the United States, and to internationally isolate his aggressive plan towards Nicaragua and El Salvador.

2. We consider that the joint efforts of the Socialist Camp, the National Liberation Movements, and all the Progressive Forces constitute the guaranty of the defeat of the warmongering and aggressive policy of Reagan.

3. It is also necessary to establish as a principle that the determining factor for our liberation process, as well as for the defense of Nicaragua, is the internal consolidation of the Sandinista Popular Revolution. That is why all the measures you are taking to incorporate all the people to the task of defense and the strengthening of the EPS are crucially important. The reasoning you are applying which affirms that the defeat of the imperialistic aggression is only possible through a true people's war is correct.

At this time, the highest priority for the FSLN is to continue and aggravate the wearing away of the enemy forces which in turn will allow us to enter that situation with our political and military forces better developed and consolidated, and with a larger capacity to bog down the aggression if it were to happen.

4. In view of the above, we consider that coordination and cooperation between us is of the highest priority, although this does not imply that measures taken have to be identical in both situations, but rather that they should be combined dialectically to permit us to move forward.

In our own case at this time, given the non-negotiating position of the imperialists and the dominant national classes, the dialogue does not play an important role in our diplomatic battles, but rather the efforts to muster international pressure to stop CONDECA's and the U.S.'s intervention and to build a large movement of solidarity towards our struggle.

5. We also consider that, given the level of our confrontation with imperialism and the puppet forces, our process requires a much higher level of logistic assistance. We believe that present circumstances are favorable to take daring steps in this direction.

Finally, we place great value on the new measure of our relations and in the search for a higher level of coordination that will multiply the potential of our two peoples in the historical struggle to defeat the imperialist intervention.

Comrades of the National Board, we are sure of the success of your work in defense of the Revolution.

United to Fight Until the Final Victory!!!
Revolution or Death! We shall Win!!!

FMLN GENERAL HEADQUARTERS:
CMDR. SHAFIK JORGE HANDAL.
CMDR. JOAQUIN VILLALOBOS.
CMDR. ROBERTO ROCA.
CMDR. LEONEL GONZALES.

TIME TO PUT FAIRNESS AND INTEGRITY ABOVE PARTISAN POLITICS

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is time to put fairness and integrity above partisan politics.

It is abundantly clear that the recount in Indiana's Eighth District came to an abrupt ending only when Democrat Frank McCloskey reached a 4-vote lead, also there were 42 ballots left to count. Even James Shumway, the Democrat-appointed recount supervisor, said the ballots not counted were indistinguishable on any legal basis or security basis from the ballots the task force had previously counted.

Mr. Speaker, the integrity and fairness of the Democratic Party is on the line. I sincerely hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will summon the courage to put fairness and integrity above party.

The New York Times, the Washington Post, the Washington Times, the Baltimore Sun, the Philadelphia Inquirer, and dozens of other responsible media are right. To seat Mr. McCloskey would be unjust, unfair, and undeserved.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following excerpts from several editorials calling for a new election in Indiana:

From the New York Times: The problem is that the recounts have been hopelessly tainted by the appearance of partisanship . . . Wisdom and fairness argue for a special election.—April 26, 1985

From the Wall Street Journal: There is simply no way the Democrats can look good saying a Democrat's four-vote victory is valid after they said a Republican's 400-vote victory was invalid.—April 22, 1985

From the Wall Street Journal: At some point, House Democrats are going to have to show they can survive into the future with-

out the help of a lot of highly publicized political finagling. A good start would be to vote next week for a new Indiana election and let Frank McCloskey show how a Democrat can earn his way into the House as an elected congressman, not as one of Tip's bananas.—April 24, 1985

From the Evansville, IN, Press: The recount . . . simply stopped 25 votes short of the end . . . Unless those votes—all the votes—are counted, those shouting for a special election . . . may more and more begin sounding like the voices of reason who have the candidates' best interests at heart.—April 20, 1985

From the Washington Post: In an election so close, neither contestant should be seated. The House, embroiled in an ear-splitting dispute over the outcome, should in fact declare the seat vacant and let Indiana hold another election.—April 23, 1985

From the Detroit News: Democrats evidently accepted those rules until their man crept ahead—and then quit.

House Republicans are rightly outraged about all this. Never before in American history has Congress ignored the certified results of an election that was conducted without allegations of fraud.—April 23, 1985

From the Denver Post: With a 70-vote House majority, Democrats hardly need to worry about losing one seat. But in their blind frenzy to protect one of their own, they've trampled on the rights of 500,000 Hoosiers to a voice in Congress.—April 1, 1985

From the Philadelphia Inquirer: Yet after so many contested recounts and partisan power plays, the only way to purge the taint of suspicion that either party stole the seat is to hold a new election, and the sooner the better.—April 24, 1985

From the Baltimore Sun: This was a virtual dead heat—and no winner ought to be declared. Otherwise, people will have another reason to be cynical about politics, and Mr. McCloskey will take his seat under a cloud.—April 22, 1985

From the Bakersfield Californian: There is no way the Democats can come out with the good conduct medal by saying a Democrat's four-vote victory is valid after they said a Republican's 400-vote victory was invalid.—April 23, 1985

From the Washington Times: Mr. McIntyre was twice certified the winner by the Indiana secretary of state. His margin of victory increased with each recount until the one managed by Mr. McCloskey's party in the House. If you think you detect the odor of fish, you're probably right.—April 23, 1985

From the Florida Times-Union: The Republican candidate was certified. In 81 disputed cases during the last 50 years the certified winner has always been seated provisionally.

There are enough discrepancies in this case to give the House reason to pause. As painful as it may be, the House should set aside partisan considerations and let a special election determine who deserves the seat.—April 23, 1985

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SCS

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago our Nation made a commitment to protect and preserve the soil and water resources of our country. This commitment was made to prevent our Nation from ever having to relive the hardship of another Dust Bowl.

April 27, 1985, marks the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the first permanent legislation to authorize the establishment of soil and water conservation programs by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The success of these programs is testimony to the hard work of our Nation's Soil Conservation Service and its employees. They are to be congratulated and commended for their record of the past 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise to express my support for soil and water conservation, and to express, on behalf of farmers and ranchers, the concern that soil conservation efforts continue.

Despite the expenditure over the last 50 years, the most recent SCS natural resource inventory identified 245 million acres of cropland—over 58 percent of the total—as needing some type of conservation treatment.

To say that this Nation's soil and water conservation programs have not been effective because we spend $800 million per year on conservation and that 58 percent of our cropland still needs some type of conservation treatment is like saying we shouldn't spend money on health care and doctors services because people are still getting sick.

For example, in 1984, Kansas farmers practiced conservation tillage on nearly 11.8 million acres—that's a 13-percent increase from 1983 when Kansas ranked first in the Nation in conservation tillage and had 12 percent of the Nation's conservation tillage acreage. And, some 20 counties developed independent conservation tillage committees that kept the public information on the importance of conservation tillage in erosion control and more productive farming. In that respect, conservation doesn't cost. It pays.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the history of SCS. This year we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Act of 1935. Congress passed this legislation at a time when this Nation was in the grips of the Great Depression and Dust Bowl. The fertile plains were literally drying up and blowing away.

During these "Dirty Thirties," the entire Great Plains region and real wealth of this Nation—our soil and water resources—were being threatened by destruction from wind and soil erosion. Congress created the Soil Conservation Service and this dedicated agency went to work.

Soil and water conservation is an investment in America's future and not a cost. Despite current surpluses, we have only to look at the continent of Africa to be reminded that our vast abundance of natural resources will be needed in the future to feed an ever growing and hungry world population.

Mr. Speaker, I know we are faced with a budget crisis of enormous proportions. Every farmer in this Nation has been squeezed by the record budget deficits which have led to high real rates of interest and an overvaluation of the U.S. dollar. This, in turn, has led to U.S. agricultural commodities being priced out of world markets.

However, the answer in our attempt to control spending is certainly not the elimination of the Soil Conservation Service. I call my colleagues attention to the recent action of the Agriculture Committee. In their consideration of the USDA's fiscal year 1986 budget, we recommend to the Budget Committee that the Soil Conservation Service and other USDA programs be funded at last year's level. This is not as much as we need for soil conservation, but it is a commitment both to deficit control and to conserving our natural resources.

As we reflect on the Soil Conservation Service's past 50 years preserving our Nation's most valuable resource, I urge my colleagues to adopt this approach.

BLUE RIBBON PANEL TO DEAL WITH WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, it would seem that almost daily we read another horror story in the press about the waste, fraud, and abuse within the Department of Defense with regard to contractors dealing with the Department of Defense. I do not think anyone can question my credentials as to being a strong supporter of defense.

For this reason, though, Mr. Speaker, I feel there is an eroding confidence in the American people in our ability—our being the Federal Government, dealing with the Executive, the Congress, and the Department of Defense, to manage our affairs when it comes to maintaining a strong defense posture.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I have written to the President of the United States urging that he appoint a blue ribbon panel, similar to the Scowscroft Commission, of the most prestigious people that he can find to come together and to deal with the problem, which is bigger than the Department of Defense and bigger than any particular agency of Government.

I think then and only then can we show the American people we are capable of first defining the problem

and, second, coming up with a solution to deal with it.

I think when we do that, we will again establish our capability, our credibility, and we will once again capture the support and the confidence of the American people.

Anything short of that, Mr. Speaker, I think will be viewed as just another Band-Aid on the big problems that we see.

I urge the President to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter that I have sent to the President:

APRIL 1, 1985.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT. The purpose of this letter is to recommend that you establish a Presidential Blue Ribbon Panel on Government Procurement Reform.

I feel that the present situation regarding the perceptions of the government procurement process, especially in the defense sector, is intolerable.

The almost daily revelation of action and alleged abuses of the system is, in reality, diverting the debating on defense from the proper direction. Instead of debating the need for a strong defense, many critics are citing these sensational revelations as prime reasons to cut the defense effort. Reasoned debate about the need for a strong defense is lost in the rhetoric surrounding waste, fraud, and abuse.

The continual drumbeat of adverse publicity which generates public outcry also engenders ad hoc and fragmented approaches aimed at correcting the situation. Various apsects of defense procurement are being separately addressed, legislated, and changed. Policies and legislation mandating warranties, spare parts competition, overhead charges certification of allowable costs, withholding of progress payments, suspensions of contractors, increased cost reporting, etc., are being imposed in an uncoordinated and reactive manner.

I certainly recognize there are abuses of the system which must be rooted out and fully prosecuted if appropriate, but I refuse to believe the situation is as bad as the popular press would have the American people believe.

Mr. President, our citizens are looking to this administration for leadership in this area. We have the opportunity to respond to the public concern and turn the situation into a positive force for review and reform of the government acquisition process.

Ideally, the Blue Ribbon Procurement Panel I recommend should be a bipartisan effort with clearly defined goals eventually including proposed legislative changes. Panel membership could include representatives of business and government.

In the interests of national defense, Mr. President, I urge that you establish such a panel as soon as possible. If you decide to act on my suggestion, I will support your efforts in any way you deem appropriate.

Sincerely,

WM L. DICKINSON.

THE TRADE DEFICIT

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

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Department of Commerce will announce the trade deficit for the previous month. It is bound to be another record setter, as it is every month that they release these figures.

The trade deficit for last year was $123 billion and it is expected to soar to $150 billion this year.

There are other statistics flowing out of the Department of Commerce, including one that shows that consumer demand is up rather dramatically, but at the same time the GNP growth is down. The difference is being made up by imports.

The major cause of the trade deficit can be laid at the doorstep of the overvalued dollar. Ambassador Brock, before he left that Department, has told us that the overvalued dollar is responsible for about 80 percent of the trade deficit.

Mr. Speaker, to date the administration appears to have no strategy or policy to deal with our trade problems. Later this week he will journey to Bonn where he will participate in the upcoming economic summit. I hope that he will join his fellow Heads of State and deal with this overvalued and currency misalignment problem.

Later I will be introducing legislation that will be a sense of Congress that the President should take up this issue when he attends the meeting in Bonn later this week.

Mr. Speaker, the sense-of-Congress resolution I intend to offer is as follows:

Whereas the magnitude and growth of the United States merchandise trade deficit, which reached $123.3 billion in 1984, is unsustainable and could result in United States indebtedness to foreign interests approaching $1 trillion by the end of this decade;

Whereas the United States balance of trade in manufactured goods has deteriorated from a surplus of $5.3 billion in 1981 to a deficit of $88.7 billion in 1984;

Whereas United States agricultural exports have declined more than $5.5 billion since 1981;

Whereas unprecedented Federal budget deficits have contributed significantly to persistently high real interest rates and an enormous real appreciation of the United States dollar against major foreign currencies;

Whereas the inflated value of the dollar is a major cause of the massive trade deficit of the United States by effectively acting as a heavy tax on United States exports and a costly subsidy of imports;

Whereas the inflated dollar is causing United States manufacturing enterprises to reduce domestic production by purchasing more component parts from foreign sources and by making more capital investments outside the United States;

Whereas this development is weakening the productive capability of the United States and is costing the United States millions of jobs;

Whereas the inflated dollar is exacerbating the present crisis in farming in the United States by substantially inhibiting United States agricultural exports;

Whereas a fair share of world markets is essential to present and future United States prosperity and job growth;

Whereas the existing free-floating exchange rate system is proving incapable of assuring fair and reasonable terms of trade; and

Whereas at the 1983 economic summit in Williamsburg, Virginia, the President made a commitment to "define the conditions for improving the international monetary system and to consider the part which might, in due course, be played in this process by a high-level international monetary conference": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the President should make the overvalued dollar, the growing United States trade deficit, and cooperative measures to redress these grave imbalances a top priority of the economic summit meeting to begin in Bonn, West Germany, on May 2, 1985; and

(2) as part of this effort, the President should seek specific assurances and commitments from participating governments to—

(A) join with the United States in gradually reducing the inflated foreign exchange value of the United States dollar;

(B) take immediate steps to stimulate domestic demand and business investment in their respective economies; and

(C) convene a multilateral conference before the end of 1985 to ensure greater stability in exchange rate movements.

SEC. 2. The President is requested to report to the Congress, within 45 days after the end of the economic summit meeting in Bonn, West Germany, on the results of his efforts to achieve the goals described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of the first section of this resolution.

□ 1520

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent during certain votes taken on Thursday, April 25, 1985.

On rollcall No. 70, the House approved the Journal of the prior day's proceedings, by a yea-and-nay vote of 216 to 177. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 71, the House authorized the reading of a paper, by a yea-and-nay vote of 351 to 14. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 72, the House agreed to the resolution (H. Res. 137) providing for the consideration of the bill authorizing appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies, by a yea-and-nay vote of 383 to 0, with one Member voting present. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 73, the House agreed to table the motion to reconsider the vote by which House Resolution 137 was agreed to, by a yea-and-nay vote of 212 to 157, with one Member voting

present. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 74, the House voted to sustain a ruling of the Chair with respect to the RECORD, by a yea-and-nay vote of 200 to 156. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 75, the House agreed to a motion to adjourn, by a yea-and-nay vote of 201 to 153. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. Speaker, also I was necessarily absent during a procedural vote taken this morning. On rollcall No. 76, the House approved the Journal of the prior day's proceedings, by a yea-and-nay of 158 to 130, with three Members voting present. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."●

A TRIBUTE TO JACK DEPPNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. NELSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

● Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise before the body to pay tribute to one of Central Florida's finest humanitarians, Jack Deppner.

For over two decades, Jack Deppner has inspired the youth of our Nation to excel both intellectually and atheletically.

Born and raised in Miamisburg, OH, Jack Deppner graduated from Dayton University and began his career in the Dayton school system. Although he taught gymnastics and biology during the school year, Jack spent his summers coaching diving at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

In 1968, Jack and his wife moved to central Florida where he taught elementary school at Patrick Air Force Base. After serving for 3 years, he transferred to Hoover Junior High School in Cocoa Beach, FL, where he was selected as Teacher of the Year for 1981-82. Jack also served two terms as the Brevard County Historical Society president.

Several of Coach Deppner's students have excelled in international competition. Jan Pope, a Deppner student in the sixties, was a medal winner in the Pan Am games. Sam Hall and Tom Gomph both competed in the Tokyo Olympics and won gold and silver medals respectively. Jack Deppner's latest accomplishment came when Kathy Johnson of Indialantic, FL, won the bronze medal in the balance beam competition in the 1984 Summer Olympics in Los Angeles.

It is a pleasure to recognize the talents of this gifted individual from my congressional district.●

LEGISLATION TO END PROHIBITION OF MEDICAL USE OF MARIJUANA FOR SERIOUSLY ILL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing for the third time legislation to end the unnecessary and unjust prohibition of the medical use of marijuana for seriously ill Americans, namely, those suffering from cancer and glaucoma. Congressional inaction on this legislation in the past has allowed the continued suffering of those cancer and glaucoma patients who would benefit from the therapeutic use of marijuana. This suffering easily could be alleviated through responsible action.

The bill I am introducing today is the vehicle for such responsible action; it would allow the controlled medical use of marijuana only by cancer and glaucoma patients. Many of the drugs which doctors prescribe daily are considered dangerous, abusable drugs. Nonetheless, they are recognized for their medical value and are treated accordingly by Federal law. My legislation recognizes marijuana's well-established medical value, and adapts Federal law to allow its medical use. The Federal regulation of drugs must be distinguished between social abuse and medical use. Currently, marijuana is a schedule I drug under the Control Substances Act. Schedule I includes those drugs considered to have no accepted medical use in the United States. This legislation would reschedule marijuana to schedule II, a category which contains those drugs, despite being abusable, that have an acceptable medical use.

As many of my colleagues know, 33 States have enacted legislation allowing the medical use of marijuana. However, these farsighted laws have either been impossible to implement or severely limited in scope due to outdated Federal laws and unresponsive policies. Several States, through resolutions passed in their legislatures or with language contained in State therapeutic marijuana program reports, have strongly urged passage of Federal legislation. It is time that Congress recognize what a majority of our States have already acknowledged—the successful use of, and need for, the medical use of marijuana.

Many cancer and glaucoma patients deserve to receive relief from proper applications of medical marijuana. The applications would both reduce the sickening after effects and loss of appetite associated with anticancer therapies. The National Cancer Institute [NCI] estimates that 800,000 to 1 million new cases of cancer are diagnosed in the United States each year. Of these numbers, NCI estimates that 250,000 or more will undergo radiation treatments. Over half of those being treated will suffer intense and uncontrollable nausea and vomiting, known clinically as emesis.

Presently, two drugs are commonly used as antiemetics for persons undergoing anticancer therapies; companzine and a synthetic form of delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinois [THC]. Yet for most patients, these drugs fail to provide adequate relief. By contrast, medical use of marijuana has proven much more successful. Data revealed by States, who managed to organize and manage marijuana therapy programs despite Federal disincentives, indicate a high success rate. For example, success rates of the programs in New Mexico, Michigan, Tennessee, and New York have been reported to be between 80 and 90 percent—much higher than rates of conventional drugs. With such high success rates, it is inconceivable that unfounded fears and inept Government procedures prevent warranted remedy, prolonging the suffering of so many Americans.

Glaucoma, a leading cause of blindness, is the general name given to an ill-defined group of eye diseases. Glaucoma is incurable, but may be controlled either by drugs or surgery. The National Eye Institute [NEI] estimates that 2 million Americans are experiencing this infliction. Many of those inflicted, however, are unable to receive adequate relief which application of marijuana could bring about. The medical use of marijuana in treatment of glaucoma patients has been proven useful due to its ability to lower intraocular pressure. Intraocular pressure, if unrelieved, causes damage to the optic nerve resulting in blindness. In addition, marijuana enhances the utility of other control medications used for glaucoma.

While the evidence grows in support of using marijuana in certain medical situations, the human need for medical marijuana application becomes more dire. Mr. Speaker, I know of too many instances when cancer or glaucoma patients have suffered or are suffering unnecessarily; I am sure many of my colleagues know of similar cases. The conscience of Congress demands an expedient response to prevent this tragic occurrence in our country. By supporting this legislation, let us begin to make the necessary distinction between the medical use of, and the social abuse of, marijuana. Let us begin to meet the needs and respect the dignity of so many suffering Americans.●

INTRODUCTION OF AMENDED "FAIR AND SIMPLE TAX" REFORM BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New York [Mr. KEMP] is recognized for 15 minutes.

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with Mr. LOTT, a slightly amended version of the Kemp-Kasten-Lott "Fair and Simple Tax" (FAST: H.R. 2222). The basic thrust is the same: Lowering the tax rates, broadening the tax base, expanding family-oriented deductions, and instituting a new exclusion for wage and salary income.

Aside from some technical corrections, the main policy changes concern the tax treatment of the working poor and of the domestic mineral industry.

FURTHER HELP FOR THE WORKING POOR

One of the features of the Kemp-Kasten-Lott "Fair and Simple Tax," of which I am most proud, is its tax relief for the working poor. For example, our bill, like its earlier version, raises the tax-free level of income for a traditional family of four from $9,440 to $14,125—that is, from nearly $2,000 below to about $3,000 above the poverty level. Earlier versions of our bill would remove about 1½ million of the lowest-income taxpayers from the income tax rolls.

Nevertheless, we have not stopped thinking of ways to improve the tax treatment of the working poor. The new bill contains two especially important changes. First, we have substantially raised the zero-bracket amount for single heads of household, from $2,480 under current law to $3,200 (all figures are for 1986). This raises the income tax threshold for a single parent with one child from $4,640 to $9,000 (not including the earned income tax credit).

Second, we have made a number of innovative changes in the earned income tax credit to increase work incentives at low incomes and support intact families with children. Our plan establishes three important principles, of which the first two were strongly recommended yesterday by Robert B. Carleson in testimony before the House Select Committee on Children Youth and Families' Task Force on Economic Security. I am grateful to him for his contribution.

First, our bill ties the percentage of the earned income tax credit to the combined employer/employee Social Security payroll tax. For 1986, this means that the credit is increased from 11 percent under current law to 14.3 percent under Kemp-Kasten-Lott. This explicitly recognizes that the earned income tax credit is not welfare, but a refund of taxes already paid by families who earn their own income. The credit was originally set at 10 percent of income because that was approximately the combined payroll tax rate at the time. But the payroll tax has risen substantially since then. Therefore we should increase the credit in step with the payroll tax.

Second, our new bill relates the maximum earned income tax credit for the first time to the size of a family. Under current law, the credit is the same for a single parent with one child as for a family of three, four, five. Our new bill starts phasing out the credit at $4,500 for a family of two, $5,000 for a family of three, and $5,500 for a family of four or more persons. Basing this on the number of persons in the family rather than the number of children gives an edge to intact families with both parents living together.

Third, our bill retains the important principle contained in our earlier bill, that the earned income tax credit should be fully phased out before taxpayers reach the bottom tax bracket. This is important for keeping down the high marginal tax rates on the poor, because phasing out the credit effectively raises the marginal tax rate; when this overlaps with the bottom tax brackets, it can result in high tax rates at low incomes. For example, under current law, the Treasury plan and the Bradley-Gephardt plan, many taxpayers earning less than $11,000 face Federal marginal tax rates of 30 percent to 35 percent, due to the combination of the ordinary income tax, the employee's share of the payroll tax, and the phaseout of the EITC. This occurs when the taxpayers reach the income tax brackets before the EITC is phased out at $11,000. This only makes it more difficult for low-income people to work their way out of poverty.

Under Kemp-Kasten-Lott, no taxpayer in this range would face a combined marginal tax rate higher than 26 percent, because the EITC is always phased out before the taxpayer reaches the bottom tax bracket. For example, the credit for two-person families is phased out at about $8,800, for three-person families at about $9,700, and for families with four or more persons at about $10,750. These levels, are below the income tax thresholds under Kemp-Kasten-Lott, respectively, of $9,000 for a single parent with one child, $11,500 for a family of three, and $14,000 for a family of four. (The figures refer to single-parent families; the tax-free levels for two-parent families of the same size—that is, with one fewer dependent—are slightly higher.)

Though the EITC is phased out somewhat sooner under Kemp-Kasten-Lott than under current law, the tax burden is lower in almost every case because the percentage is larger, and because Kemp-Kasten-Lott substantially raises the income tax threshold. (See table 1.)

DOMESTIC MINERAL INDUSTRY

The new bill retains current law treatment of intangible drilling costs, percentage depletion allowances, and mineral development costs. I believe these changes are necessary to encourage domestic energy and mineral supply. They are especially important because the mineral industry is severely depressed, becoming dangerously dependent on foreign sources thus threating our security. More than 60 percent of our operable drilling rigs are idle. Yet merely to replace depleting domestic oil reserves we need to drill 100,000 new wells a year, almost double current rates. Last year, the United States spent $60 billion to import foreign oil.

Meanwhile, our Government plans to spend $7.9 billion more to subsidize synthetic fuels, $17.8 billion to store oil in a strategic petroleum reserve, and current tax law contains $5 billion in energy conservation tax credits through 1989. If we, as a nation, believe energy is important enough to spend this much to replace our domestic energy, it is certainly equally important to produce domestic energy and provide incentives for the exploration and production of new sources of energy.

The main change concerns the treatment of intangible drilling costs. Current law permits expensing these costs—deducting them in 1 year rather than over many years—because they do not result in any recoverable property value. Our earlier bill provided expensing-equivalent for intangible drilling costs. This meant that the costs were treated like investments in depreciable property under Kemp-Kasten's Neutral Cost Recovery System (NCRS): the deductions were spread out over several years, but the total deductions were increased according to inflation plus a real rate of return. For example, instead of writing off $1,000 of expenses in 1 year, the earlier bill allowed $1,153 to be written off over 4 years, assuming 5 percent inflation. What economists call the "present value"—the value of the deductions adjusted for the nominal rate of return over time—was the same in both cases: $1,000, assuming a 3.5-percent real rate of return. Only the timing or the "cash flow" was different.

However, after explaining all aspects of this issue and discussions with experts in the oil and gas industry, it became clear to me that the current law treatment would be better for the small independent oil and gas drillers who drill and discover most of the oil and gas in this country. For independent oil producers, unlike the big oil companies, there is an important difference between expensing and expensing-equivalent: the difficulty of borrowing from the banking system to finance the high-risk venture of oil exploration. This is a difficulty not faced by big oil companies or other large and well-established corporations. This amended bill will remove the problem, and greatly encourage much-needed

domestic energy and mineral production.

This new bill is a progrowth, projob and profamily tax bill which can help move both the debate and the economy forward to new levels of employment and opportunity for America.

TABLE 1.—KEMP-KASTEN AND THE WORKING POOR (COMPARISON WITH 1986 CURRENT LAW, FEDERAL INCOME TAX)

	1 parent, 1 child			1 parent, 2 children			2 parents, 1 child			1 parent, 3 children			2 parents, 2 children		
	Current law	Kemp-Kasten	Change	Current law	Kemp-Kasten	Change	Current law	Kemp-Kasten	Change	Current law	Kemp-Kasten	Change	Current law	Kemp-Kasten	Change
Income:															
$1,000	−$110	−$143	−$33	−$110	−$143	−$33	−$110	−$143	−$33	−$110	−$143	−$33	−$110	−$143	−$33
$2,000	−220	−286	−66	−220	−286	−66	−220	−286	−66	−220	−286	−66	−220	−286	−66
$3,000	−330	−429	−99	−330	−429	−99	−330	−429	−99	−330	−429	−99	−330	−429	−99
$4,000	−440	−572	−132	−440	−572	−132	−440	−572	−132	−440	−572	−132	−440	−572	−132
$5,000	−510	−569	−59	−550	−715	−165	−550	−715	−165	−550	−715	−165	−550	−715	−165
$6,000	−400	−419	−19	−519	−565	−46	−550	−565	−15	−550	−630	−80	−550	−630	−80
$7,000	−228	−269	−41	−348	−415	−67	−479	−415	64	−467	−480	−13	−489	−480	9
$8,000	14	−119	−133	−115	−265	−150	−247	−265	−18	−234	−330	−96	−366	−330	36
$9,000	256	0	−256	127	−115	−242	−15	−115	−100	2	−180	−182	−133	−180	−47
$10,000	515	192	−323	369	0	−369	226	0	−226	240	−30	−270	99	−30	−129
$11,000	778	384	−394	627	0	−627	468	0	−468	482	0	−482	339	0	−339
$12,000	931	576	−355	767	96	−671	600	72	−528	616	0	−616	459	0	−459
$13,000	1,101	768	−333	917	288	−629	740	264	−476	756	0	−756	588	0	−588
$14,000	1,271	960	−311	1,087	480	−607	880	456	−424	904	144	−760	728	0	−728
$15,000	1,441	1,152	−289	1,257	672	−585	1,020	648	−372	1,074	192	−882	868	168	−700

Note: Estimates for indexing based on CBO economic assumptions. Examples assume all earned income.●

PRESIDENT REAGAN URGED TO FIND ANOTHER WAY TO COMMEMORATE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF WORLD WAR II

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

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, thank you for scheduling this special order on the President's decision to visit a cemetery in Bitburg, Germany.

As we all know, from having just participated in a debate on a resolution on this very subject, the President's decision to make this cemetery visit has become extremely controversial. It has not only opened the wounds of thousands of Holocaust survivors both in this country and in other parts of the world, it has outraged American veterans throughout the land.

Perhaps most importantly, however, as I tried to indicate in the brief minute that I had on the debate on the resolution just finished, this decision raises serious questions about the competence of this administration to conduct a responsible, viable foreign policy. It has given potential ammunition to the Soviet leadership and to other adversaries to use against this administration and to use against this Nation. It raises serious questions about this administration's judgment and its sense of right and wrong. This decision has opened old wounds at home and abroad and raised serious questions about our leadership not just among our adversaries but among our friends throughout Western Europe. Anybody who watched any of the television shows over the weekend, anybody who opened any of the newspapers in this country, anybody who opened any of the newspapers in Western Europe could simply see by scanning the headlines that rather than improve our relations with our Western European allies, this decision has done more to raise questions and create strains between the United States and our close friends throughout Western Europe than any decision that has been taken in some time.

In the German military cemetery in Bitburg where the President plans to lay a wreath are the graves of 49 members of the Nazi SS. The SS played a central role in the most hideous atrocities of the Third Reich. James Dickenson, writing in the April 28, 1985, Washington Post described the SS in this fashion:

> With their black uniforms, death's head, a symbol of their willingness to die for Adolf Hitler on their caps, and the runic double S flashes on their collars, the SS men were the most fanatical of Hitler's followers and the terror of the entire European Continent. Whatever the actual roles of the young men buried at Bitburg, the SS is one of the most potent symbols of the evil and cruelty in history.

In April 1941, Heinrich Himmler, the head of the SS and the Gestapo, directed that all concentration camp guard units be part of the Waffen SS. At its peak there were 1 million men in the SS. An SS artillery regiment committed the first Nazi military atrocity of the war in the early days of the invasion of Poland when it shot to death some 50 Polish Jews who had been ordered to repair a bridge. Other members of this notorious elite arm of the Nazis were responsible for carrying out the unspeakably barbarous task of exterminating some 6 million Jews, 1 million of whom were children, and some 5 million non-Jewish civilians. Think of it. A total of 11 million men, women, and children murdered at the hands of the Nazi SS. This is a story that every American, every Western European, and most citizens of the world understand and understand quite clearly, and it is a story whose wounds are opened anew by this very tragic and unfortunate decision.

It was Nazi SS officers who carried out the worst atrocity against American Armed Forces in the European theater in what became known as the Malmedy Massacre. Some 100 American soldiers were murdered in cold blood by the SS at Malmedy. According to former West German Chancellor Willie Brandt, it is well known in Bitburg that the cemetery graves of Nazi SS men include those who massacred U.S. prisoners of war. The President has been urged by Mr. Brandt to reconsider his decision. A majority of both the House and the Senate have asked German Chancellor Helmut Kohl to release President Reagan from his commitment to visit the cemetery, but unfortunately, as of this time, these messages have fallen on deaf ears.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan's planned visit to Bitburg has rubbed salt in the wounds of thousands of Holocaust survivors who know all too well the unspeakably horrible deeds carried out by the Nazi SS. There is simply no way for them to forget, no way for them to escape the memories of their torment and of their suffering.

We must not forget. The world must not forget. And, unfortunately, the visit to this cemetery suggests that somehow these actions should be placed in some form of relative perspective.

When President Reagan said that the German soldiers of World War II were victims just as surely as the victims of concentration camps, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, either he, or his staff, or some combination have fallen into a terrible trap. It is a trap that can all too often infect the body politic when it is so involved in the efforts to weigh and analyze various forms of decisions, various forms of compromise. Mr. Speaker, there are some

acts, there have been some historical lessons, that are too barbarous, too evil to fall into this form of relativism.

The Nazi SS was just that. New York Times columnist Anthony Lewis has written that the Nazi SS were part of a world of absolute evil. That the President should call them victims reveals a great insensitivity to what the SS and the Nazis were all about.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think the comment made by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], several minutes ago during the course of the debate with regard to the resolution sums up the message that those of us on both sides of the aisle are trying to provide to the President when he is asked to reconsider his trip. That message is that relativism should not have reached the level where we cannot condemn the moral outrages of the Nazi empire and where we should allow those old wounds to be reopened.

Mr. Speaker, we do not believe in collective guilt nor do we impugn the good will of the German people. We are proud of the relationship between the United States and Germany today. It is an important relationship and one that, starting with the Marshall plan, throughout the past 40 years has carefully and appropriately been rebuilt on both sides of the Atlantic. But that does not change the past. It cannot be buried and forgotten with the bodies of those 49 Nazi SS members.

Elie Wiesel, perhaps the most eloquent chronicler and witness to the Holocaust, and perhaps its most well-known survivor today, has implored the President to find another way to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the allied victory of Nazi Germany in World War II. There are so many other appropriate ways in which this reconciliation can be pursued. Out of respect for the memory of those who died and for those who carry their memories and suffering to this day, we respectfully urge the President to heed this call and to find another way.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVINE of California. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

□ 1530

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. First, I would like to commend the gentleman and thank him for requesting this time, this special order, on this most troubling of subjects.

Unfortunately, some of the debate about this subject has been treated as if what we are dealing with is some kind of personal criticism of the President, or the President's attitude on one or another subjects. I think it is most important that we underscore that the debate here is what this Nation stands for and how it expresses, through its top, elected official, its President, how it reflects on and states to the world our opinions; our feelings.

Symbols become important in that regard, and as the controversy over the President's ill-advised visit grows, this whole matter takes on that much more significance. For if we fail in our attempt to persuade the President to cancel his visit to Bitburg, we will have been seen as failing to come to grips with this important choice for our country.

That is why it is ever the more important that the President be strong; not weak. It seems to me it is a sign of weakness to go forward with something that so many, that such a broad consensus, the Representatives of this country, have stated to him. Do not go to Bitburg; in doing so, you are not promoting reconciliation, but you are debasing the memory of our own veterans who have fallen. You are suggesting that somehow those fallen in combat suffered the same fate as the Holocaust victims who the Nazis sought to exterminate.

This is the time for the strength of a leader who says, I understand my country; I understand that if I have taken a step, which I believe the President has, to do something that does not properly promote future reconciliation, but the risk that we will not have learned the lessons of the Holocaust, or the lessons of the Nazis, it is so important that the President use his leadership skills at this time to change direction. I think he will be commended by all Americans when he does so. The healing that is needed is needed here on this issue at this time.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman for his extremely important and perceptive remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST].

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

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today to express my fervent hope that the President will change his mind and cancel his participation in a memorial ceremony at the Bitburg Cemetery. A cemetery which houses the graves of some of Hitler's infamous SS guard—his concentration camp executioners, and slaughterers of American POW's. Mr. President, this visit is an insult to the survivors of the Nazi Holocaust, to the American soldiers who fought to rid the world of the Nazi plague, and to the memories of all those who perished in the death camps and on the battlefields.

I don't need to recount the atrocities committed by Hitler and the SS. We have all seen pictures of the infamous death camps and been moved by the testimony of those few who survived the horror. We know that the crimes committed there were crimes not just against Jews, but against humanity. And we recognize that those crimes were the most heinous in the history of mankind. For the President of the United States, the leader of the free world, to appear to sanction those crimes in any way is unconscionable.

Many have said during this debate that the time has come to forgive and forget. Certainly, we bear no ill will toward the people of Germany today—they have been our friends and allies for many, many years.

But how can we forget? How can we forget when at every Holocaust memorial ceremony there are dozens of men and women who still wear the numbers that were burned into their arms, and still bear even deeper scars internally? How can we forget the murder of 6 million Jews? How can we forget the torture and the gas chambers?

We cannot forget, and we must not. For many Americans whose lives were touched by the Nazi atrocities, this is an intensely personal wound that will not heal. They believe, as I do, that to forget debases the memory of those who suffered and died.

More importantly, they understand that to forget would be dangerous. Our sense of history and our sense of decency are the only assurances we have that this senseless tragedy will never be repeated. To honor the Nazis, Mr. President, is an affront to both.

I applaud your moves toward reconciliation, but caution you that we must not pay too high a price. We must not sacrifice our remembrance. You have spoken often of the great good and collective wisdom of the American people and the people have spoken clearly on this matter. This Nation looks to you for moral leadership. I ask that you display the courage needed to provide that leadership. Admit that a terrible mistake has been made, accept responsibility for that mistake, and cancel your visit to the cemetery. Whatever the consequences of that action might be, you must remember that this is a moral, not a political question.

Again, Mr. President, I urge you to heed the words of Elie Wiesel who spoke for so many of us when he implored you to "find another way."

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his very insightful remarks.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BURTON].

Mrs. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, for me, this is particularly a very difficult moment. If I did not come to this country before Hitler invaded Poland, I would not be standing here and talking.

I cannot understand, for the life of me, why the President is going to pay homage to those people in the cemetery, the Waffen SS people, which were the worst of the lot. The worst. That he is going to pay homage at the

cemetery in Bitburg. It is difficult for me to speak, because I will really break out crying.

Mr. Speaker, you are looking at a woman who does not have an uncle or an aunt or a cousin left. They all perished either in Auschwitz or Treblinka. The President of the United States, our President, is going to pay homage to the SS people buried in Bitburg. I cannot understand it. I cannot understand it; it troubles me; it bothers me.

I know that Mr. Reagan is not a bad man; I know he served in the Second World War. I myself saw him in uniform once in California. I know that he does not mean to do any harm to our people, whether they are Jews or non-Jews. I think it is just a misguided thing that happened to him. He was misguided by the people who went out there to see where the President is going to lay a wreath.

Now, we can have reconciliation with the German people; with the West German people. We have had it for the last—what is it—30, 40 years? We have had it, and I think that the United States has been a great friend to the Germans, who, after this terrible Holocaust, did not have anything. They were bombed out; they did not have any money; they were starving. Who came in to help? The Americans. The Americans built up the German economy.

To say that we need this deed to have a reconciliation with the West German people, that is really untrue, unfair, and unjust. Be just, my heart really cries out to the President. Do not do this thing, Mr. President. Be strong; be just; be fair; please, Mr. President, do not go to Bitburg, please.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentlewoman for her very eloquent remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out to all of those who feel that deep hurt of severe wounds from the worst inhumanity of man to man ever perpetrated on this planet; that the symbolism has so built up that now some people think the President is actually paying homage to SS killers.

I have tracked this very closely; I have called the White House over 2 weeks ago when this thing first broke, to implore them to take fast, corrective action. I think the blame will, in the end, be on those who are leaving White House service at the end of this month; actually they should have left on the 15th of this month. I think that if there is no turning the agenda around; if Chancellor Kohl, for some reason unknown to me is not moved by a unanimous voice vote of the U.S. Senate and a letter from 245 of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, if that does not move him, then he has some deep-felt reason himself that somehow or other 40 years of reconciliation has come down to this point on the head of a needle.

□ 1540

I do not understand it. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not understand it. However, I would say that all of this focus that is so negative at this point is released by the world hearing carefully what the President says when he visits Bergen-Belsen, that the world listens far more closely than it would have otherwise to what the President says when he visits this cemetery, and I am still hoping against hope that he will not, but I think the President then has an opportunity to take these moments in the brilliant sunlight to heal the wounds of that war a little bit more.

If the world feels, through the heart and the mind and the emotion of the President of the United States, the horror once again of the Holocaust, then some good will have come out of this. I think it is significant that the German Congress, their Bundestag, has already made it illegal to say in Germany that the Holocaust did not happen, that that alone is something significant to come out of Germany. It is something that we would never allow in this country. Our civil rights allow people to say the most outrageous and obnoxious things up and and almost including yelling, "Fire" in a theater, so we have to acknowledge that this is something that could never be passed in this Congress, but there are opportunities, if they are handled correctly, to make something good come out of all the hurt here.

I know that when I went with the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] to the Holocaust ceremony in our rotunda a few weeks ago that the high moment, when I saw most of the people crying, was when the American flags came into the room, not that we needed an American identification. What brought me to tears was the thought that those flags arrived too late, particularly at Bergen-Belsen. Twenty thousand people died in March because we could not figure out how to win that war sooner than we did. Another 7,000 or 8,000 died in the first 2 weeks of April, and 9,000 died within 2 weeks of being liberated, their only solace being that they died free men and women and children, although their bodies were so emaciated they could never know the fruits of freedom beyond a few days. Another 4,000 died in May. Almost 85 percent of the total of the 50,000 people who died in Bergen-Belsen died in the last few weeks of the war and the few weeks to come.

I am sure the President will be apprised of all of that, and I am just trusting, if I cannot trust on the good judgment of people in the White House who set this up, I am trusting my President, I am trusting his heart, the compliments that Mrs. BURTON just paid him of how far back his support goes for all the survivors of the Holocaust, that he will take this hurt that so many people are feeling and turn it into a shining moment in the Sun when he will make the world again remember the horror so it can never happen again.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman for participating in this special order and for his thoughtful comments. I do appreciate his, and so many colleagues of his on the other side of the aisle, having participated in this bipartisan effort to encourage the President to reconsider his unfortunate decision.

The one area in which I have some disagreement with the specific comments of the gentleman is that I find it extremely difficult to understand, particularly in light of the unfortunate, complicating comments that have already been made in terms of comparing some of the people who were buried at the cemetery with some of the victims of the concentration camps. I find it very difficult to see how these words can heal and how this issue can be placed on the footing that I understand the gentleman would like to see it placed on by any action short of actually deciding not to visit the specific cemetery at issue. There are so many other places in Germany which would be appropriate focuses for healing, for reconciliation, and for a symbolic statement. But I do very much apppreciate the thoughtful and helpful comments of the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman for taking out this special order.

As you say, there may be a silver lining in the President's trip, but I think no matter what is said by him that there will be more threads of misunderstanding and of misperception. Over the weekend, like everybody else, I read and I listened intently to the various comments from both sides of the Atlantic on the trip to Germany by the President, and I heard it urged in various ways in defense of his trip, especially to the cemetery, that it is time to focus on the future and not on the past, and that the West Germans feel that the protest against the visit represents an effort to impose collective guilt on the German people.

Let me express my feeling, and that is that some important distinctions are being blurred or forgotten altogether

by those who defend in that way or any way the President's decision. One distinction is between collective guilt and community responsibility. If what is meant by collective guilt is that all in Germany by citizenship alone bear a common guilt, I do not believe in that concept at all.

But there is a real difference between collective guilt and community responsibility. I do believe in community responsibility if by that is meant that a society collectively must acknowledge the evils that grew within that society and their debt to its victims. Nazism, after all, did grow within a particular society, with millions participating, with millions of others acquiescing, and with millions losing their lives as a result. It was not imposed Nazism by an invading army from another land.

A second distinction is between compliance with orders and exertion of individual will. We did not punish every individual within German society, whether members of the general public or rank and file military personnel for compliance with orders of their national government. But at the same time, it is not necessary that those nations who fought Germany pay equal honor to the vast majority who complied with the national orders and to the minority within Germany who bravely pursued against the Nazis their own individual conscience, often to their death at the hands of their own countrymen.

A third distinction that is important is the proper one between facing the future and forgetting the past. There is no contradiction necessarily between the two and, indeed, in this case there is an absolute congruity because unless we do in fact weep over the incalculable spilling of innocent blood, the future can go dangerously awry.

I thank the gentleman from California very much for giving me this opportunity to speak.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BURTON of California). The gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] has 33 minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the Chair.

I would be pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I will not take much time.

Madam Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman in his special order today, asking the President to cancel his planned trip to Bitburg, the situs of the burial ground for some of the SS officers, formerly associated with the Nazi Party in Germany.

I had occasion a few years ago to travel to Israel and to visit the Holocaust Museum in Jerusalem with my little daughter who had never witnessed some of the film that she saw there, some of the horrible, grotesque atrocities pictured there that were inflicted upon human beings. She was horrified, as I was reminded of the horrors of the Nazis which were inflicted upon the Jewish people in World War II.

I felt, when the flak occurred announcing the President's visit to the cemetery, that it was a very insensitive act on the part of any official of the U.S. Government, much less the President of our great country, to bestow the honor of visiting a cemetery where these monsters are buried. The only good that I can think that could possibly come of this visit is that it may possibly heighten the visibility of the atrocities of World War II so that little children who were not born during that era may be reminded of the indelible horrors that occurred before their birth so they might learn of these terrible inhumanities to man.

As I was made aware of the fact that 40 percent of the American people were revealed in a poll today as not knowing which side the United States fought on during the Vietnam War, it is possible that some value may occur from the President's visit to this cemetery and his presence there will give those of us who are sensitive to those atrocities a forum to mind others that civilized humanity shall never allow those atrocities to occur again.

Mr. LEVINE of California. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and congratulate him for reserving time for this very important special order.

Madam Speaker, let me say that this trip of the President's has pained me greatly. One cannot understand why the President is actually going. One hears so many different explanations, but none of them make any sense. None of them have refuted the idea of going to a different place where the SS is not buried, where one could honor the many millions of Germans who were not part of Nazism—those who suffered on the home front and those who suffered in the war as so many other people did. Yet, through the din and noise and everything else that has emanated from the White House recently, we have not heard a single reason why Bitburg is a better place to visit than the grave of Konrad Adenauer, or of Pastor Neimoller, the great German theologian, or of the resistance fighters—the many thousands and hundreds of thousands of Germans who resisted quietly and with arms, with voices, with thoughts, and with hearts. Or the President could honor a symbol of the new Germany, the generation that was born after the war.

Mr. President, do not go to Bitburg. By insisting on visiting Bitburg, Mr. President, you are saying that there is not another site in Germany that is untainted. We have heard not from the President but from some of his advisers that Helmut Kohl has asked him to visit. Helmut Kohl is an ally of the President's, as West Germany is an ally of the United States, an ally that we need and deeply appreciate. But there are times in diplomacy and politics when a friend comes to you and says, "Please do me this favor," and you say to that friend, "I would do almost anything you ask, but I must draw the line. I cannot do this. Let me do the favor in another way, at another time, in another place."

Morality does enter into politics every so often. There has never been a more appropriate time that morality should enter into politics than today. I find it somewhat ironic that Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger, the prime practitioners of real politics, hard-nosed, brasstacks politics, are being cited as a reason, as a bolster, for the President going to Bitburg when it is not the type of diplomacy that they practiced, necessary as it often is, that is needed now.

Mr. President, I know you do not intend this, but you are sending a signal. You are sending a signal to thousands of people in Germany and France and England and Italy, and yes, in this country and in many other countries, to the small minority who are fanatics, who are neo-Nazis. You are sending a signal to them that their hatred is OK. You are not saying that it is OK, but in their warped minds, when you visit that cemetery, they will believe it is OK. And lest you think, Mr. President, that this hatred is insignificant and far away, let me read to you some lines from the very popular German magazine, Quick. The lines, quoted in the New York Times, are from an article entitled, "Reagan visit in Germany: The Power of the Jews," and it reads, talking about Jewish Americans:

> Their protests were accompanied by a gigantic press campaign in which not only Jewish commentators recalled the suffering of Europe's Jews under the Nazis. The major television networks broadcast anti-German films; theaters put dramas of Jewish suffering in their programs.

The article referred to "the powerful influence of Jewish Cabinet ministers such as Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, surrounding Reagan." Caspar Weinberger happens to be a practicing Episcopalian.

Quick also asserted, that "the Jewish lobby dominates U.S. commerical television networks and many newspapers."

Mr. President, is this any more evidence than you need? Do not give a signal, an unintended signal but a real signal. Do not go to Bitburg. Choose another site. There are many people in my district, tens of thousands, who are Holocaust survivors. When you walk down a shopping street in my district in the summer, when people are wearing short sleeves, you can see tattooed numbers on people's arms. These people want reconciliation with Germany, too. But they do not want it at the graves of the SS. Nor do American veterans want reconciliation at the graves of the SS.

A man came to me in my district just yesterday and he told me that he and his family have lived in this country for a long time. A cousin of his was one of the American prisoners captured by the Germans at the Battle of the Bulge and massacred by the Waffen SS at Malmedy. American POW's with their hands up in the air, walking along being brutally machine gunned.

The tragedy of Nazism is not limited to any one group. The horror, the blackness, the emptiness of Nazism is not limited, and it must never be forgotten. We cannot wash it over. We should build a foundation between West Germany and ourselves, but not at the gravesite of the SS, because reconciliations such as that can never be.

Mr. President, all of us who have spoken here on this special order, and many, many millions of Americans and people of the world are asking you, please do not visit Bitburg.

□ 1600

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his extremely thoughtful and important remarks.

I am now very pleased to yield to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Nevada [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID. Madam Speaker, I had the good fortune this morning of attending a burial at Arlington National Cemetery. I participated in this gravesite service honoring my friend from Nevada, J. Lyn Smith, a paratrooper in the Second World War. This is a great contrast to the proposed trip to a German cemetery of our President.

Madam Speaker, I do not think any reasonable person can assert that the President's decision to go to Bitburg during his trip to West Germany next month was provoked by any mean spirit within him, or by irreverance to the memory of American and allied veterans of World War II. Apparently the President was asked to make this visit by a tearful Chancellor Kohl. When he accepted, the President did not know there were SS soldiers buried there. Now he knows.

If he does not alter his plans, he risks searing the sensibilities not only of survivors of the Holocaust, but of any one who can identify with the victims of Nazi Germany's hateful edict. Clearly, this encompasses a lot of people. Both the House and the Senate have directed letters to the President exhorting him to reconsider the Bitburg component of his trip. Large elements of the American public have urged better judgment. And some of our allies have expressed their reservations over this decision, as well.

As if this weren't enough to compel a change, surely, too, the Soviets will have a field day with this fodder for anti-American propaganda. Why bring this upon ourselves?

President Reagan misdiagnoses where the test of his integrity lies in this whole dilemma. He won't be accused of lacking integrity for recanting what is a bad decision. Instead he stands to lose far more by clinging to this mistake, having to lay a wreath and make a speech at Bitburg—where 47 SS soldiers are buried—and then confront a tide of negative repercussions.

Because the only major player that Reagan would need to mollify if he chooses another cemetery is Kohl, certainly this ill-advised decision can be turned around. There is still time for the President to reschedule his itinerary. I implore him to do so.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. REID], and I am now pleased to yield to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for taking out this special order to try and get across the fundamental point that we are seeking to make.

I do not know anyone in the House nor anyone in Washington to whom I have spoken who objects to firm, friendly, solid relations between America and West Germany. What we object to is the notion that you have to include a visit to a cemetery where there are Nazi soldiers, particularly the SS, as a means of doing that.

The West Germans have a great deal of which to be proud. Out of that terrible event of the Nazi regime, for which German society was responsible, they have come to the situation where today West Germany stands out as a respected, democratic nation. Indeed their East German brothers and sisters have to be physically restrained from coming to this new, prosperous, democratic nation of West Germany.

It is important that we honor that accomplishment, but not by denying what went before. In fact, it is a measure of the accomplishment when we realize what went before, and there is no inconsistency at all between a recognition of what West Germany has accomplished today and a continued decision that there can be no forgetting, no reconciliation, and no relaxation of what has to be a universal human hatred of the Hitler regime. There is no inconsistency there.

In fact, we are not talking now simply about bad public relations on the part of the President. We are talking about a misperception that says there has to be some honor and some fealty paid to the people who fought for and defended the Nazi regime as a means of forging and continuing to have our close links with West Germany.

Yes; I understand the West German Government has asked President Reagan to do this. They are mistaken, and there cannot be a serious argument, after all that has transpired between our own Nation and West Germany since 1945, from the Marshall plan on to the current very heavy stationing of American troops there.

Through good, economic relations, through all that we have been through together, it is inconceivable that anyone can argue that this visit to the cemetery is necessary. It is a very grave error that the President made. He has consistently compounded the error time and again by his statements and by his explanations. It is not too late. You do not show weakness by admitting when you made a mistake. The weakness is in persisting in this mistake and in compounding it as the President has done.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], and I am very pleased to yield now to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN]

Mr. FEIGHAN. Madam Speaker, I share the concern expressed by so many Members of this House about the President's planned trip to the German military cemetery in Bitburg, West Germany. The ceremony is an affront to the memory of all who died at the hands of Hitler's legions and to all those who sacrificed to ensure that freedom would endure in Western Europe.

Surely, it is inappropriate for an American head of state, representing the people who liberated Germany and Western Europe from the greatest horrors in the history of humankind, to participate in a ceremony of remembrance for those who fought to extend the terrors of nazism during the Second World War. I cannot at all understand how this terrible ceremony was ever contemplated to be appropriate; nor can I imagine why Chancellor Kohl and President Reagan insist on going through with it.

I fully share the President's goal of increasing reconciliation between the German and the American people. Yet, the placement of a wreath at a

military cemetery containing SS graves undermines that goal considerably. The American and German people have come together in the postwar years because of our shared commitment to the enduring values of peace, freedom, and democracy. Since the defeat of nazism in Europe, the people of West Germany and of West Berlin have dedicated and demonstrated their commitment to those values.

Rather than commemorate the deaths of many who died opposing those values, might it not be more appropriate to commemorate the lives of those who fought for freedom and a progressive future in postwar Germany? I wrote to President Reagan 2 weeks ago suggesting that the cemetery ceremony be replaced with one at the grave of Konrad Adenauer, the German Chancellor whose courage and leadership did so much to restore the trust and faith that Americans and Germans feel for one another. Instead, the President has decided to go ahead with his visit to Bitburg, while adding a ceremony at Bergen-Belsen.

The tragic initial decision to go to Bitburg is only exacerbated by the insensitivities expressed by those who believe that a trip to the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp can in some way add balance. How can anyone believe that a wreath-laying ceremony in a cemetery containing Nazi Waffen SS could be balanced by another event? The only appropriate action must be a cancellation of the Bitburg ceremony.

Over 2,400 years ago, Sophocles, in "Antigone," wrote an eternal truth that President Reagan and Chancellor Kohl would be well to remember. "All men make mistakes," he wrote, "but the just man admits his error and repairs the pain he has caused. The only sin is pride."

It would be a tragic error if the President's insistence on visiting the Bitburg ceremony undermined the spirt of reconciliation that has existed between our two countries for some time. Since the late 1940's, when Americans came to aid of West Berliners during their hour of need—during the Berlin blockade—Germans have known that the American people supported their freedom and were willing to take risks to preserve and defend it. Our efforts under the Marshall plan helped to forge a growing and vibrant economy there, and our work in NATO has ensured that all West Germans have had the chance to live in peace and freedom.

Madam Speaker, the President's trip to West Germany should not be used to gloss over the tragedies in the past or to rewrite history. I believe it should commemorate America's participation in the conquering of Hitler, the ending of the Holocaust, and the liberation of Western Europe from the grip of Nazi rule. I commend my colleagues for calling this special order. Chancellor Kohl and German people must understand how sincerely we oppose the Bitburg ceremony and the presence of President Reagan in a Nazi graveyard. I urge them to change their plans and work to arrange an event that will appropriately celebrate our two countries' continuing efforts to maintain the peace and freedom of Western Europe.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his remarks.

I am very pleased now to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE] for making this time available to us to discuss this important issue and to reiterate my own deep concerns about the President's proposed visit to the Bitburg Cemetery in Germany.

In the past few days a great deal of discussion has focussed on the decision process involved in this matter, as well as the options available to the President to alter this decision. In today's Washington Post, mention was made that the President now plans to visit the Bitburg Cemetery for only a very brief time, while arranging a much more lengthy visit to the Bergen-Belsen concentration camp. It is obvious that many people are working to encourage the President to change his mind about visiting Bitburg, and I again reiterate my own suggestion that a more appropriate site of reconciliation would be to lay a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Germany.

The events of the last few weeks have caused a great deal of personal anguish to many of my own constituents. My 22d Congressional District in New York has a high percentage of veterans of World War II, as well as concentration camp survivors. I have received more personal pleas and outcries from them in less time than I have on any other issue. Some of those veterans had families who perished in the camps, so that the Americans were not just fighting for freedom and democracy but the very lives of their own brethren. This intense, personal dedication deserves a noble response on our part, and on the part of our President. Elie Wiesel and others have responded to this crisis of anguish most eloquently, and all have spoken from the heart. Their appeal is not political, it is humanitarian. As Americans, we cannot in good conscience honor those who dedicated themselves to the singleminded act of genocide. It does not matter that many of these soldiers were young men; the SS was a voluntary branch of the Nazi regime, with a 2-year strict training program. Sworn enemies of the Jews, these SS soldiers fulfilled Hitler's orders to make Europe judenrein—empty of Jews. These same SS soldiers perpetrated a monstrous massacre of our own Allied troops, without any regard to the moral implications of their barbaric actions.

Madam Speaker, I join with my colleagues in appealing to our President to reconsider his visit to the Bitburg Cemetery as an improper setting for his comemorative wreath-laying ceremony.

□ 1610

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Madam Speaker, I guess one of the most difficult things in politics is to say simply, "Look, I goofed."

The White House has clearly made an error in judgment in deciding that it is appropriate for the President of the United States to visit the Bitburg Cemetery. There are numerous reasons that should compel the White House to change its mind if it were not so hard in public life to say a mistake was made. This visit is an affront to the victims of the Holocaust; an affront to the soldiers who fought nazism, and a very serious mistake in foreign policy.

The young men who fought together in World War II from the United States and the Soviet Union met at the Elbe River. They recently commemorated an anniversary of that time when they marched together in opposition to the spreading terror of nazism.

For an American President now to go to a cemetery to honor those in the cemetery, including Nazi SS troops buried there, would give the Soviets an enormous propaganda coup. What they would do, you can imagine for the next year, 5 years, or 10 years, is send pictures all around the world about an American President visiting a cemetery paying honor to dead Nazi war SS troops.

This is an incredible foreign policy mistake. All of us need to be prepared to say, "Yes, on second thought, it's the wrong thing to do."

The President made a commitment. The President said, "Yes, I'll do that." But on reflection, it is not a good idea. It is not a good idea for him. It is not a good idea for this country.

So I think, along with my distinguished colleague from California and others who had made the case very eloquently, it is time for the President and the White House to say, "Yes, we blew this one. What we are proposing to do doesn't make sense and, yes, we are going to change our minds because changing your mind when you are pro-

posing to do something wrong is the right thing to do."

It is the right thing for the President. I hope the President changes his mind.

I thank the gentleman for taking this special order.

Mr. LEVINE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

In closing, let me thank all of those who have participated in this special order on both sides of the aisle, and all those who participated just before this special order in the presentation of the very important resolution that has strong, bipartisan support urging the President to reconsider his trip.

Let me thank all of those who constitute a clear majority of both this House on a bipartisan basis and the other body on a bipartisan basis who have urged Chancellor Kohl to reconsider his invitation to our President with regard to this ill-conceived plan.

Let me in terms of recapturing some of what was said by so many people, again on both sides of the aisle, summarize simply by saying that this is not designed to be a political issue. This is an issue where Democrats and Republicans together have joined in a very respectful fashion to urge the President of the United States to reconsider an ill-conceived decision.

This, I might say on a personal note, is the first special order that I have ever taken out in my two terms in the House. I believe that this time should be reserved for issues on which one feels very deeply and in which there are very important concerns at stake.

I think we have seen from the people who have spoken here today how deeply people do feel on this issue. This is an issue on which people are speaking from the heart. You do not see people reading elaborate speeches from notes. You do not see people using lines that have been given to them by their staffs. This is an issue which is extremely clear on a variety of levels, on a moral level, on a foreign policy level, on a diplomatic level, and on all the levels that have been discussed here today. It is one that has beckoned forth deep sentiment from throughout this entire country and from citizens who are very good and close friends of our country from around the globe.

In the name of everything that is good in America and in the name of everything that we have stood for as a nation since the days of the Revolution and particularly in the name of reconciliation and healing with the people of Germany, on behalf of the Republicans and the Democrats who have spoken today, and on other days on the floor of this House, and in the other body, and so many citizens from around the globe, I earnestly hope and sincerely urge the President to reconsider this very unfortunate decision.

● Mr. DELLUMS. Madam Speaker, the President's persistent and wrong-headed determination to visit a West German military cemetery at Bitburg that contains the graves of at least 47 Waffen SS members, while canceling a similar visit to the original "model" Nazi concentration camp at Dachau, will leave a scar of shame on the national memory for generations to come.

This decision is a deliberate affront to all people of conscience, regardless of national origin, ethnic or religious background, because it honors the victimizers at the expense of their victims. The SS in all its perverse manifestations were the ultimate subversion of the Judeo-Christian ideals that have been the very foundation of Western civilization.

The SS were the implementers of Hitler's "final solution" who were directly responsible for the genocide of almost 6 million Jews. They were the mass murders who exterminated equal numbers of non-Jews in the concentration camps because of their opposition to, or lack of suitability for inclusion in the criminal madness that was the Third Reich.

It was the Waffen SS that initiated a series of deliberate World War II atrocities, beginning in Poland in 1939, and continuing with the murder of 101 British prisoners of war at Le Paradis in 1940 to the wanton massacre of at least 71 uniformed U.S. military personnel at Malmedy, Belgium, in 1944. Some of the members from the SS unit that conducted the Malmedy massacre are buried in the cemetery at Bitburg.

What must the surviving American veterans of the Battle of the Bulge who helped to liberate Germany from the Nazi horrors think of a President who chooses to honor these murders while ignoring them?

What must the veterans of other Allied nations whose comrades were also massacred by the SS in virtually every country of Europe think of this decision which is historically ignorant and personally insensitive?

What must those Germans who resisted Hitler and Nazism think when Wehrmacht military and Waffen SS are publicly remembered—and implicitly honored—while their incredible courage is deliberately ignored—all in the name of "reconciliation"? What a tragic revision of recent history! What an incredible inversion of moral imperatives. * * *

At the same time the President is visiting the cemetery at Bitburg the SS will be having a public reunion in Bavaria, not far from the site of Dachau. The President is also scheduled to meet with Franz Joseph Strauss, the West German political leader in Bavaria who first urged the President not to visit Dachau because he feared "leftist, anti-American" protests.

How sad—and how shallow a series of excuses by the leaders of both countries. I urge the President to rescind his personal decision to visit the military cemetery at Bitburg and to focus his full attention on honoring the victims of Nazism, not its perpetrators. To do any less in our name is to dishonor us all.●

● Mr. RODINO. Madam Speaker, some have called the President's decision to go to the Bitburg Cemetery a political error, a public relations gaffe. Others have called it a diplomatic mistake, particularly with the damage it appears to have done to our relations with our West German allies. But his decision is much more than a political or diplomatic mistake. It is a moral dagger that pierces the heart of so many Americans and Europeans who suffered under the iron fist of nazism. And it is a psychological assault on the Holocaust survivors—and on the relatives on the many who didn't survive—who must live with a memory haunted by the evil, grim specter of the Nazi final solution.

Imagine the inner tears of the survivors who heard the President say that the German World War II soldiers "were victims, just as surely as the victims in the concentration camps." Imagine the inner anguish of the survivors who heard the President decline a visit to Dachau, then agree to visit Bitburg, and then, after the press revealed that the cemetery contained the graves of the SS troopers, decided to visit Bergen Belsen to balance out his visits. We cannot balance out good and evil. If everyone is a victim, then no one is a victim.

Madam Speaker, I am concerned about reports that the President's advisers counseled him not to "cave in" on this decision. But who is he caving into, Holocaust survivors? American veterans?

For 40 years the American and German people have developed close ties because of a common faith in democracy. Our alliance is strong, and our shared goals are noble. Reconciliation between our two nations is a fact. A ceremony at Bitburg is unnecessary. There are many other ways to remember—a visit at the grave of Konrad Adenauer, a commemoration of the German resistance, a recognition of the allied dead. But why Bitburg? Why the pain for the survivors and the Allied veterans? Why tread on history?

Madam Speaker, allow me to quote from the moving remarks of Elie Wiesel:

> I, too, wish to attain true reconciliation with the German people. I do not believe in collective guilt, nor in collective responsibility. Only the killers were guilty. Their sons and daughters are not. And I believe * * * that we can and we must work together

with them and with all people. And we must work to bring peace and understanding to a tormented world that * * * is still awaiting redemption.

Madam Speaker, Bitburg is not the door to redemption. I implore the President: for the sake of history, and for the sake of the living, please don't go.●

● Mr. WEISS. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge the President to cancel his plans to visit the Bitburg Cemetery, where, in addition to German soldiers, he will be honoring Waffen SS members, who conducted the Nazi genocide against the Jewish people.

Mr. Reagan's trip to Germany—his belated addition of a visit to a concentration camp, and his refusal to cancel a stop at Bitburg—reflects a moral and historical blindness to the suffering of the victims of Hitler's Germany. No dramatic speech by the President or public relations extravaganza by his advancemen can heal the wounds opened by President Reagan's insensitivity.

Scheduling for the trip has been blighted by moral obtuseness and misjudgment. In February the President first indicated he would not visit a German concentration camp site, saying he wanted to avoid opening old wounds while in Germany. Then, he added the stop at the Bitburg Military Cemetery. On April 18, he justified this visit by explaining that German soldiers who died defending nazism were "just as surely" victims as the 6 million Jews and millions of other nationalities tortured and slaughtered in Hitler's gas chambers.

President Reagan now stubbornly refuses to admit he made a mistake. After a direct plea not to visit Bitburg from the Chairman of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council and Buchenwald survivor, Elie Wiesel, the President still resists altering his plans. Simon Wisenthal, a Holocaust survivor who searches for Nazi war criminals still at large, denounced the Bitburg stopover while declining the President's invitation to Bitburg. The U.S. Senate urged the President to reassess his plans. And last week, 257 Members of this body wrote Chancellor Helmut Kohl asking him to withdraw his invitation to Reagan to lay a wreath at Bitburg.

Even with the added trip to Bergen-Belsen, the Bitburg visit is morally wrong. It prevents us from paying proper tribute to the victims of nazism and the Americans who fought that evil. It is an improper way to pay tribute to the free and democratic Federal Republic of Germany. And, it is an improper way to pay tribute to heroic Germans that resisted Hitler's efforts in World War II.

The President is now scrambling to find a politically acceptable way to visit Bitburg when there is no such alternative except not to visit the cemetery. Some assert that it would be a sign of weakness for the President to cancel his visit. On the contrary, this is an opportunity for the President to present a lesson about the Holocaust for current and future generations. If the President cancels his Bitburg visit, the lesson will be an unambiguous one, and all the more powerful. It would certainly be a demonstration of personal, as well as our Nation's, resolve about human rights and freedom. This is a strong message, not a weak one.

"The issue here is not politics," said Elie Wiesel, "but good and evil." Unfortunately, the President fails to see the difference even when presented so plainly. Madam Speaker, the American people can distinguish between right and wrong.

I, too, believe that our friends in the Federal Republic of Germany should not collectively suffer guilt for the Nazi crimes, and on this 40th anniversary of V-E day we should celebrate our friendship. However, I am afraid to think of what that day will symbolize to the world when the President of the United States lays a wreath at the graves of SS troops. I urge the President to cancel his trip to the Bitburg Cemetery.●

● Mr. EDGAR. Madam Speaker, my colleagues, I'm sorry that we all have to be here today. To you, to me, to most Americans, it's obvious that the President should not lay a wreath before the graves of the SS at Bitburg. But today, after weeks of controversy, we're here making a last desperate plea for President Reagan not to reopen the wounds of World War II.

I share the President's desire to achieve reconciliation. However, the Bitburg ceremony is guaranteed to be divisive, not unifying. It is guaranteed to be a hurtful act, not an act of healing.

I believe Elie Wiesel said it best when he accepted his medal at the White House 11 days ago. He said:

I too wish to attain true reconciliation with the German people. I do not believe in collective guilt, nor in collective responsibility. . . . we can and must work together with them and with all people. And we must work to bring peace and understanding to a tormented world that, as you know, is still awaiting redemption . . .

The issue, as Mr. Wiesel said, is not one of politics, but one of good and evil. The President should not be attempting to heal by honoring the graves of SS soldiers, Hitler's elite corps who ran the death camps and participated in the massacre of American prisoners of war. A ceremony recognizing even one individual who participated in the Nazi war crimes denigrates the purpose of the President's trip and works against reconciliation.

There is still time for the President to change his plans, to honor the grave of a German member of the resistance, or Chancellor Adenauer, who did so much for postwar reconciliation. There is still time for the President to change his plans, to contribute to the healing of wounds.

Let me close on a personal note. Veterans and members of the Jewish community have been vocal in their opposition to the President's trip; some have even said that this is a "Jewish issue" or a "veterans issue."

Jews and veterans should not be alone; I submit that this is an issue for all Americans. As a Methodist minister, I believe that all of us—Christians and Jews, Republicans and Democrats, men and women—should speak out to insist that good triumphs, that healing triumphs. Working together, we can pursue and achieve justice.●

● Mr. YATES. Madam Speaker, I participate in this special order today with a sense of fundamental sadness that is rooted in disappointment and disbelief. When I spoke to the House on April 15 about the serious mistake that the President was making with the scheduled visit to the Bitburg Cemetery, I, like many others, believed that the President would recognize this and the cemetery would be dropped from his itinerary.

This has not happened. A bad situation has become much worse and there is now a very troubling, Kafka-like quality to the whole event. It is as though the ability to alter the trip was beyond the reach or power of mortal man. But it is not too late, and the President should listen to reason.

Those SS graves in Bitburg are symbolic. They represent the darkest chapter in modern world history. To go to that cemetery with the wreath, the flags, and all implications that the visit carries with it is a mistake of tremendous proportions for this country, Germany, and the West as a whole. There can be no reconciliation with the SS. As Elie Wiesel said to the President: "That place, Mr. President, is not your place. Your place is with the victims of the SS."●

● Mr. DASCHLE. Madam Speaker, even though President Reagan is leaving on his European trip tomorrow, there is still time for him to cancel his visit to Germany's military cemetery at Bitburg.

And he must cancel the event.

The President of the United States should salute today's Germany—the Germany that is a model of Democracy, not honor a dark moment in human history when thousands upon thousands of Jewish men, women, and children were murdered simply because of their heritage.

The President of the United States should pay tribute to 40 years of peace between the United States and Germany, not honor German soldiers who were responsible for tens of thousands of American casualties.

The President of the United States should visit a cemetery where Allied

forces are buried, not a cemetery that was once used as a staging area for the bloody Battle of the Bulge where more than 70,000 American GI's were killed.

The President of the United States should pay his respects to the victims of the Holocaust and its survivors, not lay a wreath at the gravesites of those who guarded the death camps from escape and outside interference.

The visit to Bitburg is a terrible mistake. It reopens old wounds. It is an insensitive decision that minimizes the sacrifices of American veterans and the suffering of Jews who were declared enemies of the state. It drives a wedge between the United States and Germany. And it goes against all that this Nation stands for, and has fought for, in its 200-year history.●

● Mr. GARCIA. Madam Speaker, the President's scheduled trip to the Bitburg Cemetery has caused a great deal of furor both among his supporters and those who do not always agree with him.

Why is there so much controversy over this visit? Why is a symbolic trip to a cemetery so important? Because symbolism is all the victims of the Holocaust have left. It is the only solace they can find from the horror they experienced. We cannot adequately imagine that horror; we can only pay respect through our remembrance.

The words "never again" ring loudly from the survivors and the families of the survivors of the Holocaust. But to make certain that those words have meaning, it is up to us to join with them in their efforts to keep the memory of this tragedy alive.

I think it is important that when we ask the President not to go to Bitburg we do so not as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans who do not want our Nation to be in any way connected with the evil of the SS. The memory of the excesses of that evil must be preserved so that we can forever guard against this dark side of humanity. The President must not go to Bitburg and betray the vigilance of this memory.●

● Mr. McGRATH. Madam Speaker, the message is clear. The American people are distraught over the memories that the President's proposed trip reawakens. Pleas have come from all segments of our society imploring the President not to visit Bitburg's military cemetery.

I have never received such impassioned mail as that which this controversy has evoked. This outpouring reaffirms my belief that the President must find another way to signal our sincere reconciliation toward the democratic government that rose from the ashes of Nazi Germany 40 years ago.

I have heard from veterans, Holocaust survivors, and many people who do not fall into either category. I would like to share with you the sentiments they have expressed which highlight the height of the despair and confusion they feel.

I'm a veteran of World War II who lost many dear friends fighting for our country * * * In decorating and honoring the graves of ex-Nazis we are doing a disservice to the cherished memories and the ideals of our American war dead.—Mr. Benjamin Feldman, 5th District, New York.

As a refugee from Nazi Germany who lost his parents and innumerable dear ones in the Holocaust, as a volunteer for the draft for the U.S. Army who entered service prior to Pearl Harbor, as a participant of D-Day invasions of both North Africa and Sicily, having been wounded in action in Normandy, as a recipient of the purple heart, the bronze star, and the Belgian Croix de Guerre Avec Palme, but above all as an American, I am sickened and offended by the insensitivity displayed toward the memory of the thousands of American servicemen killed by those whose graves you intend to visit on your upcoming trip to Germany.—Siegmund Spiegel, 5th District, New York.

One doesn't have to be a World War II veteran or Jewish to resent the idea of the President of the United States honoring Nazi war dead * * * Millions of mature 60 plus and elderly 70 plus Americans, like us remember vividly Allied sacrifices in World War II—including American prisoners of War butchered by Nazi troops near that cemetery * * *. Many living Germans were part of Hitler's efforts to build a Reich that would rule the world * * *. Honoring all war dead is a meaningless blurring of the fact that many of those dead don't deserve honor.—Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Magnell, 5th District, New York.

As a combat veteran of WW II, I feel debased by President Reagan's decision to visit the German cemetery that holds the remains of so many of the Nazi criminals of that conflict * * *. We can never let the world forget what the Germans of that era did to humanity. To honor those who participated in that horror is an insult, not only to Americans, but to all people, all over the world who value the right of every human to be allowed to think and worship according to his own beliefs.—Mr. Gil Malawista, 5th District, New York.

I share the concern and opposition expressed by my constituents. Currently, there are numerous groups trying to convince the world that the Holocaust never took place. This offensive and preposterous assertion is sure to gain some acceptance if the President lays a wreath at a cemetery where members of the elite SS guard are buried.

The fundamental lesson of the Holocaust is never again. As elected representatives of our Nation, our responsibility is to assure that this lesson never fades. I commend the gentleman from California and New York for reserving this time so that this very expression may be relayed to the President.●

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a deep sense of outrage at President Reagan's proposed plan to visit the cemetery at Bitburg, Germany. This cemetery contains the graves of German SS officers, the Nazi elites who brutally carried out Hitler's plan to exterminate the Jews of Europe. Regardless of the intent of including Bitburg on the President's itinerary, or the addition of other events to the schedule, President Reagan should immediately cancel his plan to lay a wreath at Bitburg.

This month we have been commemorating the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II and the liberation of the Nazi death camps. Part of remembering the dead and the other victims of nazism is never forgetting those responsible for the Holocaust. President Reagan's plan to lay a wreath at Bitburg is far from a gesture of reconciliation with modern Germany. Rather it is opening the wounds of thousands of Holocaust survivors and Gold Star mothers everywhere. Furthermore, it is paying homage to the memory of 47 Nazi SS members, participants in the torture and murder of millions of innocent people.

I have written personally to President Reagan asking him to remove Bitburg from his itinerary. In my letter I also encouraged him to do everything possible to continue our Nation's friendship with present-day Germany. I do not believe in collective guilt. But I must join with Elie Wiesel who said: "The issue here is not politics, but good and evil." The American President's place is with the victims, not the perpetrators, of Nazi atrocities.

Our current friendship with Germany does not make us forget the past. Out of respect for those who died and suffered, out of respect for the lessons of the Holocaust, I join with my colleagues and friends in the Jewish community in calling for the President to cancel his trip to Bitburg.●

● Mr. LENT. Madam Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in expressing my deep concern over the President's plans to visit the Bitburg Cemetery in West Germany. The President's trip to Bitburg is intended to improve diplomatic relations with Germany but it has had the opposite effect here in the United States. The President's stated intention to visit a military cemetery in Bitburg has opened old wounds and sharply divided this Nation.

Some would portray this visit as an issue of primary concern to the Jewish community, but that is inaccurate. It is a Jewish issue, but it is also an issue of concern to gentiles. Many of the major veterans organizations have protested against the President's visit. They are disturbed because the President's visit would honor the murderers of their fallen comrades, as well as the perpetrators of the most horrifying slaughter in the history of mankind.

I had hoped that the eloquent speech given by Elie Wiesel at the White House last week would change

the President's mind and show him the folly of his plans. While I sincerely believe the President was deeply moved by Mr. Wiesel's words, he apparently feels that he has made some personal commitment to Chancellor Kohl as one head of government to another.

The administration should recognize that a decision that causes such controversy at home is worthless, no matter what its value abroad. They should be working with the West Germans to develop an option that will benefit both sides and alienate no one. I join with Elie Wiesel and the countless others who believe that the President's place is not in Bitburg, his place is with the victims.●

● Mr. ADDABBO. Madam Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in urging President Reagan to cancel his visit to Bitburg Cemetery.

Certainly none of us has a problem with the President's stated desire to commemorate 40 years of peace and friendship with the people and Government of West Germany. But in doing so, the President must not ignore the horrors and brutality of the Nazi regime and should scrupulously avoid even the appearance of paying tribute to individuals who perpetrated crimes against humanity.

If the President wants to honor the victims of World War II, he does not have to look very far. All of Europe was a victim of the Nazi regime. The millions who were murdered in the death camps, the fallen soldiers of the Allied forces, the people and towns of Europe that were overrun and occupied by the Nazi war machine, the fighters in the German resistance movement, all were victims and all deserve to be honored by the President of the United States.

I am sure that it was never the President's intention to honor members of the SS. The planned visit to Bitburg was simply a result of poor judgment and bad advice. The most honorable course of action would be to admit the error and cancel the visit to the cemetery. I respectfully urge the President to reconsider his plans. It is not too late to find an alternative site for the President to mark 40 years of peace.●

● Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Madam Speaker, the proposed visit by President Reagan to the German war cemetery at Bitburg, billed as symbolic of our reconciliation with present-day Germany, actually undermines the genuine reconciliation our present alliance with Germany symbolizes. The juxtaposition of the symbol of reconciliation with that entombed in those graves, the greatest evil the world has suffered, can only pervert the symbol of reconciliation which we wish to express. We cannot reconcile ourselves with the past and its nefarious symbols. The SS, the elite corps of Nazi Germany, perpetrated the most grievous crimes against humanity ever recorded in history. The Nazis distorted the distinction between good and evil through the very distortion and perversion of symbols: the ones who at the gate of the death camp inscribed "Work makes Free"; the ones who called their mass deportations to death camps "resettlement"; the ones who sent their victims to the "showers" to "disinfect" them; the ones whose "Final Solution" meant the total annihilation of a whole people. Madam Speaker, how can we even symbolically reconcile ourselves with this past?

As the leader of the free world, President Reagan has the responsibility to honor and uphold the values for which countless Americans fought and died in their struggle to free Europe from the Nazi tyranny which almost engulfed the world. Americans fought for the preservation of freedom in the world; for the survival of democracy which affords its citizens equal protection under law. And many died for the free Europe we have today; including democratic West Germany. Is it then fitting for the beneficiaries of this legacy of freedom to reconcile themselves with the very evil which would undermine our hard-won liberties?

Madam Speaker, I join my appeal with those of my colleagues that he cancel his visit to the Bitburg Cemetery; a visit that only revives memories of Nazi atrocities and reopens bitter wounds. Mr. Reagan would demonstrate true leadership if he were to cancel his proposed visit to the cemetery.

Madam Speaker, the reconciliation that has, in fact, existed for some time cannot be justified if it rests on the scattered cinders of forgetfulness.●

● Mr. SMITH of Florida. Madam Speaker, President Reagan's decision to carry out his plans to visit the Bitburg Cemetery honors those directly responsible for the deaths of millions of American soldiers and Jews. Those buried in this cemetery are the perpetrators of some of the greatest crimes of humanity during this century. Many of the German soldiers buried at Bitburg were members of the Waffen SS, the combat arm of an elite Nazi unit.

As a Jew who has personally suffered family losses, I am outraged that 40 years after the end of the world's most atrocious regime, the President of the United States intends to honor the German military war dead. This is an indignation that offends not only the souls of the 6 million Jews who were slaughtered at the hands of the Nazis, but the 400,000 American servicemen who lost their lives in World War II as well. Rather than healing old wounds, this has opened them up again. Rather than increasing understanding, it increases misunderstanding. Rather than celebrating the future, it has rekindled the horrors of the past.

After observing the sense of outrage from nearly all sectors of the American population, the President was quick to add a stop at the Bergen-Belsen Concentration Camp to his itinerary; however, he continues to include the Bitburg ceremony on his schedule. Visiting the site of a Nazi concentration camp where tens of thousands of Jews were brutally murdered can not be considered a trade-off to visiting Bitburg.

To voice my opposition to the President's planned trip to Bitburg Cemetery, I have cosigned several letters with many of my colleagues advising the President of Congress' belief that there is a more appropriate way to highlight the peace and friendship between West Germany and the United States. In addition, I am an original cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 125, a sense of the Congress resolution that the President of the United States should not honor the memory of those responsible for the deaths of millions by visiting Bitburg.

We should not honor the guilty. We know the pain of remembering the Nazi genocide and feel the loss of each life as if it were our own. Hitler's reign ended 40 years ago, but for the many who survived the camps, the hiding, and the awful waiting, it happened yesterday. Therefore, we must remember, not honor, the Nazi barbarism, so that it may never happen again.●

● Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, our President leaves tomorrow on a 10-day trip to Europe. Our President intends to visit a West German cemetery at Bitburg where 47 of the Third Reich's notorious Waffen (weapons) SS troops, as well as 2,000 German soldiers, lay buried. Many Americans, I being among them, strongly believe the President's plan to honor these men is ill-advised and insensitive.

Just 40 years ago, 6 million Jews, plus millions of other innocent people, were murdered in the Nazi Holocaust—victims of the SS organization that once included the 47 who lay buried at Bitburg. The aim of the SS was, according to SS leader Heinrich Himmler, to "find out, to fight and destroy all open and secret enemies of the Fuhrer, the national socialist movement and our racial resurrection." For a U.S. President to honor men with such a mission shows a tragic lack of understanding of Nazi atrocities.

Most of the soldiers buried at Bitburg died in the Battle of the Bulge in 1944, the most ferocious battle ever fought between Americans and Germans. Over 19,000 of our GI's died; about 50,000 were wounded. Every veteran who fought in this battle has vivid and bitter memories. Many will

recall the news that during the battle, a Waffen SS battle group gunned down 71 American prisoners of war captured just north of Bitburg. Afterward, the SS soldiers used the bodies for target practice.

The President's decision to lay a wreath at Bitburg demonstrates a lack of sensitivity to those who suffered at the hands of the Nazis. The President should reconsider the inclusion of the Bitburg Cemetery in his forthcoming trip to West Germany. Instead, our Nation should pay honor to the memories of the millions of innocent Jewish victims and thousands of American and Allied soldiers who were victims of Nazi atrocities. We should honor the new bonds that have developed between our Nation and West Germany since World War II and in doing this look forward to a promising and flourishing relationship, not backward to the horrors of the past.●

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order now, which was previously called.

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

There was no objection.

A BROKEN PROMISE

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

Mr. FRANK. Madam Speaker, the gentleman who preceded me, the gentleman from California, said that special orders ought to be used when one feels strongly, and that is precisely what I want to do today. I feel strongly for a couple reasons.

The subject is the very solemn, oft-repeated promise, that President Reagan made during the 1984 campaign that he would not reduce Social Security benefits and the fact that he has subsequently broken that promise.

Apparently when the initials S.S. are involved, the President has a somewhat flexible attitude toward promise-keeping. When the S.S. stands for Social Security, the promise is not worth very much. When it stands for Schutzstaffel, then apparently it is an obligation too solemn ever to be set aside.

I think the President is keeping the wrong promise. A commitment made in a conversation to the head of another government when nothing has been bargained for over that does not seem to me as important as the very solemn, very public pledge, made by the President of the United States as a candidate for reelection to the American people, when he said, "I won't be cutting your Social Security benefits."

□ 1620

Because the President has a proposal now before the Congress to reduce Social Security benefits by a substantial amount. In fact, a proposal came forward from the other body to reduce Social Security benefits, and in the compromise that was worked out, the President went them one better because the proposal that came forward as part of a so-called compromise for a 3-year reduction in the cost-of-living increase that Social Security recipients would be entitled to get is a deeper cut over that 3-year period than what had initially come out.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Does the gentleman recall one of the Presidential debates in which the President said "You should never say never in politics, but I will say never"?

Mr. FRANK. I do recall that, and what he said never about, as the gentleman points out, was cutting Social Security benefits.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. That is precisely what he said: "I will never allow Social Security benefits to be cut." That was just several months ago. The paradox of this whole thing is that this President is participating in an effort that will lower Social Security checks from the present law's COLA in order to counter a buildup on the other side of the budget for the military. And that is precisely what we are talking about. We are talking about taking money from senior citizens, many of whom are at or near the poverty line, in order to build more submarines, jet fighters, tanks, or MX missiles.

The President's budget priorities are misplaced, and I appreciate the gentleman taking this special order to point that out.

Mr. FRANK. I thank my friend from North Dakota who has been a very staunch advocate for sensible priorities in the budget. He reminds us we are not talking about increased overall Federal spending. We are not talking about trying to increase what the President sent us in the deficit. We are talking about making those reductions in a sensible way and not taking Social Security benefits away from those who are entitled to them to fund General Dynamics' abuses of taxpayers' money or for MX missiles that we do not need or other waste elsewhere in the budget.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If you deny someone, whose purchasing power has been eroded because of inflation, the opportunity to have that purchasing power restored through a COLA, that denial of those funds does not help the deficit. Social Security funds are raised through a payroll tax to be used only for Social Security. Some people around here are trying to play a game of using those Social Security revenues that they cannot use to offset deficits they create by an excess of military spending. That breeds the most incredible waste we have ever seen in this Government's history.

Mr. FRANK. The gentleman is correct.

You know, sometimes people forget what today is. But now the gentleman reminds me, and we can say, if people do not remember what the day is, today is the first of never, apparently, because we heard the President say he would never cut Social Security benefits, and he is now proposing to cut them. So as of today, it is the first of never.

I do not know what you do to your clock, but what you do, if you are old, to your bank account is watch it dwindle.

The gentleman is right. In 1983, the President signed into law, both Houses having passed an increase in Social Security taxes and a reduction at that point in Social Security benefits. And the argument was that that was necessary.

Some agreed; some disagreed. But that was then argued to be necessary to put Social Security on a sound footing so that the elderly would not have to worry.

What the President is now asking Congress to do is to take part of that increase in the regressive payroll tax of Social Security and use it to offset the deficit that we are getting because of General Dynamics abusers and because we are going to do the things in the military that are far beyond what we have to do.

We ought to be very clear about what the President has tried to suggest. Let us be very clear. When you have a law that now says elderly people are supposed to get every January—it used to be July but it has been pushed back 6 months—a cost-of-living increase equal to inflation, and you take that away from them, you are reducing their benefits below what they are now legally entitled to.

And then the President said, anyone who says I am reducing their benefits is lying in their teeth. I do not know how one lies in one's teeth and it

would seem to me that it would be a very uncomfortable place to lie. But the fact is that the President's own calculation means that, in this one instance, he does understand what we are talking about.

He is the one who tells us that if we only give the Pentagon a 3-percent increase over and above inflation, that is a 7-percent overall increase, that that is austerity. So, for the Pentagon, they get full inflationary compensation plus 3 percent.

But if you are 82 years old and living at about the poverty level, receiving about $500 a month or a little bit less, you get 2 percent. And the President says he has not cut you and we know that that simply is not true.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. If the gentleman will yield one more time—those who listen to the gentleman and others should not conclude that we are not for trying to move this fiscal policy into some sort of balance. The mismatch between revenues this Government has and expenditures that the President proposes, which is a $180 billion deficit mismatch, has nothing at all to do with Social Security COLA's. We ought to adjust Social Security COLA's up or down based on the economic health of that system, not based on whether or not the President wants another 7, 9, or 13 percent in military spending.

This does not have anything at all to do with the general question of whether or not we ought to restrain spending. Of course we should. But we ought to do it in the right way.

Mr. FRANK. I just want to make it clear. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Larry Speakes, who is the official White House spokesperson—and, Madam Speaker, in the intermittent interest that some of the people on the Republican side have about the rules, I am going to ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to quote. I would assure any Republicans watching, I am going to quote Larry Speakes, so I am sure they would not have any objection.

I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to quote from some documents here, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mrs. BURTON of California]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the Speaker.

On October 9, and I am going to insert some stuff in the RECORD, and one is a superb, thoughtful essay written by Robert Ball, a former Commissioner of Social Security, a man who participated in 1982 and 1983 in the proposal to reduce benefits at that time and raise taxes because he thought it was necessary, he has a magnificent refutation of the logic by which the President is trying to justify. And let us be very clear what the President has done. He made a promise when he ran for election that he would never cut Social Security benefits. He has broken that promise. He has asked the Congress to reduce the cost of living below what it now legally is supposed to be, not just for this fiscal year but for 2 additional fiscal years. For 3 full fiscal years, it would cost billions of dollars and put an awful lot of older people who are now barely above poverty back into poverty.

Here is what Mr. Speakes said, according to Mr. Ball:

When asked further on October 9 about the Social Security cost-of-living adjustment, White House spokesman Larry Speakes, and a reporter had this exchange:

"QUESTION. You say that benefits will not be reduced. The law includes a provision for increases in benefits based on cost of living. Does this guarantee those increases as well?

"Mr. SPEAKES. Yes. This is the law.

"QUESTION. And you say it doesn't include—that there will be no tampering and delaying or trimming of the cost of living?

"Mr. SPEAKES. No tampering, no nothing."

But unfortunately no nothing more clearly explains the Reagan program for Social Security recipients than no tampering. There is a clearcut violation of a pledge and an effort to reduce what, among the poorest people in this society, all older people living in poverty are going to get.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank him for asking for this time in order that we might explore this issue on Social Security because I think there has been a lot of misexplanation of what is going on. And a lot of people are being asked to think that freezing Social Security benefits or reducing the cost of living over a 3-year period by at least 2 percent every year is somehow a form of deficit reduction, and some kind of budget restraint, when it is nothing of the kind.

I think an important fact that should be emphasized is that the Social Security trust fund will take in $9.2 billion more next year, in 1986, than it is going to spend. So, if anything, the Social Security trust fund is making the deficit look smaller than it actually is, not bigger.

Mr. FRANK. If I could just interrupt the gentleman, I appreciate his statistics. If I am correct, the $9.2 billion is even if we pay out the currently mandated cost of living?

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Absolutely. And I think it is important to go back and understand why it is we are in this fix where the dedicated funds in Social Security are made to look like they are reducing the deficit.

In fact, back in the 1960's and before the Social Security fund was kept separate from the Federal budget, because we understood that these dollars could not be used to fund other parts of the budget, they cannot be used for the military budget, they cannot be used for housing or for educational loans, and as such this money is not really available. But in 1969, the budgets were brought together and at that time the surplus in Social Security was used to hide the fact that we were running a deficit that we should not have been running then.

□ 1630

And here again we have got the same kind of a strategy. I wanted to underscore something that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] mentioned, and that is in 1983 the people of this country were told that we had to compromise, which we needed in Social Security, and that people, workers, would have to pay higher taxes and employers would have to pay higher taxes during the 1980's to ensure that the cost of living increases could be paid, that senior citizens would have to do without the cost-of-living increase for a 6-month period, which is a permanent reduction in people's benefits; but that was in order to secure the Social Security system for 75 years.

Well, here we are already 2 years later being told that this lead is off and, in fact, those tax increases which the gentleman quite properly describes as regressive, are to be used for something else, for a deficit reduction.

Well, I think that those who are advocating this reduction in Social Security benefits better be advocating giving those tax increases back to the workers and the employers. I cannot imagine any Member of this House coming on the floor and saying that he had a tax program to deal with the deficit and then saying the following: This tax program is only going to be on earned income, not on unearned income. You are only going to have to pay on the first $39,600 that you earn. If you earn more than that, that will be tax-exempt.

And if you are an employer you will pay no matter whether you are losing money or making money, you will still have to pay this tax. And any Member who came here proposing that kind of a tax increase to fight the budget deficit would not get one supporter.

Yet that is exactly what is being proposed with the cuts in Social Security.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman.

Let us drive this point home because people have to understand what the President of the United States is doing. He is, by his own description, Mr. Anti-Tax Increase.

You remember he made a couple of promises last year. One promise he made was no new increase in taxes, and when someone even suggested it,

somebody on his side or somebody on the Democratic side, it came from both places, his answer was, "Make my day."

When someone talks about his promise not to raise taxes, he is Clint Eastwood. Of course, when someone says that they are going to violate his campaign promise not to cut Social Security benefits, he is Woody Allen. I mean he becomes a somewhat different character, or the Roadrunner, perhaps, getting as far away from his promises as he can.

But let us look at the effect of what his own tax policy is.

In 1983 his appointed commissioners, along with others, recommended an increase in the Social Security tax. That increase came from some people that Ronald Reagan, among others, the Speaker and the Senate majority leader, appointed.

He lobbied for and signed into law, Ronald Reagan, an increase in Social Security tax affecting every wage-earner in this country and the self-employed small business people; Ronald Reagan's appointees recommended the tax; Ronald Reagan lobbied for the tax; Ronald Reagan signed the tax into law, ostensibly to pay for Social Security benefits. Now he is asking Congress to take that tax increase he signed into law ostensibly to pay for Social Security benefits and to use it for his military foreign assistance; some will go to the Philippines, some will go to build an airport in Grenada, some of it will go to fly General Dynamics people around and not have them pay any taxes, some of it will go for the MX, some of it will go for some other purposes, some of it which might be useful purposes. But he has taken that tax increase that was explicitly to be used only for Social Security and ask us not to provide Social Security cost-of-living increases. As the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORRISON] pointed out, even if the law, as it now stands is followed, and you know people are not getting rich off of Social Security. There is a small number of wealthy people who get Social Security. But the great bulk are not wealthy. Social Security continues to be the most effective, most broadly ranging antipoverty program in America today in the sense that it keeps people from that poverty line. And Ronald Reagan is going to deny them the money even though there will be under current law a $9 billion surplus generated by Social Security. I think he is trying to scoop some money from the Social Security trust fund and use it to cover up the deficit.

I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I think that is exactly right. That should be disturbing to everyone who believes that the Social Security trust fund is a separate fund that guarantees our ability to keep the compact we have made between generations, that that trust fund will be maintained. This is the kind of step, once taken, that could easily be repeated time and time again.

I would emphasize that those who are supporting this 2-percent reduction in the COLA, they were talking about this change long ago, long before this particular proposal. They are not talking about deficit reduction; they are talking about Social Security reductions; CPI minus 2. We have heard that around this Chamber for 2 or 3 years now. This is a specific proposal. Those individuals have the right to advocate it, but they ought not hide it as if it were a deficit reduction. They want to reduce Social Security benefits. Let us debate that on its own terms. I think it will lose on its own terms.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut. He is absolutely right. There are people who have the bizarre notion that on the whole, old people in America have too much money. I must say, as any Member of Congress, that I meet with a lot of elderly people. I know the gentleman from Connecticut does because he has been very active on behalf of the elderly. I want to know where they are hiding all these rich old people, because I would like to find them, befriend them; maybe they will be nice to me. I have a lot of old people in my district, most of whom are nice to me, but unfortunately I have not found all of these rich ones.

I just want to make some statistical points here because it is true there are a few people who are on Social Security who are very wealthy. But the bulk of the people on Social Security are average working people who in their retirement years would be living in desperate poverty if we did not have a decent Social Security program.

Some of the people on Social Security are still in poverty. What the President is asking us to do is to deny compensation for the cost of living for the next 3 years to people who are living in poverty or who are just above poverty.

The Pentagon, remember, gets a full cost-of-living increase plus a 3-percent bonus under his plan. Elderly people get less than a third of that.

Let me read from a very useful report which I am going to put into the RECORD from the Democratic Study Group, "Rose Garden II." CBO estimates that Social Security, along with railroad retirement, provides 82 percent of total income for elderly recipient families classified as poor; 79 percent of people classified as near poor, income is less than 20 percent above the poverty line. It is a very important source, in addition, for many low-income persons who are not elderly, but who are disabled, who are widowers or widows caring for children. All of them are victimized.

CBO has said that the President's proposal to reduce the Social Security cost-of-living increase will do more to increase poverty than any other proposal before us or any other economic event of recent times. And it will also degrade those who are just above poverty.

Is there insistence that elderly people, having worked hard all their lives in factories, in stores, in hospitals, having raised children, that it is somehow a crime for them to be a little bit above the poverty level? Because that is what we are talking about. We are not talking about a proposal aimed at denying Social Security cost-of-living increases to a handful of wealthy people. President Reagan is asking that we deny half of the Social Security increase that elderly people are now legally entitled to get for the next 3 years up and down the line. The poorest people in this country by the hundreds of thousands will be victimized by this breach of promise by the President of the United States.

I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think those statistics are very telling.

Another CBO statistic that I think drives this point home is that the Senate proposal, the Senate proposal that the President has endoresd and agreed to, the reduction in the COLA for the next 3 years, would put 650,000 senior citizens who are now at or above the poverty line into poverty.

We have already driven 250,000 senior citizens into that status by that 6-month cost-of-living delay in 1983. This is 650,000 more people.

Now we will hear some people argue that the problem is solved by a small increase in the so-called SSI, the supplmentary security income program and that that solves the problem. The fact is that it does nothing of the kind. The SSI benefits are themselves below the poverty line. So people who benefit from that will not be raised to poverty, but will be allowed to sink even lower, lower below the poverty line. And those who are in such desperate straits that they need to avail themselves of that program, will have to give up everything they saved in their lives. Virtually nothing in terms of assets can be held by a person who gets those kinds of benefits. So these people not only will be kept below poverty but pushed into even greater destitution by that plan that has been endorsed by the President.

Mr. FRANK. I thank the gentleman because the increase in SSI does not begin to undo the misery that will be inflicted on hard-working older people

by this. I want to stress that because we are told that we have to be tough; people are going to say, "Well, these are tough times, so be tough," I do not mind people being tough in tough times; I do not mind people being tough in tender times. People who like being tough are entitled to be tough.

□ 1640

But how do you prove your toughness by saying to an 83-year-old woman living in a major metropolitan center, in an expensive, high cost-of-living area where she has lived all her life, and now she has no relatives left and no friends, and she is living entirely on Social Security and she is maybe getting $500 a month.

You prove your toughness by telling her that for the next 3 years she will get only half of the cost-of-living increase? That as her food goes up, her rent goes up and her light bill goes up, and her health care and her transportation goes up, she will get half what it needs to pay them?

I wish people with this need to show their macho would find someone other than these 83-year-old vulnerable people on whom to demonstrate it.

There are plenty of areas in this Federal budget. Let's look at the Pentagon. Let's look at the agricultural program, Let's look at almost any other place you want. And it is compounded by the fact that the President of the United States made this solemn promise.

We are being told—it is not simply a rhetorical ploy—we are being told by our friends, "Well, yes, he shouldn't go to the cemetery at Bitburg and he shouldn't go and honor the SS, but he promised." The promise he gave, over the phone or in person to Helmut Kohl, why is that so absolutely unbreakable when the election pledge he made—he said to people, in effect, and you do this when you are a candidate—"If you vote for me, I promise that I will not cut Social Security." He solicited people's votes.

Older people have been frightened. Let's make a couple points. The gentleman from Connecticut made another excellent point that I want to just echo, when he talked about the intergenerational compact.

Because when taxes were increased on Social Security in 1983, when people who are now in their twenties and thirties and forties who are working, were asked to pay more in their taxes, they were told that was to go to build up the trust fund so there would be no question that when they reach retirement age, there would be adequate funds for them.

When the President starts cutting now—what he is asking in effect is that we accept the principle that we will not just look at those trust funds as means of paying for future cost-of-living increases; we will consider them somehow as a pot that can be used to reduce the deficit; that we will try to build up the trust fund, but not to pay our legal obligations; but rather to accumulate surpluses that can offset deficits elsewhere.

Let us talk about the elderly and Social Security. Some people have this crazy notion that reducing poverty among the elderly was something we should be embarrassed about. Not just reducing poverty, reducing near-poverty.

I do not think older people ought to be living at the absolute margin, afraid that an illness is going to wipe them out or any kind of unforeseen financial exigency will wipe them out.

In 1972, Social Security was indexed. It was done a little bit too much. Since that time, look what has happened: In 1977, the Notch Act and its accompaniments reduced Social Security. Then the Consumer Price Index was recalculated, because people said old people are getting too much, because they are getting too compensated for housing costs they do not have. So the CPI that they get is not as high as the one that they used to get.

Then in 1983 their benefits were reduced further; the cost of living was cut in half by being put back for 6 months. It is not as if nothing has happened.

After all of these things have happened, after three separate reductions in the law indexing Social Security benefits, after an increase in taxes to pay for Social Security benefits, with Social Security cost-of-living already having been reduced, with people born in the notch years suffering I think unjustly, with the Social Security trust fund in surplus, Ronald Reagan says:

> I need to give a 7-percent increase to the Pentagon, and therefore I have to cut in half the cost-of-living increase that Social Security recipients are entitled to.

He breaks his promise, an explicit, solemn promise. I think it is significant—as we know, our friends on the other side of the aisle have been very combative lately, and they are usually here to defend their President. I have never seen them as eloquent as I see them now by their absolute and complete silence, because they know—some of them are pretty good lawyers—when they have got an unsellable case. They know that the President of the United States made a promise; his press secretary said the promise includes not cutting benefits under cost of living, and it is being broken. It is being broken for no good fiscal reason but because some people have harbored this agenda—the gentleman from Connecticut has pointed out—they think old people have too much money, and we look at this whole Federal budget, and they look at military assistance for Marcos in the Philippines, and they look at the MX missile and star wars, and they look at some of the pork barrel projects and they say "Gee, we better cut cost-of-living increases for Social Security."

I yield again to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. I just want to say one more thing, and that is that I worry very much about where this is bound, in the future, if we start down this road. The President made his promise and it was, no more than 1 month ago that he was saying, "We're wasting a lot of time looking to Social Security to solve our deficit problem. It doesn't do anything for our deficit problem."

Just like he was right to promise not to cut, and he was right to say that, now he has reversed himself. We all know that in his budget proposal, he does not deal with the deficit; he does not get it down to any reasonable level at any time in the near future.

That means that next year, if we take this step, we will just be called on again to look at the same list of sources of cuts.

I think the senior citizens of America deserve a strong, unequivocal statement from this Congress that it is not going to be tampering with Social Security in the future, and I am very pleased that the gentleman from Massachusetts has scheduled this time so that we could lay before our colleagues how fallacious and erroneous is the proposal that to show that we are strong on reducing the deficit, which I think we are committed to doing the job, that we somehow have to beat up on senior citizens, to beat up on Social Security recipients, in order to justify doing what is right in asking fiscal prudence from other parts of our Federal budget.

Mr. FRANK. I am going to conclude, Madam Speaker. Let me just read from Mr. Robert Ball under the unanimous consent that I was given earlier that allows me to read.

Mr. Ball says:

> There is a mistaken notion—that has recently gained some currency—that Social Security, because it has no needs test, is somehow a middle-class program. Social Security is a universal program, and, of course, does cover the middle class—

Although let me say as my aside, the middle class, having contributed to the program, I do not understand why anyone ought to think it is wrong, and older retired middle class people, or to benefit from them; of course they should—

> but it is also our most effective antipoverty program. If there were no Social Security, there would be about 3.5 elderly poor persons for every 1 not below the poverty level.

Absent Social Security, 3.5 times as many elderly people would now be in poverty.

Social Security cuts the incidence of poverty among the elderly by over 70 percent. Nine to ten million people above 65 are kept above the rock-bottom poverty level by Social Security, and four to five million other social security beneficiaries are kept above the poverty level by their benefits. Millions more would have income only slightly above if it were not for Social Security.

Mr. Ball also points out, this is a permanent cut, not a 3-year cut. Because by reducing each year the amount people would get, you are reducing the base on which future increases come. This is a denial of billions of dollars. There are literally about $5.7 billion now, and I think it is ultimately $12 billion over 3 years that the elderly are entitled to.

People in the other body proposed, in their budget proposal, reducing Social Security benefits for 1 year. Understand that in this case, the President's compromise made it worse. Donald Regan says—the President's Chief of Staff—that he was the one, on behalf of the President, who suggested that.

So let us just quickly summarize where we are. Ronald Reagan, in his campaign for reelection, in his debates, through his press secretary, made a solemn pledge to the voters that if they voted for him and reelected him President, he would not reduce cost-of-living increases to Social Security recipients. He invited people to break that promise.

He has now joined in breaking the promise himself. The Pentagon will get a 7-percent increase. The waste will get an increase as well as what we need; the muscle as well as the fat.

Other areas of the program that he supports will get increases. The Social Security tax increase that he signed into law 2 years ago will not go to the purposes for which it was intended, if he has his way. It will not go to pay the cost-of-living increase. If he has his way, hundreds of thousands of elderly people; 650,000 the gentleman from Connecticut points out, who are now in poverty, will fall into poverty.

Millions more will have a reduction in the cost of living and you can say, Well, it is only 2 percent this year. And 2 percent next year and 2 percent the year after. So there is a 6-percent deterioration in their cost of living.

These are not people, on the whole, who are living so high on the hog—and of course, the President would also increase the amount they have to pay out for medical bills by raising Medicare fees, and some of them who happen to live in subsidized housing would have increases there, and that public transportation that many of them have to use would go up.

The President's budget is an assault on the elderly, including the poor elderly, middle-income elderly, in flagrant violation of the campaign promise he made. That promise may not be very important to him.

I think campaign promises ought to be treated as a very important obligation by all of us who go and say to people, "If you vote for me, if you give me the most sacred thing you have got in our democratic system, your ballot—from the standpoint of that system, then I will honor any kind of obligation I undertake to you."

□ 1650

The President was not forced to make that promise. He volunteered it. He reached out to make it. There is no economic justification for cutting the cost of living increase that Social Security recipients are now legally entitled to get. There is no moral justification. There is no justification in terms of the deficit.

The President is wrong to have made that promise and to have so callously broken it, and I hope that the majority of the Members of this Chamber will remember the older people have a legitimate expectation not to get rich when they retire, not to become people who are living in luxury, but they have a legitimate expectation that there will not be on retirement a drastic reduction in their standard of living. To say to older people that they are going to get a 6-percent drop in their real standard of living over the next 3 years, with everything else that is going on in Ronald Reagan's budget, is wholly unjustified, and I hope the House will not yield to it.

Madam Speaker, as previously mentioned, I am including in the RECORD at this point a letter from Robert M. Ball, and other extraneous material:

WASHINGTON DC,
January 25, 1985.

Congressman BARNEY FRANK,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK: I thought the enclosure might be useful to you during the current congressional consideration of possible changes in the cost-of-living adjustment for social security beneficiaries. As you can see, I think it is a bad idea.

Cordially,

ROBERT M. BALL,
(Commissioner of Social Security, 1962-73).

[Study Group on Social Security, New York, NY]

CUTTING OR SKIPPING THE COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT (COLA) FOR SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARIES IS UNWISE AND UNFAIR—JANUARY 18, 1985

(By Robert M. Ball)*

1. Cutting the COLA is a benefit cut for 36 million social security beneficiaries.

The COLA is an integral part of the basic social security (old-age, survivors and disability insurance) system and the financing of the program, which is fully adequate, is designed to pay for the COLA. The COLA is not a benefit increase. The adjustment merely maintains the purchasing power of the benefit.

2. The separately and adequately financed social security program is not contributing to the deficit and should not be cut because taxes are too low to pay for other domestic and military spending.

Social security is not contributing one cent to the deficit. On the contrary, the deficit in the consolidated budget is being reduced because of social security. In order to build up reserves, social security will be taking in more than it pays out for several decades. This, of course, helps overall government financing. Social security funds that are not needed for the payment of benefits are lent to the government at interest. Thus other activities can be partially financed by borrowing from social security without the government going into the financial markets and competing with private industry.

3. The overwhelming majority of social security beneficiaries have low incomes.

Social security supplies more than half the income for two-thirds of its over-65 beneficiaries. About one-third get more than 90 percent of their income from social security. Yet the average benefit payment is less than $450 a month. An estimated 500,000 people would be pushed below the government's rock-bottom measure of dire poverty if their purchasing power were cut by a COLA freeze. If the increase in the Consumer Price Index for next year is 4 percent, the average monthly cut for beneficiaries would be $18, if 5 percent, $22.50 a month. These amounts may sound small to some, but to people largely dependent on social security, these cuts can mean choosing between food and medicine.

There is a mistaken notion—that has recently gained some currency—that social security, because it has no needs test, is somehow a middle-class program. Social security is a universal program, and, of course, does cover the middle class, but it is also our most effective anti-poverty program. If there were no social security, there would be about 3.5 elderly poor persons for every 1 now below the poverty level. Social security cuts the incidence of poverty among the elderly by over 70 percent. Nine to ten million people over 65 are kept above the rock-bottom poverty level by social security, and four to five million other social security beneficiaries are also kept above the poverty level by their benefits. Millions more would have incomes only slightly above poverty if it were not for social security. Whittling away at social security benefits will reverse the progress that has been made and plunge additional people into the poor and near-poor category.

4. Cutting the COLA for even one year is a permanent cut.

Cutting the COLA is a cut in benefits that continues year after year for all those who are on the benefit rolls at the time the COLA is due to be paid. For them, in each year that follows, a new COLA is applied to a lower benefit than would otherwise be the case so that they never catch up with inflation.

5. Cutting the COLA introduces unfair treatment among beneficiaries.

Those who are on the benefit rolls next December would have their benefits cut. On the other hand, those who apply after 1985 will receive full benefits, unless, as many will fear, the freeze is extended.

6. Modifying social security commitments in ways unrelated to social security purposes undermines faith in the program.

---

*Commissioner of Social Security 1962-73 and member of the 1982-83 National Commission on Social Security Reform.

Social security promises rest on past earnings and contributions and stretch into the distant future. Workers today are paying for protection that in part will not be realized for 20, 30 or 40 years in the future. To modify benefit promises in ways unrelated to social security needs or purposes would further weaken faith in the system, and, indeed, in the promises of government itself.

The law provides that social security should be inflation-proof. People are counting on it. The President has reenforced the promise in the law by an unequivocal pledge not to cut social security protection, including the cost-of-living benefits. During the debate with Mr. Mondale on October 7, 1984, the President said:

"I will never reduce social security benefits to people who are now getting them."

Two days later on October 9 an official statement went further, saying:

"The President will never stand for reduction of social security for anybody, those now getting them or future recipients."

When questioned further on October 9 about the social security cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), White House spokesman, Larry Speakes and a reporter had this exchange:

Question: "You say that benefits will not be reduced. The law includes a provision for increases in benefits based on cost of living. Does this guarantee those increases as well?"

Mr. Speakes: "Yes. This is the law."

Question: "And you say it doesn't include—that there'll be no tampering and delaying or trimming of cost of living?"

Mr. Speakes: "No tampering. No nothing."

The American people voted in 1984 partly on the basis of this commitment made by the President so that for both sustantive reasons and because the integrity of the Presidency is at stake, social security should not be part of the deficit reduction effort.

7. Cutting the COLA will break the agreement implicit in the 1983 Amendments.

All during 1981 and 1982, social security beneficiaries—36 million people, principally elderly retired persons, totally disabled people, widows and motherless and fatherless children—were terrorized by the fear that their benefits would stop or be reduced. There were almost daily reports of social security "bankruptcy." Under this daily pounding, a high proportion of the 120 million contributors to the program became convinced that they would never receive the benefits toward which they were contributing. The Nation was greatly disturbed by the possibility that the government might turn its back on the commitments it had made over the last 50 years. The 1983 Amendments to the Social Security Act restored fiscal solvency to social security and have reassured people that their benefits are safe. It seems very unwise to open up the question of benefit cuts again. Failure to keep social security benefits up to date with purchasing power would be particularly resented because OASDI is now adequately financed, and the benefit reduction clearly would be made solely for the purpose of reducing the overall deficit.

After a year of study, the National Commission on Social Security Reform, appointed jointly by the President and the Republican and Democratic leadership of the Congress, agreed on a set of recommendations which were endorsed by 12 of its 15 members. These recommendations became the basis for the 1983 Amendments to the Social Security Act.

No one who supported the plan liked all parts of it. There was some pain for everyone involved in social security, but not too much for any one group:

Beneficiaries had the cost-of-living adjustment postponed and put permanently on a calendar year basis, a move which amounted to approximately a 2½ percent benefit cut over the average beneficiary's lifetime.

Contribution rate increases were speeded up for both workers and employers, with employers paying more than under previous law in 1984, 1988 and 1989 and employees paying more in 1988 and 1989.

The self-employed are now required to pay social security rates that are comparable to what is paid by, and on behalf of employees, a considerable increase over what they have been paying in the past.

Higher-income social security beneficiaries (less than 10 percent of all beneficiaries) will for the first time pay an income tax on one-half their social security benefits, with the proceeds of the tax going to support social security.

Those non-profit employees not previously covered (about 15 percent of the total) and newly hired Federal employees have been brought under the system, as have members of Congress and top officials of the Executive Branch.

The Federal Government speeded up its payment for military service credits and will pay for the refundable tax credit for employees in the year 1984 and for certain tax credits for the self-employed.

To bring the separately financed OASDI system into balance, agreement was struck among many diverse interests. To now impose additional sacrifice on one group—beneficiaries—is a violation of that agreement.

8. Keeping benefits up to date with the full cost of living makes sense.

Since the amendments of 1972, the purchasing power of social security benefits has been protected against inflation. The provision was adopted as a conservative measure because its sponsors believed that an automatic provision for meeting increases in the cost of living would tend to prevent ad hoc benefit increases and other expensive changes in the program that went beyond keeping the benefits up to date with price changes. It has turned out to be one of the most valuable provisions in the social security program.

It makes sense to decide on the proper level of benefits that people should get at the time of first receipt, and then to maintain the purchasing power of that benefit. It doesn't make sense to provide a given level of benefits at the time of retirement or total disability, or to survivors on the death of a wage earner and then to let inflation cut the value of those benefits so that people in their seventies or eighties have less than when they retired.

CONCLUSION

After the turmoil of 1981 and 1982 social security is now doing just fine. Let's keep it that way.

SECTION IV—SOCIAL SECURITY

"A one-year freeze in Social Security benefits would have been tolerable. But reducing them by 2 percent a year for each of the next three years is grossly unfair and an ominous precedent. Holding down the cost-of-living adjustments year after year means that retired people get poorer as they get older."—The Washington Post Editorial, April 7, 1985.

The most controversial proposal in the new Reagan/Republican budget calls for a reduction in the annual cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for Social Security. The proposal is controversial because it would produce even larger cutbacks in Social Security than the COLA freeze adopted by the Senate Budget Committee; because it would have an especially harsh effect on many low-income people; and because it represents abandonment of the promise President Reagan made repeatedly during the 1984 campaign.

The proposed COLA reduction would cut Social Security spending by $3.0 billion in fiscal year 1986 and a total of $22.7 billion over the three-year period fiscal year 1986 through fiscal year 1988, compared to the amounts needed to maintain the benefits mandated by current law.

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

The new Reagan/Republican proposal would essentially reduce the COLA by two percentage points per year over the next three years, but with a minimum 2 percent COLA guaranteed regardless of the inflation rate. If the Administration's inflation projections prove accurate, this proposal would cut the COLA roughly in half.

Specifically, President Reagan and the Senate Republicans propose to set the annual Social Security COLA at 2 percent for each of the next three years, provided that inflation does not exceed the rates currently projected by the Administration (4.1 percent in fiscal year 1986, 4.3 percent in fiscal year 1987, and 4.1 percent in fiscal year 1988). If actual inflation exceeds these projections, and additional increase equal to the excess of actual inflation over projected inflation would be added to the basic 2 percent COLA.

For example, if inflation is 4.1 percent next year (the rate projected by the Administration) the COLA would be 2 percent. If inflation is 5 percent the COLA would be 2.9 percent (the basic 2 percent plus 0.9 percent for the excess of actual over expected inflation). If inflation is only 3 percent, the COLA would be 2 percent.

The "guaranteed COLA" issue

President Reagan and other Republicans have sought to portray their COLA proposal as a benefit liberalization, since their plan would provide a guaranteed 2 percent COLA regardless of the inflation rate, whereas under current law no COLA is provided in years when inflation falls below 3 percent. It should be noted, however, that current law merely delays the COLA in such circumstances, rather than canceling it, with a catch-up increase provided once inflation rises above the 3 percent threshold. Thus, while current law contains the possibility of a temporary COLA delay, the Reagan/Republican proposal contains the virtual certainty of the premanent cancellation of part of the COLA due in each of the next three years.

In addition, the Republicans' guaranteed COLA would only provide protection against a largely hypothetical possibility. Neither the Office of Management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), nor private forecasters currently expect the inflation rate to fall below the 3 percent threshold that would trigger a Social Security COLA delay during the next three years.

EFFECT ON BENEFICIARIES

Based on Administration assumptions, the new Reagan/Republican proposal would reduce Social Security benefits by 1.9 percent in fiscal year 1986 and 5.7 percent in fiscal year 1988, compared to the benefits

that would be received under current law. This reduction would cost the average recipient $81 in fiscal year 1986, $198 in fiscal year 1987, and $314 in fiscal year 1988, according to an analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

By the time the three-year COLA reduction specified by the new budget compromise is fully phased-in, it would cost beneficiaries almost 50 percent more than the one-year COLA freeze originally approved by the Senate Budget Committee. By fiscal year 1988, the one-year COLA freeze would reduce benefits 3.9 percent below the levels mandated by current law, compared to the 5.7 percent benefit cut under the new Republican plan.

Impact on the poor

Of particular concern is the effect of the proposed COLA reduction on low-income beneficiaries, many of whom are heavily dependent on income from Social Security and related programs. For example, CBO estimates that Social Security (along with Railroad Retirement) provides 82 percent of total income for elderly recipient families classified as poor, and 79 percent of total income for elderly recipient families classified as near poor (that is, with incomes less than 25 percent above the poverty line). In addition, Social Security is a very important source of income for many low-income persons who are not elderly but who are disabled, orphaned, or widows or widowers caring for children.

The Republicans propose to partially alleviate this problem by increasing benefits under the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program—which provides cash assistance to aged, blind, or disabled people with very low incomes. Many poor people affected by the COLA cut do not receive SSI, however, partially because of the stringent income and assets tests required to qualify, and partially because some otherwise eligible people are evidently reluctant to seek what they perceive to be "welfare" benefits.

CBO estimates that the SSI benefit increase would offset the COLA reduction for only about one-third of the poor families affected, and for less than one-fifth of the near poor families affected. Even with the SSI benefit increase, CBO calculates that an estimated 2.9 million poor families will suffer a net loss (averaging $200 per year) and that another 1.9 million near poor families will suffer a net loss (averaging $280 per year). Further, according to CBO, the net effect of the COLA reduction and SSI benefit increase would be to increase the number of people living in poverty by 570,000—380,000 of whom are elderly.*

PRESIDENT REAGAN'S PROMISES

The proposed cutbacks in Social Security cost-of-living adjustments have become particularly controversial because they represent abandonment of firm promises made by President Reagan during the 1984 campaign to oppose any cuts in Social Security benefits.

Further, the Administration is hardly in a position to argue that these cuts were forced on the President by Senate Republicans. As noted above, the Social Security cuts contained in the new Reagan/Republican compromise are considerably deeper than those proposed by the Senate Budget Committee. What's more, White House chief of staff Donald Regan has told the press that it was he who suggested the three-year COLA cutback, and that he made this proposal "on behalf of the President."

Incredibly, when asked by the press whether the Democrats would "beat up on him" for breaking his campaign promises, the President responded, "Well, if they do they'll be lying in their teeth."

The following page contains examples of some of the statements made last year by President Reagan and his press secretary pledging to preserve full Social Security benefits.

"I will never stand for a reduction of the Social Security benefits to the people that are now getting them . . ."—President Reagan, Presidential Debate, October 7, 1984.

"The President will never stand for reduction of Social Security benefits for anybody."—White House Deputy Press Secretary Larry Speakes, October 9, 1984.

Deputy Press Secretary Larry Speakes was asked: "You say that benefits will not be reduced. The law includes a provision for increases in benefits based on cost of living. Does this guarantee those increases as well?" Speakes answered: "Yes. The law is the law."—White House Briefing, October 9, 1984.

"We're never going to take away from those people who are dependent on Social Security, now or in the future."—President Reagan, October 10, 1984.

"I will absolutely battle against any suggestion of reducing or taking the benefits these people on Social Security are getting. . . . They're going to get those benefits the way they are."—President Reagan, October 12, 1984.

"I made it plain that I would never hold still for any change in Social Security that pulled the rug out from the people that were depending on it."—President Reagan, October 16, 1984.

"The President has made it emphatic that he will not touch Social Security in any shape or fashion."—White House Deputy Press Secretary Larry Speakes, December 6, 1984.

[Center on Budget and Policy Priorities]

AVERAGE SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFICIARY TO LOSE $1,667 OVER 5 YEARS UNDER NEW WHITE HOUSE BUDGET

LOW INCOME PROGRAMS TO BE CUT $25 BILLION OVER NEXT 3 YEARS

The average Social Security beneficiary would lose $1,667 over the next five years under the new budget plan announced by President Reagan and Senate Republican leaders last week, according to a new analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

The losses would come from reductions in Social Security cost-of-living adjustments and increases in the monthly premiums charged to elderly Medicare beneficiaries.

The analysis also finds that the new budget would also reduce programs for low income persons by $25 billion over the next three years—$4.6 billion in FY 1986, $8.7 billion in FY 1987, and $11.4 billion in FY 1988.

The largest reductions in the low income area would come from the elimination of rural housing programs for low income persons and major reductions in Medicaid, the analysis reports. The cuts over the next three years in Medicaid would be five times larger under the new White House/Republican budget than under the budget plan adopted last month by the Senate Budget Committee.

The analysis is based on budget estimates from the Senate Budget Committee and the Office of Management and Budget.

Social Security reductions

The analysis reports that reductions in Social Security benefits would, for 1988 and all succeeding years, be larger than those adopted in March by the Senate Budget Committee.

The Budget Committee proposal to freeze Social Security cost-of-living adjustments for one year would reduce benefits by $8.1 billion in 1988 and subsequent years, the analysis notes. But while the new budget plan reduces benefits less than the Senate plan in 1986, by 1988 it represents a $12.1 billion a year reduction.

"Over the course of time, beneficiaries would lose substantially more under this plan than under the Committee plan," according to the analysis. "This is because the Budget Committee plan reduced benefits about 4 percent by canceling the 1986 cost-of-living reduction. By contrast, the new plan cuts benefits about 6 percent for 1988 and subsequent years—by lowering the cost-of-living adjustment 2 percent next year, an additional 2 percent in 1987, and a further 2 percent in 1988."

The average Social Security loss per beneficiary reaches $314 by 1988 and at least $1,257 over the next five years, the Center reported.

The new budget plan also raises the monthly premiums that elderly persons must pay for Medicare coverage. These premiums are subtracted from monthly Social Security checks—and as a result, the checks will fall still further behind inflation, according to the Center.

In 1988, the average elderly Social Security beneficiary will lose $385 from these Social Security and Medicare changes combined, the Center noted. In 1990, the average loss will reach $512.

Over the next five years, the average cumulative loss from both Social Security and Medicare will be $1,667 per beneficiary.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities is a nonprofit research and analysis organization supported primarily by foundations.

HURTING THOSE WHO NEED HELP THE MOST

(By William V. Shannon)

The budget "compromise" worked out by President Reagan and the Senate Republican leaders is as morally despicable as anything that has come out of Washington in the last four years.

Along a trail of broken promises and political doubletalk, Reagan is once again on the attack against old-age pensioners, the needy sick, hard-pressed farmers, unemployed teenagers and college students from working-class families. Programs that help make our inner cities livable for the poor such as mass transit, low-income housing and general revenue-sharing would be sharply reduced or canceled.

All this is being done in the name of reducing the deficit. The theory is that the deficit, which is now $213 billion, could be brought below $100 billion by 1988.

There are two things wrong with this theory. The first is that it does not fit the facts. In February, the Congressional Budget Office, using more cautious, and therefore probably more accurate, assumptions about economic growth and interest

---

*These CBO estimates all include the effects of the proposed COLA reduction for Federal civilian and military retirement and Railroad Retirement, as well as for Social Security. These estimates are based on Administration inflation assumptions and 1983 income levels; dollar losses are stated in 1983 dollars.

rates, forecast that even if Congress approved all the Reagan spending cuts the annual federal budget deficit would remain around $185 billion for the rest of the 1980s.

The second falsehood underlying this compromise is that cuts in spending could ever bring the budget into balance. As fast as those cuts are being made, the money saved by them is being used up by the higher-interest payments on the rising national debt.

The reckless Reagan tax cut of 1981 produced these huge budget deficits. Only a substantial tax increase can bring them back to a manageable size. The 1981 act reduced federal government revenue for the five years from 1982 through 1987 by $750 billion. If the old 1981 rates were still in effect, the current deficit would be reduced by two-thirds. The remaining one-third is accounted for by Reagan's increases in military spending.

The Reagan tax reduction and the accompanying budget was not an economically or morally neutral act. It was an economically unnecessary and monstrously unjust transfer of wealth from the poorest, weakest, most vulnerable people in our society to the strongest and the richest.

In thinking about the Reagan budget compromise in coming months, the public should keep one text in mind. It is from William Greider's "The Education of David Stockman" in the Atlantic Monthly of December 1981 in which Reagan's chief budget adviser is described after the tax-cutting orgy of that year.

"It seemed to leave a bad taste in his mouth, as though the Democratic process had finally succeeded in shocking him by its intensity and its greed. Once again, Stockman participated in the trading—special tax concessions for oil-lease holders and real estate tax shelters, and generous loopholes that virtually eliminated the corporate income tax. Stockman sat in the room and saw it happen.

"Do you realize the greed that came to the forefront?" Stockman asked with wonder. "The hogs were really feeding. The greed level, the level of opportunism, just got out of control."

To trim the deficits created by this hoggishness, Reagan, Stockman and the Senate Republican leaders have been squeezing food stamps for the marginally poor and eliminating public-service jobs for the marginally employable. Now, as part of their latest "compromise," they propose to take another whack at the old-age pensioners. The elderly would have to pay more for their Medicare protection. They would also have their cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) restricted to 2 percent.

Many forget that as part of the 1983 bipartisan agreement that put the Social Security system on a financially sound basis for the immediate future, pensioners had to accept a "one time only" COLA delay for six months. That was not just a postponement; it was a perpetual reduction in benefits because each subsequent cost-of-living adjustment is based on one's existing benefit level. Once a step on the escalator is lost, it cannot be regained.

How well off are these old people who Reagan has chosen to make fresh sacrifices? The large majority of people over 65 have incomes between $4,000 and $15,000. Single retirees (mostly widows) have a median monthly benefit below $450. Anyone here want to volunteer to pay his own rent, fuel bills, telephone bill, and food and clothing costs on $450 a month?

(William V. Shannon is a contributing columnist.)

● Mr. OBERSTAR, Madam Speaker, Just 6 months ago, President Reagan, as well as the overwhelming majority of candidates for the House and Senate promised the American people that they would not support further cuts in Social Security.

The 1983 amendments strengthened the Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Trust Funds by accelerating tax increases, delaying cost-of-living adjustments, and ignoring a 2.4 percent change in the consumer price index. There is no financial justification for cutting benefits to present or future retirees. The trust funds are not in trouble today, they are accumulating surpluses.

The only significant change which has occurred since last fall is that the elections are behind us.

My colleagues here have discussed the adverse impact of a 2-percent per year COLA reduction on today's annuitants. I want to discuss the fairness issue for workers age 59 through 64 who are still in the work force.

Substantial benefit reductions for future retirees were made in 1977 when the flawed benefit formula of the 1972 amendments was corrected. A new 1977 benefit computation formula was designed so that a worker with average wages throughout his worklife would receive, at age 65, a benefit equal to 42 percent of preretirement income. That goal was to be achieved by averaging indexed lifetime earnings up to age 62 an then applying all cost-of-living adjustments granted after the worker reached age 62.

If Congress approved the budget agreement recently worked out between the Senate Republicans and the White House, workers reaching age 62 this year—will have their benefits reduced by 6.5 percent and will retire at age 65 with approximately 40.1 percent of preretirement income. Individuals reaching age 62 in either 1984 or 1986 will have their full entitlement reduced by 4.25 percent; workers reaching 62 in 1983 or 1987 will face a 2-percent reduction in the benefit which would otherwise be payable.

The proposed Senate Republican—Reagan administration budget will worsen the notch effect we have all heard so much about for those born in 1921 and create another notch for those born between 1922 and 1925.

More important, for those born in 1923, who reach age 62 this year, we will have come halfway to the administration's aborted 1981 Social Security proposals which had as their objective a reduction in benefits to only 38 percent of preretirement income for average wage earners.

The oldest of our retirees cannot afford to absorb a cumulative 6.5 percent reduction in their purchasing power because they are least likely to have resources to supplement Social Security annuities. Yet, comparatively, the oldest retirees are taking the smallest cut because younger retirees and workers close to retirement age will receive reduced benefits for longer periods of time.

Prior to 1972 when cost-of-living adjustments were put on automatic pilot, increases were granted periodically to insure that retirees would benefit from the increased productivity of the active work force. The chief criticism of those sporadic increases was that the Congress was overreacting to political pressures and granting increases related to wage increases that were greater than price increases, and that retirees were being over-compensated.

The automatic increase provisions was to keep retirees even with inflation. Never before in the history of the Social Security Program, however, has Congress set out to systematically reduce the purchasing power of the Nation's elderly by stipulating that benefits will be kept below price increases.

If Congress votes to reduce or freeze Social Security benefits, the effect will be to blame the old, the sick, the poor, and make them pay for excessive military expenditures and inappropriate tax reductions granted in 1981. That budget policy cannot and will not serve the long-range best interests of this Nation.●

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRANK. Madam 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 on today.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MIKULSKI (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. BADHAM (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BATEMAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCKINNEY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. LUNGREN, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SWINDALL, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. KEMP, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. MYERS of Indiana, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. STRANG, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. DORNAN of California, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. BARTLETT, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, for 30 minutes, April 30.
Mr. DORNAN of California, for 10 minutes, April 30.
Mr. HENDON, for 60 minutes, April 30.
Mr. GILMAN, for 60 minutes, May 1.
Mr. BROYHILL, for 60 minutes, May 6.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS of Illinois) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MOAKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. NELSON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BUSTAMANTE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LEVINE of California, for 60 minutes. today.
Mr. FRANK, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. MOODY, for 60 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BATEMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COMBEST.
Mr. DREIER of California.
Mr. COURTER in two instances.
Mr. LOTT.
Mr. BARTLETT.
Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.
Mr. CONTE in two instances.
Mr. FIELDS.
Mr. MICHEL in four instances.
Ms. SNOWE.
Mr. WOLF.
Mr. MCDADE.
Mr. GROTBERG.
Mr. BROOMFIELD in three instances.
Mr. LENT.
Mr. MYERS of Indiana.
Mr. STANGELAND.
Mr. DAUB.
Mr. COUGHLIN.
Mr. BEREUTER.
Mr. MCGRATH.
Mr. THOMAS of California.
Mr. GRADISON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STUDDS in two instances.
Mr. GAYDOS.
Mr. WIRTH.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. NOWAK.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. ERDREICH.
Mr. SKELTON.
Mr. LANTOS in two instances.
Mr. FUQUA.
Mr. HUCKABY.
Mr. GUARINI in two instances.
Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.
Mr. FLORIO.
Mr. MOODY.
Mr. WILLIAMS.
Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania.
Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia in two instances.
Mrs. LONG.
Mr. BIAGGI.
Mr. TRAFICANT.
Mr. WAXMAN.
Mr. STALLINGS.
Ms. KAPTUR.
Mr. KANJORSKI.
Mr. GARCIA.
Mr. ROYBAL.
Mr. FORD of Michigan.
Mr. MATSUI.
Mr. BONKER.
Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.
Mr. APPLEGATE.
Mr. COELHO.
Mr. MURTHA.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. TORRES.
Mr. REID.
Mr. BEDELL.
Mr. BARNARD.
Mr. BARNES.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. YATRON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.
Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.
Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in 10 instances.
Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution designating the month of May 1985, as "National Child Safety Awareness Month."

Date April 25, 1985

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 30, 1985, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under Clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1135. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed amendment to the fiscal year 1986 military construction authorization bill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1136. A letter from the Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the sixth report on applications for delays of notice and customer challenges under provisions of the Right To Financial Privacy Act of 1978, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 3421: to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1137. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations for chapter 1, Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981; Financial Assistance to State Educational Agencies To Meet Special Educational Needs of Migratory Children, and Neglected or Delinquent Children in Institutions, and General Definitions and Administrative, Project, Fiscal, and Due Process Requirements, pursuant to GEPA, section 431(A)(1) (88 Stat. 567; 90 Stat. 2231; 95 Stat. 453); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1138. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a copy of notice for final funding priorities for Handicapped Special Studies Program, pursuant to GEPA, section 431(d)(1) (88 Stat. 567; 90 Stat. 2231; 95 Stat. 453); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1139. A letter from the Deputy Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the annual report on application for court orders made to Federal and State courts to permit the interception of wire or oral communications during calendar year 1984, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1140. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to make permanent a reform in the method used for computing pay for Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1141. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notice of the intent to designate 32 countries as least developed beneficiary developing countries, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2464(c)(6)(B)(ii) (H. Doc. No. 99-60); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1142. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the U.S. Customs Service for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1143. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1984 covering the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Leasing and Production Program administered by the Department of the Interior through the Minerals Management Service, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1953, chapter 345, section 15(1) (92 Stat. 648); jointly, to the Committees on Interior and

Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

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. PANETTA: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 146. Resolution relating to election of a Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of Indiana. (Rept. No. 99-58). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1784. A bill to authorize appropiations for fiscal year 1986 for the operation and maintenance of the Panama Canal, and for other purpose; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. GIBBONS:

H.R. 2250. A bill to authorize appropriations for the U.S. International Trade Commission, the U.S. Customs Service, and the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 2251. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs under title VII of that act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself and Mr. MADIGAN):

H.R. 2252. A bill to revise and extend the programs of assistance under title X of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUNDINE (for himself, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut):

H.R. 2253. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the special facility for sub-Saharan Africa, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the African Development Fund; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.R. 2254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small businesses to reduce the value of excess inventory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNEY of New York (for himself, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. ECKART of Ohio):

H.R. 2255. A bill to provide that the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 will apply to certain petroleum and to establish a separate account in the Superfund for leaking underground storage tanks; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 2256. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to provide assistance for State clearinghouses for information relating to missing children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORD of Tennessee:

H.R. 2257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require information reporting with respect to airline passes provided under frequent flier or similar programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK:

H.R. 2258. A bill to provide for a program of assisted higher education for individuals intending to engage in police work; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 2259. A bill relating to the establishment and disposition of customs districts and ports of entry, the provision of customs services on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii:

H.R. 2260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1953 to extend the energy percentage of the investment tax credit for qualified intercity buses to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii (for himself and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 2261. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the formation of physicians' and surgeons' mutual protection associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERTEL of Michigan:

H.R. 2262. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to take certain extraordinary actions regarding contracts of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 2263. A bill to authorize the President to present a gold medal to the parents of Father Jerzy Popieluszko; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2264. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide civil penalties for false claims and statements made to the United States, to certain recipients of property, services, or money from the United States, or to parties to contracts with the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS (for himself and Mr. HOPKINS):

H.R. 2265. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to strengthen the position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to provide for more efficient and effective operation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 2266. A bill authorizing appropriations for Amtrak for fiscal years 1986 and 1987, establishing a Commission to study the financial status of Amtrak, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire:

H.R. 2267. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to control immigration into the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MICHEL) (by request):

H.R. 2268. A bill to approve and implement the free trade area agreement between the United States and Israel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

H.J. Res. 263. Joint resolution designating June 14, 1985, as "Baltic Freedom Day"; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.J. Res. 264. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LELAND:

H.J. Res. 265. Joint resolution designating the month of June 1985, as "Black Music Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LUKEN (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, and Mrs. COLLINS):

H.J. Res. 266. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the week beginning on April 13, 1986, as "National Garden Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire):

H.J. Res. 267. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that expenditures made by the United States shall not exceed its receipts, except in time of war or national emergency, and providing for its phased-in implementation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. YATRON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. PRICE, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. GREEN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. FISH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LENT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BARNES, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mr. CHANDLER):

H. Con. Res. 132. Concurrent resolution observing the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H. Con. Res. 133. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that each State should develop a curriculum for instructing schoolchildren in the history of the Holocaust; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONKER (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FRANK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZ-

KA, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. MINETA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PEASE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. GAYDOS):

H. Res. 147. Resolution urging the President to make the overvalued dollar, the growing U.S. trade deficit, and cooperative measures to redress these imbalances a top priority at the economic summit meeting in Bonn, West Germany; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Foreign Affairs, and Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

92. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to the civil liberties of Orthodox christians living in Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

93. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Oklahoma, relative to funding available to the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 43: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 52: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 68: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GRAY, of Pennsylvania, and Ms. OAKAR.

H.R. 83: Mr. PORTER and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 151: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 281: Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. FAZIO, and Ms. OAKAR.

H.R. 283: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GRAY, of Pennsylvania, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. OAKAR.

H.R. 469: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 479: Mr. MONSON, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 480: Mr. ANDERSON.

H.R. 528: Mrs. ROUKEMA and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 602: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MONSON, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 620: Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 705: Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 753: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 776: Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 831: Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 873: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. WHITLEY, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MONSON, and Mr. LOEFFLER.

H.R. 874: Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 968: Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 1059: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 1099: Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 1121: Mr. BONKER, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1161: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1207: Mr. BONIOR of Michigan, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LEVINE of California, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1267: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 1294: Mr. OWENS and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 1327: Mr. SUNIA, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. PRICE, Mr. FAZIO, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 1408: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 1423: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma and Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii.

H.R. 1519: Mr. YOUNG of Missouri and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.R. 1524: Mr. GEPHARDT and Mrs. BURTON of California.

H.R. 1542: Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 1552: Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. ECKERT of New York, and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 1562: Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. WISE, Mr. BARNES, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1564: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FROST, Mr. STRANG, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. CROCKETT, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1566: Mr. MONSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 1567: Mr. MONSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 1584: Mr. VENTO and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1626: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 1650: Mr. BARNES, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. WIRTH.

H.R. 1682: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BEDELL, and Mrs. JOHNSON.

H.R. 1719: Mr. COBEY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. FRENZEL, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SHAW, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

H.R. 1907: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1911: Mr. WEBER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MONSON, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SHUMWAY.

H.R. 1916: Mr. MCDADE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PRICE, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. WEBER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. COBEY, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. MCGRATH.

H.R. 1927: Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 2032: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. LELAND, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 2069: Mr. LUKEN, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. DYSON, Mr. RUDD, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROE, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HOPKINS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. MARTIN of New York.

H.R. 2080: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. HAYES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. HENRY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 2093: Mr. EDGAR.

H.R. 2119: Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. HORTON, Mr. REID, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FISH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. WEISS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. HERTEL of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 36: Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ROE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FROST, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. DYMALLY, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. STOKES, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.J. Res. 41: Mr. PANETTA.

H.J. Res. 64: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. COURTER, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. SUNIA.

H.J. Res. 65: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. DURBIN.

H.J. Res. 100: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FROST, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MRAZEK, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.J. Res. 125: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CARR, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. DYSON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GROTBERG, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HENDON, Mr. HENRY, Mr. HERTEL of Michigan, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HYDE, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCKERNAN, Mr. MACK, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REID, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROGERS,

Mr. ROSE, Mr. SABO, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. SILJANDER, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STRANG, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. COBEY, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. BLILEY, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. COELHO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. ECKART of Ohio, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. OLIN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LENT, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. COBLE.

H.J. Res. 128: Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MONSON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. YATRON, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. CARR, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FEIGHAN, Ms. FIEDLER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. STUDDS.

H.J. Res. 131: Mrs. HOLT, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. EVANS of Iowa, Mr. BARNES, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, and Mr. BATES.

H.J. Res. 136: Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DYSON, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, and Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

H.J. Res. 152: Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. LUNDINE.

H.J. Res. 192: Mrs. BOGGS and Mr. LEACH of Iowa.

H.J. Res. 230: Mr. GRADISON and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.J. Res. 258: Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BARNES, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. DAUB, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. MCGRATH.

H.J. Res. 261: Mr. VENTO and Mr. DIOGUARDI.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. COYNE, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SABO, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. STARK.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. WILSON, Mr. FRANKLIN, Mr. RAY, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. ECKART of Ohio and Mr. RITTER.

H. Con Res. 82: Mr. DURBIN.

H. Con Res. 100: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. DAUB, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. EDGAR, Mr. SAVAGE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WORTLEY, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H. Con. Res. 121: Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REID, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. WEISS, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. RUSSO, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. COELHO, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARR, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SMITH of Florida, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. DYSON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. MOORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. RUDD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MCGRATH.

H. Con. Res. 125: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FROST, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. MARKEY.

H. Con. Res. 131: Mr. ASPIN, Mr. DAUB, and Mr. HUGHES.

H. Res. 60: Mr. PEASE.

H. Res. 67: Mr. GARCIA, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H. Res. 112: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. LUNGREN.

H. Res. 127: Mr. KRAMER, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. PRICE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. LUJAN, Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. THOMAS of California, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H. Res. 135: Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. BARNES, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. STOKES.

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. 1612: Mr. ANDERSON.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1555

By Mr. LEACH of Iowa:

—Page 30, line 17, strike out "$3,900,400,000" both places it appears and insert in lieu thereof "$3,895,400,000".

Page 36, strike out lines 15 through 23 and insert in lieu thereof the following new section:

SEC. 206. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE FOR THE NONCOMMUNIST CAMBODIAN PEOPLE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President may make available funds authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of chapter 1 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the provision of food, medicine, or other humanitarian assistance to the noncommunist Cambodian people, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall remain in effect until October 1, 1987.

H.R. 2068

By Mr. SOLOMON:

—Page 2, line 15, strike out "$543,574,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$491,222,800".

Page 2, line 16, strike out "$572,519,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$520,167,800".

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

AMBASSADOR KIRKPATRICK'S THOUGHTFUL SPEECH

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1985, Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick gave an address on our Nation's response to totalitarianism. I want to share it with you because I believe she has reminded all of us of what it means to defend our values with strong policies instead of wishful thinking.

At this point I insert the body of the text of her speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF AMBASSADOR JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK

I do want to say what I take to be the principle function of our foreign policy. I take that to be defending our own nation and its democratic institutions against external attack or subversion; defending our allies against external attack or subversion, and preserving our civilization, the kind of world in which we can live and thrive and enjoy our lives; a world of independent nations with whom we can trade, among whom we can travel; nations which will not pursue aggressive expansionist policies and destroy the peace of their neighbors.

I take it to be a purpose of our foreign policy to promote democratic institutions and human rights and economic development everywhere. I take it to be a function of our foreign policy as well to manage our foreign relations in such a way that they do not consume too large a share of our resources, time, effort, and money. I think those are the things that President Reagan has, in fact, been trying to do and I think it's the thing that Cap and a great many of us who are here, in the Congress as well as the Administration have tried to do.

I think no place have we tried to work towards these goals more persistently than in Central America. Now, it's never useful to over simplify and we need to recognize that there are various kinds of obstacles to the achievement of our goals. There are stubborn problems of climate and culture and politics, history, mutual insecurity and animosities, and deep set rivalries, and they often stand in the way of achieving our goals. The fact is that we also need to recognize that the principal obstacle to our security and also to our helping preserving and enjoying our civilization and our world is unfortunately, the expansionist policies of the Soviet Union.

I believe that there were two principal dimensions to the so-called "Changed Correlation of World Forces" that we heard so much about in the period before 1981. The "Changed Correlation of World Forces", I think consisted of two parts; the growth of Soviet military power, and the concomitant decline in the military strength of the West, and the dramatic expansion of Soviet influence outside Europe and North America.

We all know the development of Soviet military power is important. It permitted an extraordinary buildup in the Pacific, created new vulnerabilities in Europe, created new vulnerabilities here at home. We also know in principle that we can deal with that by restoring our own military establishment, and also by trying to get a handle on the Arms Race through verifiable agreements arrived at in Arms Control Negotiations.

The fact is that we don't even have an adequate theory of how to deal with Soviet expansion outside Europe and North America. In just 20 years the Soviet Union progressed from being a continental power in Europe to becoming a global power, acquiring bases and surrogates you all know, in Cuba, Vietnam, Ethiopia, Angola, South Yemen, Nicaragua, Afghanistan, expanding its military reach to the vicinity of such strategic checkpoints as the Panama Canal, Straits of Gibraltar, the Suez Canal, Straits of Hormus, the entrance to the Red Sea, and the Indian Ocean, the sea lanes of East Asia, and so forth, Cam Rahn Bay.

In the same period, the number of Soviet and block troops in non-Soviet non-Warsaw Pact countries increased more than 500 percent. From that point of view, that period between 1975 and 1980 was a period of great success.

We need to be clear about what they mean by "success" in thinking about the Third World and in thinking about the countries outside North America and Europe. What they mean is the incorporation of a country into the world socialist system, or at least a reliable beginning in the process of incorporating a country into the world socialist system.

Their view of success is very different than our view. Our view of success is, in fact, to help a country preserve its independence. We have succeeded when a country avoids incorporation and maintains its independence.

It's an interesting difference in what happens to countries where they succeed and where we succeed. Where they succeed, the country is incorporated into a global military mutual-aid society, in which armaments and services from all the member states of the Soviet empire are drawn and brought to bear on unfortunate targeted countries.

From out point of view, when we succeed, the country that is successful may not make any contribution at all to collective enterprise. It may not extend any basing rights, for example, for collective purposes. It may not help its neighbors maintain their independence. So be it. That's our kind of success. We are not seeking to build an empire. We are not seeking client states. We do seek a world of independent nations.

The only problem is that this expansion of Soviet power and the incorporation of ever larger numbers of nations into the world socialist system is dangerous for us and for other independent nations.

I might note that this incorporation usually takes place incrementally; one slice at a time, like salami tactics applied to international politics.

The process of incorporation into the world socialist system was described in the Granada Documents, which I'm sure many here have read. The stages in this process are not complete until full military integration of a country into the world socialist system has been achieved. It had not yet been achieved in Granada. It has been achieved in Cuba. Cuban integration into the Soviet Military System is symbolized by the presence in Cuba of some Soviet personnel. For example, some seven thousand civilian advisors; some 2,800 in that famous combat brigade; some seven—I'm sorry. Some 2,800 military advisors, plus about 2,000 special Soviet personnel who are manning an electronic intelligence facility that monitors our electronic communications here in the United States.

Cuba, of course, provides bases that extend the reach of Soviet naval and air power and electronic surveillance over our coastal waters and our coast. Cuba provides advisors and troops for Nicaragua, Angola, Ethiopia, Mocambique, Conga, South Yemen. Cuba provides manpower and planning for the drug and terror network that reaps chaos in Latin America and mightily affects our own country.

Nicaragua has been partially, but not wholly incorporated into the Soviet military world system. Nicaragua provides training, arms for guerillas from a dozen countries. Nicaragua provides a home, refuge, sanctuary, for the international terrorist network. Indeed, its capital has become Manigua where one finds Bader Manhof remnants, Red Brigades, Basque, ETA Members, Argentine Monteros and ERP, Peruvian Sendero-Luminoso, and Marta El Salvadoran FMLN, of course. Guerillas from all over the world meet there with their PLO mentors and exchange notes and train one another. Of course, with a little help from the Libyans.

One of the consequences of this steady flow of services and manpower to the—to Nicaragua, and from Nicaragua to other countries in Central America and South America is the kind of tragedy I visited in El Salvador last weekend, when I visited the hamlet—it's not even, really a village, where the massacre of the previous days had taken place. Where some 19 Salvadorans had been dragged from their beds and killed in cold blood. I saw the style in which seven men had been shot, and one had his head crushed. I was with our Ambassador who picked up a shell casing which bears on it a Number "10", which I am told is a definitive marking of such casings of Bulgarian make.

Where do the bullets in El Salvador's hamlets come from? They come from Bulgaria. Where do the bullets used against Nicaragua's own democrats and Freedom Fighters come from? Well, they come from Bulgaria too, and of course from Vietnam, and from East Germany and Czechoslovakia, and from the Soviet Union. The struggle that is underway today in Central America has very special significance for us, and I presume everyone here understands that.

True, we live in a big inter-dependent world, and events in very remote places can have a large impact on us. A coup in Sudan, a civil war in Angola, a Vietnamese offensive in Cambodia, a conversation between Chinese and Soviets, a struggle in New Cala-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

donia, a Presidential election in Greece, a massacre in El Salvador, may have all of them important effects on our well being and our national security, but not all situations in all places are equally important to us. Not all deserve the same attention from our Government, and not all decisions of our Government deserve the same attention from American citizens.

In thinking about foreign policy and national security, one must begin with geography, because in foreign affairs, geography is destiny. In thinking about foreign policy, one must end with ideals of one's civilization, because they provide the—literally, the spiritual food and intellectual food off which we live.

Developments in Nicaragua matter more to us than developments in many other countries, because Nicaragua is at the center of the isthmus that stretches south to Panama, north to Mexico. Those countries constitute our fourth border, and that gives Central America and the Caribbean an irreducible strategic importance for us.

Now, we're not accustomed to thinking strategically and we're not accustomed to thinking about any potential vulnerabilities that we may have. The Soviets are. They began thinking as early as 1967 about the strategic vulnerabilities for the United States that could be created if they could threaten our security on our southern border.

Nicaragua can constitute a security problem for the United States of major proportions. Not because they establish a socialist economic system, though we regret that and we know it will fail; not because they create a repressive new military dictatorship under which the people of Nicaragua suffer, though we regret that very deeply, and we think the people of Nicaragua deserve better; not because they espouse ideas we find obnoxious and untrue, though we regret that too. Nicaragua constitutes a security problem actual and potential, especially for the United States because it is being very rapidly integrated into the socialist military world system. It is advanced into the process of incorporation into that Soviet world system.

Today, everyone who cares to know, knows that Nicaragua, whose Government began as a broad based coalition with important democratic presence, is today wholly controlled by communist leaders and that situation came into being because the Marxist guerrillas had a monopoly of weapons.

Everyone who cares to know, knows that the Nicaraguan Junta Representatives went soon after they achieved power to Moscow, where they were greeted by General Secretary Chunyeko and Foreign Minister Gromeyko (phonetic), where they signed a party to party agreement, among other things, approving the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Everyone who cares to know, knows today that the Government of Nicaragua is sustained by Cuba, whose advisers started arriving in days after the victory, and it is sustained by the famous Internationalistas from all over the Soviet block.

Everyone who cares to know, knows that today in Nicaragua the Government is repressive, the economy is in shambles, and hope flies with the democratic resistance forces.

You know, sometimes we like to console ourselves with believing that things are not as bad as some people say and that after all, the Sandinistas might turn out to have a falling out with Cuba and the Soviet Union, and Cuba might turn out to have a falling out with the Soviet Union, and that if only we were more obliging or understanding than we are, there would be nothing to worry about, and we could all live happily together in this hemisphere forever after.

I think of that perspective because just before I came here tonight I missed the reception because I was appearing on McNeil-Lehrer where I encountered some people who seemed to have that view. Just before that, I was testifying before the House Sub-Committee on Foreign Affairs on this subject where I met some people who seemed to have that view. You know, the kind of people that tell us that we drove Fidel Castro into the hands of the Soviet Union even though Fidel Castro himself tells us that he had been an apprentice Marxist-Leninist for years before he came to power and he disguised his true beliefs.

What can the United States do in this situation? I think we can help Nicaragua's Freedom Fighters, that's what we can do. We should assist Nicaragua's Freedom Fighters because it helps Nicaraguans and it helps the Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters themselves, who are not only decent and upright, but a very impressive group of democrats working now for democracy in their country as each of them has worked for democracy for Nicaragua for years in the past.

We can help them because they are good men whom we should be proud to help. We can help them because it helps the region, and we can help them because it helps us.

Will Congress permit the President to provide the 14 Million Dollars of assistance to the Nicaraguan Forces fighting against the consolidation of a communist government in their own country? That is the question which is confronting the Congress and this country today. I believe that the answer to that question, given by the Congress, will effect the fate of Nicaragua; effect the stability of Nicaragua's democratic neighbors; Costa Rice, El Salvador, Honduras. It will effect the evolution of other countries in the region, including Guatemala, Panama, Mexico. It will effect the security of the United States, the cost of our defenses, the strength of our alliances for many years to come.

Above all, I believe the decision to be made by the Congress will seriously effect the possibilities for peace in the next decade.

You know, very often in human affairs, peoples intentions lead them to actions which defeat their intentions. The problem with the kind of self-defeating appeassment that is, in my opinion, involved in a refusal to support Nicaragua's resistance forces is that it doesn't work.

I was reading recently an old book of Walter Lippmann, when he was talking about the period before World War II, and he said in that book, and I quote, "The surrender of the Rhineland in 1936; of Austria and Czechoslovakia in 1938, were the strategic preliminaries to the neutralization of Russia and the conquest of Poland in 1939; that is, what was surrendered by our allies in the name of peace became the strategic foundation upon which Hitler prosecuted his war." Thus do the best intentions of flawed policy makers sometimes go astray.

You know, mistakes when individuals make them are always regrettable and sometimes they are serious, but the mistakes of Government are more serious than the mistakes of individuals. If I make a mistake it involves only me and my family, probably, and maybe a friend or two. When Governments make mistakes, whole societies suffer. Often those mistakes are honest, but the costs are no less high because of the honesty and good intentions of those who make the mistakes.

Some people say we should not support Nicaragua's Freedom Fighters because we should leave the problems of Central America to the Central Americans and the problems of Nicaragua to the Nicaraguans. My response to that is that we would like nothing better than to leave the problems of Nicaragua to the Nicaraguans. Exactly the point is that Nicaragua's fate is not being left to the Nicaraguans. It is being determined by people and guns from very remote places, by heavy armanents, major weapons system from Eastern Europe and by Guerrillas and Internationalistas from every terrorist nation in the world.

Colonel Cadaffy has mentioned that he would send his troops to fight in Nicaragua. As I understand it, he's been helping the Nicaraguans for quite a long time, so there will be nothing new about that.

I would like to say in closing that today the United States Congress authorizes more than—and appropriates and provides, more than 15 Billion Dollars of economic and military assistance to nations and groups in the world. That's a lot of money, 15 Billion Dollars.

We provide some millions of dollars to freedom fighers fighting in remote parts of the world. Now, I support most of that foreign economic and military assistance and I support certainly all that assistance to freedom fighters in remote places, but I should like to say that it makes no sense at all, to refuse to provide help for the Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters today.

Let me just say that the most terrible mistake that we could make would be to conclude that the struggle in Nicaragua does not concern us, or that the Nicaraguans are in some sense not ready for democracy. The fact is that their struggle is our struggle, and their freedom and our freedom are indivisible, and if we do not understand that now in time to help Nicaraguans to help themselves and stand with those who stand for freedom in that country, we will, I am afraid, learn that lesson under much more painful circumstances not too far in the future.

Thank you.●

POLYGRAPH TESTS

HON. DOUG BARNARD, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a problem facing workers in all States. More than 1 million workers will be subjected to polygraph testing this year. And the Office of Technology Assessment estimates that at least 50,000 of those people will be wrongfully denied employment either because they refuse to take the tests or because of the inherent inaccuracies of the tests.

In addition to the Office of Technology Assessment, the House Government Operations Committee and the Privacy Protection Study Commission

have raised serious doubts about the validity of the polygraph machine in determining the trustworthiness of potential employees. Courts will not allow polygraph results as evidence in trials because of the documented evidence of the uncertainty of the machines.

There is no simple way to discover when a person is lying because there is no known physiological response that is unique to deception. The polygraph tests do not rely solely on the machine but on the interpretation of a subjective examiner of the breathing patterns, blood pressure, and galvanic skin response.

Several of my colleagues have introduced legislation to curb or otherwise control the use of polygraph testing. As Members begin deliberation of these bills, I would like to submit the following article written by Atlanta attorney, Mr. Irving K. Kaler, which appeared in the March 11 issue of Newsweek for their serious consideration.

A MOLE AMONG THE GERBILS?

(By Irving K. Koler)

It wasn't until my son Michael applied for a job as a stockboy in the pet department of a local discount store that I learned that I was the father of a potentially hardened criminal.

As a condition of his employment, Michael was subjected to a lie-detector test. After all, the pet department must be protected from unwittingly giving employment to a possible guppy snatcher or a goldfish filcher. But Michael, who is only 16 and who has never had any altercation with the law, became understandably agitated when asked questions such as how many times he had been marrried (none), and how many time he had been arrested (again, none).

Apparently, the machine and the operator made no distinction between one type of agitation and another, so Michael, whose nature is open and guileless, was declared to have flunked the test. Michael's only transgressions are an excessive volubility in class and perhaps an affinity to a father whose humor inclines more toward Milton Berle than to Russell Baker.

Now, thanks to this incident, I almost feel as if I have joined the company of Ma Barker in the pantheon of wicked parents. I avert my eyes when passing our neighborhood post office, apprehensive that there is displayed an unflattering picture of my son.

This episode jarred me into investigating the current use of the lie-detector device, also known as the polygraph. Why, for instance, are we Americans increasingly willing to consign to some person or machine our right to think and make determinations for ourselves? It is bad enough that we entrust this authority to politicians, but it is absolutely incomprehensible that we rely upon some goofy, Rube Goldberg-type contraption to make sensitive decisions.

FEELINGS

It so happens that Michael has an unusual aptitude for caring for small animals. As a matter of fact, he has a regular job with a neighbor feeding and watering chickens, rabbits and even ponies. The machine that disqualified him is not capable of discerning this special feeling and regard.

This box which measures pulse rate, blood pressure, respiration and perspiration, is being used, I learned, by a great many businessmen and retailers to screen employees; at least a million tests are performed each year. In the store where Michael works carrying customers' bags to their cars, only a few departments administer a polygraph test. Under this idiosyncratic policy, he has been disqualified from stocking birdseed, but not from becoming a manager.

I am not alone in registering my apprehension about this matter. There is increasing opposition to the expanded use of the polygraph, based on concerns that the machine represents an invasion of privacy and that its findings are often unfounded and imprecise. Twenty-two states and the District of Columbia prohibit employers from requiring an employee to take a lie-detector examination. Congress is considering a bill that would restrict its use by federal agencies, except the CIA and National Security Agency, and require the consent of the person being examined. A federal judge in Macon, Ga., Judge Wilbur D. Owens Jr., has also noted that "because of the lack of scientific evidence in support of polygraph validity, polygraph results are inadmissible as evidence in criminal prosecutions, both in the United States courts, and in Georgia courts."

In his potentially landmark decision, Judge Owens recently ruled that it is unconstitutional for certain Georgia municipalities to compel their employees to take lie-detector examinations even during departmental investigations into suspected drug use. "No device known to man can 'read' an individual's mind and indicate whether that person is lying," he said. The test, he found, is "nothing more than the polygraph examiner's personal opinion of the truthful or deceptive manner in which the questioned person responded." The examiner formulates the questions; the employee is not allowed to present any evidence or otherwise dispute a suggestion of wrongdoing. "The polygraph examiner in reality becomes both judge and jury."

Moreover, the polygraph report may become a permanent part of an employee's records, and he can never compel a correction. Thus, like the mark of Cain, detrimental results can pursue him forever and mar his chances for any job. As Judge Owens points out, this may violate his rights under the Fourteenth Amendment.

GUARDS

I recently went to the pet department of the store I mentioned earlier and was appalled by the indifferent care accorded the rabbits, guppies, hamsters, goldfish, canaries, gerbils, parakeets and puppies being sold there. I also noticed that no money is exchanged in that department since all purchases are concluded at a battery of cash registers at the front of the store. Only pets, or their supplies, can be pilfered. And I can't imagine any commodity less capable of being smuggled through the maze of detectors, sonic beams, sound alarms, turnstiles, guards, clerks and cashiers than a squirming rabbit, or more difficult to camouflage than a bulbous goldfish bowl.

Men and women of America, it is time we rise in indignation against this untrammeled invasion of our humanity! After all, we should possess a greater power to reason than some cold and merciless machine which, in all likelihood, hates rabbits, puppies and even those limpid-eyed guppies.●

A MESSAGE TO THE HOUSE, FROM INDIANA

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today's edition of the Washington Post contains a letter to the editor from a voter from the Eighth District of Indiana about the activities of the House of Representatives Task Force and its conduct in the recount of that district's votes. This letter reflects the sentiments of a large majority of the people of Indiana. This is the letter:

A MESSAGE TO THE HOUSE, FROM INDIANA

I am a resident of the long-suffering 8th Congressional District of Indiana. Because of a close election in November and the refusal of the House of Representatives to seat either candidate, the district has been without a congressman.

To determine who won, Congress sent a task force, led by three congressmen, to the district for a recount. That task force refused to count some ballots and agreed to count others, some of which were illegal or irregular. Then the task force declared Frank McCloskey the winner by four votes out of 234,000 cast.

Since we now have been given a congressman we may or may not have elected, I would like to offer some suggestions to the U.S. House of Representatives:

(1) In an extremely close election with numerous irregularities, please give us the right to a speedy new election. We would like to be represented in Congress and would rather choose our own representative that have Congress choose him for us.

(2) If we must be invaded by a task force from Washington, please do not send us current members of Congress. Send people known for their integrity and impartiality whose primary concern is not in protecting party interests or pleasing party leaders but in ensuring the legality and fairness of the electoral process.

(3) If members of Congress are traveling in this area and approaching the 8th District, please keep going. Do not stop. We have seen and had enough of you.

FRANCES BROWN,
Newburgh, Ind.●

THE SECRETARY OF STATE TALKS ABOUT THE LESSONS OF VIETNAM

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, Secretary of State George Shultz honored those Americans who had served in Vietnam. His speech was both moving and prophetic, and I strongly recommend it to all of my colleagues in the Congress.

In the past few days, the question of aid to the Contras was widely debated here in the Congress. Unfortunately,

the House failed to provide additional funding for those struggling freedom fighters. As I watched the debate unfold and the final vote appear, I began to think that the Congress was making a tragic mistake that future generations of Americans will have to pay for.

I agree with Secretary Shultz' assessment of why America fought in Vietnam. For those very same reasons, our country is supporting the Nicaraguan freedom fighters. In spite of the predictions of the critics of our policy in Vietnam who said that peace would come to that distant land when our troops finally left, it didn't. Our worst expectations of Communist intentions were confirmed. The Vietnamese Communists are still trying to dominate all of Southeast Asia.

In Central America, I fear that a similar disaster will overtake the forces of democracy and freedom in that nearby region. Promises will be broken, commitments will be forgotten, and the export of the Marxist-Leninist revolution will slowly, but surely, extend to the Rio Grande River.

I call upon my colleagues to remember that America cannot afford to again be naive about the intentions of Communist revolutionaries. As the champion of freedom, America cannot afford to back down from its commitments to liberty in the world. While all of us were deeply touched by the legacy of Vietnam, we cannot let that experience paralyze this Nation into inaction and timidity.

With these concerns in mind, I recommend the following excerpts from the Secretary of State's speech on Vietnam to all of my colleagues in the House.

THE MEANING OF VIETNAM

(Address by Hon. George P. Shultz, Secretary of State, at the Department of State, Washington, DC, Thursday, April 25, 1985)

Just a few hundred yards from here stands the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Its stark beauty is a reminder of the searing experience our country went through in its longest war. From a window of my office I can see the crowds of people—veterans, families, old and young—coming to search for names on the black granite slabs, or to search their souls in meditation. It is more than a memorial; it is a living human tribute taking place day after day. This is not surprising. That war left its mark on all the American people.

There are three dozen names that do not appear on that memorial. Instead they are here in this Diplomatic Entrance, on our own roll of honor. Many civilians served in Southeast Asia—from the State Department, AID USIA, and other agencies. Many of you here today were among them. While the war raged, you were trying to build peace—working for land reform, for public health and economic progress, for constitutional development, for public information, for a negotiated end to the war. I am here to pay tribute to you.

* * * * *

Our understanding of the past affects our conduct in the present, and thus, in part, determines our future.

Let me discuss what has happened in Southeast Asia, and the world, since 1975; what light those postwar events shed on the war itself; and what relevance all this has to our foreign policy today.

INDOCHINA SINCE 1975

The first point—and it stands out for all to see—is that the Communist subjection of Indochina has fulfilled the worst predictions of the time. The bloodshed and misery that Communist rule wrought in South Vietnam, and in Cambodia and Laos, add yet another grim chapter to the catalogue of agony of the twentieth century.

Since 1975, over one million refugees have fled South Vietnam to escape the new tyranny. In 1978, Hanoi decided to encourage the flight of refugees by boat. At its height in the spring of 1979, the exodus of these "boat people" reached over 40,000 a month. Tens, perhaps hundreds of thousands never made it to safety and today lie beneath the South China Sea. Others managed to survive pirate attacks and other hardships at sea in their journey to freedom. We have welcomed more than 730,000 Indochinese refugees to our shores.

The work of people in this Department has saved countless lives. Your dedication to the refugees of Indochina marks one of the shining moments of the Foreign Service.

In addition to "boat people," Hanoi has given the world its own version of the "reeducation camp." When the North Vietnamese Army conquered the South, it rounded up officials and supporters of the South Vietnamese government as well as other suspected opponents. Many were executed, or disappeared forever. Hundreds of thousands were sent to these camps, suffering hard labor, indoctrination, and violent mistreatment. To this day, upwards of 10,000 remain imprisoned. They include Buddhist and Christian clergy, and intellectuals, as well as former political figures. According to refugee reports, they face indeterminate sentences, receive food rations below subsistence levels, are denied basic medical care, and are punished severely for even minor infractions of camp rules—punishment often resulting in permanent injury, or death.

Hanoi has asserted for years that it will let these prisoners go if only we would take them all. Last fall, President Reagan offered to bring all genuine political prisoners to freedom in the United States. Now, Hanoi no longer adheres to its original proposal.

Another Communist practice has been to relocate people in so-called "new economic zones." In the years after the fall of Saigon, hundreds of thousands were uprooted and forced into these isolated and barren rural areas to expand agricultural production and reduce "unproductive" urban populations. Many have fled the zones, returning to the cities to live in hiding, without the ration or neighborhood registration cards needed to get food or jobs. Indeed, no one in Vietnam may change residence or place of work without permission, and unauthorized absences open whole families to arrest.

The 24 million people of South Vietnam are now victims of a totalitarian state, before which they stand naked without the protection of a single human right. As Winston Churchill said of another Communist state, they have been "frozen in an indefinite winter of subhuman doctrine and superhuman tyranny."

* * * * *

The neutralist government in neighboring Laos was swiftly taken over in 1975 by local Communists loyal to Hanoi. As in Vietnam, thousands of former officials were sent to "reeducation camps." Fifty thousand Vietnamese troops remain in Laos to ensure the "irreversibility" of Communist control—in Hanoi's version of the Brezhnev Doctrine—and thousands of Vietnamese advisers are in place to monitor Laos' own "socialist transformation."

Hmong villagers in Laos who resisted Communist control were suppressed by a military juggernaut that relied on chemical weapons produced and supplied by the Soviet Union in violation of international treaties. Six decades of international restraints on chemical warfare have been dangerously eroding in recent years—and "yellow rain" in Indochina was the first major breach. Yellow rain. Another addition to our vocabulary from post-1975 Indochina.

Finally, in Cambodia, the worst horror of all: the genocide of at least one million Cambodians by the Khmer Rouge, who also took power ten years ago this month. The Khmer Rouge emptied the cities and murdered the educated; they set out to destroy traditional Cambodian society and to construct a wholly new and "pure" society on the ruins of the old. A French Jesuit who witnessed the early phases of Communist rule called it "a perfect example of the application of an ideology pushed to the furthest limit of its internal logic." We say at least one million dead. Maybe it was two million. The suffering and misery represented by such numbers are beyond our ability to comprehend. Our imaginations are confined by the limits of the civilized life we know.

In 1979, Cambodia was ravaged by widespread famine that killed tens if not hundreds of thousands. Vietnam bears much responsibility for this famine. Its invasion prevented the planting of the 1979 rice crop; its army adopted scorched-earth tactics in pursuing the retreating Khmer Rouge.

Many will recall how the Vietnamese obstructed international relief programs and refused to cooperate with the efforts of the Red Cross and others to establish a "land bridge" of trucks to bring relief into the country from Thailand.

RETROSPECTIVE: THE MORAL ISSUE

What does all this mean? Events since 1975 shed light on the past: This horror was precisely what we were trying to prevent.

The President has called our effort a noble cause, and he was right. Whatever mistakes in how the war was fought, whatever one's view of the strategic rationale for our intervention, the morality of our effort must now be clear. Those Americans who served, or who grieve for their loved ones lost or missing, can hold their heads high: Our sacrifice was in the service of noble ideals—to save innocent peoples from brutal tyranny. Ellsworth Bunker used to say: No one who dies for freedom ever dies in vain.

We owe all our Vietnam veterans a special debt. They fought with courage and skill under more difficult conditions than Americans in any war before them. They fought with a vague and uncertain mission against a tenacious enemy. They fought knowing that part of the nation opposed their efforts. They suffered abuse when they came home. But like their fathers before them, they fought for what Americans have always fought for: freedom, human dignity, and justice. They are heroes. They honored

their country and we should show them our gratitude.

RETROSPECTIVE: THE STRATEGIC PRICE

We left Indochina in 1975, but the cost of failure was high. The price was paid, in the first instance, by the more than 30 million people we left behind to fall under Communist rule. But America, and the world, also paid a price.

For a time, the United States retreated into introspection, self-doubt, and hesitancy. Some Americans tended to think that American power was the source of the world's problems, and that the key to peace was to limit our actions in the world. So we imposed all sorts of restrictions on ourselves. Vietnam—and Watergate—left a legacy of Congressional restrictions on Presidential flexibility, now embedded in our legislation. Not only the War Powers Resolution but a host of constraints on foreign aid, arms exports, intelligence activities, and other aspects of policy—these weakened the ability of the President to act and to conduct foreign policy, and they weakened our country. Thus we pulled back from global leadership.

Our retreat created a vacuum that was exploited by our adversaries. The Soviets concluded that the global "correlation of forces" was shifting in their favor. They took advantage of our inhibitions and projected their power to unprecedented lengths: intervening in Angola, in Ethiopia, in South Yemen, and in Afghanistan. The Iranian hostage crisis deepened our humiliation.

American weakness turned out to be the most destabilizing factor on the global scene. The folly of isolationism was again revealed. Once again it was demonstrated—the hard way—that American engagement, American strength, and American leadership are indispensable to peace. A strong America makes the world a safer place.

VIETNAM AND CENTRAL AMERICA

Vietnam and Central America—I want to tackle this analogy head-on.

Our goals in Central America are like those we had in Vietnam: democracy, economic progress, and security against aggression. In Central America, our policy of nurturing the forces of democracy with economic and military aid and social reform has been working—without American combat troops. And by virtue of simple geography, there can be no conceivable doubt that Central America is vital to our own security.

With the recent legislation and municipal elections, El Salvador has now held four free elections in the past three years. When the assembly takes office shortly, El Salvador will have completed an extraordinary exercise in democracy—drafting a new constitution and electing a new government, all in the midst of a guerrilla war.

The state of human rights is greatly improved, the rule of law is strengthened, and the performance of the armed forces markedly better. Americans can be proud of the progress of democracy in El Salvador and in Central America as a whole.

The key exception is Nicaragua. Just as the Vietnamese Communists used progressive and nationalist slogans to conceal their intentions, the Nicaraguan Communists employ slogans of social reform, nationalism, and democracy to obscure their totalitarian goals. The 1960 platform of the Communists in South Vietnam promised:

"Freedom of expression, press, assembly, and association, travel, religion, and other democratic liberties will be promulgated. Religious, political, and patriotic organizations will be permitted freedom of activity regardless of belief and tendencies. There will be a general amnesty for all political detainees [and] the concentration camps dissolved. . . . [I]llegal arrests, illegal imprisonment, torture, and corporal punishment shall be forbidden."

These promises were repeated time after time. We find similar promises in the letter the Nicaraugan revolutionary junta sent to the Organization of American States in July 1979.

The junta, which included the Communist leader Daniel Ortega, declared its "firm intention to establish full observance of human rights" and to "call . . . free elections." The Nicaraguan Communists made the same commitment when they agreed to the Contadora Document of Objectives in September 1983, and when they said they accepted the Contadora draft treaty of September 1984.

What the Communists, in fact, have tried to do since they took power in Nicaragua is the opposite: to suppress or drive out non-Communist democratic political forces; to install an apparatus of state control down to the neighborhood level; to build a huge war machine; to repress the Roman Catholic church; to persecute Indians and other ethnic groups, including forcible relocations of population; and to welcome thousands of Cuban, Soviet, East European, PLO, and Libyan military and civilian personnel. They have formed links with PLO, Iranian, and Libyan terrorists, and are testing their skills as drug traffickers. Like the Vietnamese Communists, they have become a threat to their neighbors.

Broken promises. Communist dictatorship. Refugees. Widened Soviet influence, this time near our very borders. Here is your parallel between Vietnam and Central America.

Brave Nicaraguans—perhaps up to 15,000—are fighting to recover the promise of the 1979 revolution from the Communists who betrayed it. They deserve our support. They are struggling to prevent the consolidation and expansion of Communist power on our doorstep, and to save the people of Nicaragua from the fate of the people of Cuba, of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Those who assure us that these dire consequences are not in prospect are some of those who assured us of the same in Indochina before 1975.

The ordeal of Indochina in the past decade—as well as the oppressions endured by the people of Cuba, and every other country where Communists have seized power—should teach us something. The experience of Iran since the fall of the Shah is also instructive. Do we want another Cuba in this hemisphere? How many times must we learn the same lesson?

AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY

Today we remember a setback, but the noble cause of defending freedom is still our cause. Our friends and allies still rely on us. Our responsibility remains.

The larger lesson of the past decade is that when America lost faith in herself, world stability suffered and freedom lost ground.

This must never happen again. We carry the banner of liberty, democracy, the dignity of the individual, tolerance, the rule of law. Throughout our history, including the period of Vietnam, we have been the champion of freedom, a haven of opportunity, and a beacon of hope to oppressed peoples everywhere.

Let us be true to the hopes invested in us. Let us live up to our ideals, and be their strong and faithful champion around the world.●

SUMMARY OF AGRICULTURE SITUATION

HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, I recently received the following letter from Mr. Curtis Burgess, president of the Nebraska Soybean Association. It is an excellent summary of the agriculture situation which I want to share with my colleagues.

NEBRASKA SOYBEAN PROGRAM,
Lincoln, NE, March 12, 1985.

Hon. HAL DAUB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAUB: On behalf of Nebraska soybean farmers, I'd like to thank you and your staff for your time when we were in Washington, March 6, 1985. We really appreciated your taking the time to visit with us.

All of us in agriculture know we are in a crucial period. The decisions made this year will affect our nation's food and fiber industry well into the next century. The choices we face are not easy ones, and we know your task in the coming months will be a difficult one. The future course of agriculture hangs in the balance.

Today, American agriculture is in a financial crisis. The reasons for it can be argued at length, but the crisis itself is real and immediate. Yet the need for quick action on farm credit—and that need is more pressing—should not blind us to the longer term needs of U.S. farmers.

Soybean farmers support a pro-trade agricultural policy that will make the United States the world's preferred supplier of food and fiber. We believe that if the 1985 Agricultural Act does not concern itself with the vital task of selling more of what we produce, it will prove unable to improve farm income. And income, after all, is what farmers want and need.

Some farmers—including some in Nebraska—believe we should retreat from foreign markets and produce only for domestic consumption. They believe that, through mandatory production controls that would essentially make it against the law not to accept federal subsidies, we can shrink our production enough to boost prices to a desired level.

The advocates of this viewpoint are quite sincere. They are also, in my opinion, tragically wrong. Consider, for example, the case of wheat. In 1983, farmers marketed 8.1 billion dollars worth of wheat for both dometic and foreign use, at an average price of $3.52 per bushel. If they had marketed only their domestic production, and received 90% of parity ($6.55 per bushel), then their total receipts would have been only 5.2 billion dollars.

In fact, American farmers are inextricably part of the international marketplace. The question is not whether we are part of the

world market, but whether we will compete in it.

What is the role of government in agriculture? Is it to guarantee farmers' incomes? Soybean farmers have traditionally answered "no" to that question. We do not claim that there is no role for government—after all, farmers must deal with foreign export subsidies, unfair trade barriers, and an overvalued dollar, all factors over which they have no control. Government's proper role in this environment is to stand shoulder to shoulder with producers and try to see to it that they have the opportunity to compete fairly.

Soybean farmers do not seek to influence policies for other commodities, unless they adversely affect soybeans. We do, however, feel strongly that it is in all farmers' interest to make the 1985 Agricultural Act a trade centered law. We believe export promotion should be Title I of the bill, so that available resources can be channeled into selling commodities, not storing them.

Surely it makes more sense to base our agricultural policies on opportunity than on coercion. An agricultural policy based on rigid, coercive supply controls would be, in my view, unsustainable for any great period of time. We simply cannot pretend that we still live in the 1930's: the world has changed, and agriculture has changed, too.

All farmers want higher prices. Many of us do not believe, however, that higher price supports are the only way to get higher prices, or that the harsh supply controls that traditionally go along with high supports could succeed over the long term. Instead, I believe most farmers want to expand demand: to sell more overseas and at home, to develop new uses and new markets for what they grow, to challenge the government created barriers that keep us from selling our abundance to the world.

As I have said, if the government wants to help farmers, perhaps trade policy is a good place to start. Our farmers compete with subsidized Brazilian and Argentine soy meal and soy oil; they face trade barriers in any markets; they face trade distortions created by the irrational agricultural policies of the European Community and other competitors. Our government has done a lot of talking about how bad all of this is. Action, however, has been scant. It sometimes seems that the United States turns Teddy Roosevelt's wisdom on its head when it comes to trade policy: walk loudly, but carry a very small stick.

The answer to the challenges we face in the international arena is not to withdraw from world markets, but to compete aggressively in them. That means action to allow the dollar to depreciate, so our goods can once again be competitively priced. It means demonstrating by word and deed that the United States intends to maintain and expand its export share, and that it will no longer stand idly by while other countries take its markets away through predatory subsidies.

As I said at the beginning of this letter, you are in a position of awesome responsibility. There has never in my memory been a more critical time for U.S. agriculture than right now. The actions Congress and the Administration take in the coming months will determine whether our farmers can look forward to profits, or only continued stagnation. I feel confident you will do your very best to achieve an agriculture that allows profits, opportunity and growth, and I thank you for your attention to this letter.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

CURTIS BURGESS,
President, Nebraska Soybean Association.●

SAN MARCOS RIVER

HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in the March 1985 issue of the Endangered Species Technical Bulletin, published by the Department of the Interior, there was an article on the San Marcos River. This article is worthy of note because it describes the efforts made by the city of San Marcos and Southwest Texas State University in preserving four species of life that exist only in central Texas and, in most cases, only in the San Marcos River.

The San Marcos gambusia, the fountain darter, the San Marcos salamander, and Texas wildrice all depend on the springfed San Marcos River for their life support. If this river is polluted or allowed to dry up because of overly excessive discharge from the Edwards aquifer, the river's source of spring water, then these endangered species will vanish.

I submit this article for the RECORD and congratulate the city of San Marcos, under the leadership of Mayor Emmie Craddock, for its efforts to control pollution of the river. I also want to congratulate Southwest Texas State University, under the leadership of President Robert L. Hardesty, for the work that the Edwards Aquifer Research and Data Center [EARDC] is doing to study the effects of various stimuli on these rare species.

The article follows:

[From Endangered Species Technical Bulletin (Vol. X No. 3—1985)]

FOUR SAN MARCOS RIVER SPECIES

The San Marcos River begins at a series of springs along a fault zone in the City of San Marcos, Texas. Although their flows have varied over the years with fluctuations in their source, the Edwards Aquifer, the San Marcos Springs have never been known to go dry. Their uninterrupted flows, high water quality, and constant water temperature may account, at least in part, for the fact that the San Marcos Springs and River ecosystem has a greater known diversity of aquatic organisms than any such ecosystem in the region. Many of these species are found nowhere else, and now are restricted to the first few kilometers or less of the spring run.

Due to a variety of factors, including depletion of the aquifer for human uses, pollution, and alterations in the river corridor for recreation and other purposes, the San Marcos River is in danger of losing its unique biological resources. Currently, three animals and one plant native to the San Marcos ecosystem are listed by the Fish and Wildlife Service as Endangered or Threatened:

San Marcos gambusia *(Gambusia georgei)*—Due to its rarity, little is known about the small (25 to 40 millimeter standard length) fish, the most imperiled of the four listed San Marcos species. Currently, the San Marcos gambusia is thought to occur in very small numbers only within an approximately one-kilometer stretch of the upper river. Its habitat needs apparently are quite specific: thermally constant flows; quiet shallow, open waters adjacent to sections moving more rapidly; a muddy, but generally not silted, substrate; partial shading from the sun; and high water quality. Any significant changes in these natural ecological conditions could result in the extinction of this species, which is classified as Endangered.

Fountain darter *(Etheostoma fonticola)*—This small (25 millimeter standard length), mostly reddish brown fish has a distinctive dorsal fin with black, red, and clear bands. Like the San Marcos gambusia, the fountain darter needs clean, clear water of consistent temperature; however, it also requires vegetated stream bottoms, preferably with mats of filamentous green algae (*Rhizoclonium* sp.) that it uses for cover.

The fountain darter is known from the San Marcos River and another Edwards Aquifer spring discharge, the Comal River. It was extirpated from the latter during the 1950s, due primarily to temporarily reduced flows, but a small population has been reestablished by reintroduction. Since the Comal River is only 5 kilometers in total length and has been known to periodically cease flowing, it does not comprise much of a "safety valve" for the species, and the San Marcos River ecosystem must be conserved if the fountain darter is to survive and recover. Since there are two small populations, however, this fish is listed as Threatened rather than Endangered.

San Marcos salamander *(Eurycea nana)*—This short (up to 59.6 mm total length), slender amphibian is colored light tan on its back, but it can alter its dorsal coloration to dark brown, and back again, in accord with the darkness or lightness of its substrate. A lungless species, the San Marcos salamander retains its gills and does not leave the water to metamorphose into a terrestrial form.

Data on the salamander's historical range are unclear. Currently, this Threatened species is known to occur only in Spring Lake, an unusual 40-acre impoundment formed when flows from the San Marcos Springs were dammed in the late 1800s. Most individuals are located in the northernmost section of the lake, on a limestone shelf immediately in front of the lakeside Aquarena Springs Hotel. There, concrete banks in front of the hotel and limestone boulders in adjacent shallow waters support a lush growth of the aquatic moss *Leptodictyium riparium* and mats of a coarse, filamentous blue-green alga (*Lyngbya* sp.). In view of the abundance of predators (primarily fish, but also crayfish, turtles, and aquatic birds) in Spring Lake, such protective cover is essential to the survival of the salamander. A plentiful food supply for the salamander also is harbored by the aquatic vegetation.

Texas wildrice *(Zizania texana)*—Texas wildrice is an aquatic grass that forms large clones or masses firmly rooted in the river's gravel bottom. The culms and leaves usually are immersed and long-streaming in the swift current. (The species is not found in slow moving or stagnant water.) In former times, when Texas wildrice was more abundant and less subject to human disturbance, the flowering tops of the plants projected as

much as a meter above the water. Today, however, flowering plants are rarely seen, and when present, do not extend very far above the surface. Since no seedlings have been observed in the native San Marcos River habitat, it is unknown whether or not the Texas wildrice can any longer reseed itself, given its low numbers and the continuing threats to its ecosystem. Accordingly, it is classified as Endangered.

Dr. W. H. Emery of Southwest Texas State University in San Marcos has worked with the Texas wildrice since at least 1975, and has had success in seed collection, seed storage and germination, seedling survival, and development of survival clones to the F_2 generation through pollenization under controlled conditions. His attempts to transplant clones of nursery-grown plants into the wild met with some temporary success. Unfortunately, however, long-term survival was prevented by factors including flooding, predation by an exotic rodent (nutria), and some recreational users of the San Marcos River who damaged the plant's fruiting heads.

THREATS TO THE ECOSYSTEM

Aside from their specific microhabitat needs, all four of the listed species in the San Marcos River ecosystem require an uninterrupted water supply that is clean, clear, free-flowing, and thermally constant. Any significant changes in these conditions will make the recovery effort difficult, if not impossible, and could even result in extinction. Therefore, the *San Marcos River Recovery Plan* is being treated by the Service as a *habitat* recovery plan. If the stream is conserved, it is likely that the species will survive.

Because the San Marcos Springs and River ecosystem is inextricably tied to the condition of the Edwards Aquifer, increased use of the groundwater is cause for concern. A steady growth in the human population is expected for the foreseeable future, and the Texas Department of Water Resources predicts that groundwater pumping will increase well into the 21st century. Data from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation suggest that future demands on the aquifer will far exceed its ability to recharge. The recovery plan cites numerous predictions that, unless steps are taken to conserve the aquifer's water supply, "the flow from the San Marcos Springs will cease around the year 2000." The implications for all aquatic life in the San Marcos ecosystem, not just for the listed species, are obvious.

The quality of the remaining water faces the same threats posed by rapid urbanization in many other areas, including the problems of occasional pollution from overloaded sewage treatment facilities, erosion and siltation, and flooding caused by uncontrolled runoff. Locally applied herbicides and pesticides also may be having unanticipated effects. For example, the Texas Highway Department has used the herbicide "Roundup" for grounds maintenance around a bridge that crosses the San Marcos River. Rainfall could easily wash this chemical into the type locality of the San Marcos gambusia. Although the effects of this substance on the four listed species are not known, it may be more than coincidental that no San Marcos gambusia have been detected at its type locality since the spraying program was initiated.

At least 10 species of introduced fishes have been detected in the San Marcos River, and some are particularly abundant. These exotics may be preying on the native fishes, out-competing them for food and territory, and spreading introduced parasites.

The Texas wildrice, which occurs within the city limits of San Marcos, faces some special problems. In 1967, Emery discussed the damage being caused by the following activities: the mowing of aquatic plants at Spring Lake to make the water more attractive to tourists, which sent masses of cut vegetation downstream and damaged the emergent wildrice inflorescences; the periodic harrowing of the river bottom to remove vegetation; the introduction and commercial harvesting of aquatic plants; the collection of native aquatic plants; and the raw sewage discharged into the water whenever the city's sewage treatment capacity was exceeded. Ten years later, Emery noted that the impacts of these factors had abated significantly but the wildrice had not been able to recover by producing new plants. The population declined even further during a 1980 flood, which swept away many of the clones and physically altered the river channel. Since the Texas wildrice seems to be particularly sensitive to chemical changes in the water, application of herbicides (such as the "Roundup" mentioned earlier) could be taking a toll.

PLANNED RECOVERY EFFORTS

The overall objective of the San Marcos Recovery Plan (approved 12/3/84) is to ensure the long-term conservation of the San Marcos Springs and River ecosystem, which should enable the four listed species to eventually regain a secure status. Concurrently, some specific research and management activities will be necessary, particularly for the gambusia and the wildrice.

In order to assess population trends and the effectiveness of recovery actions, each of the four species must be monitored on a regular basis. For the San Marcos gambusia and the Texas wildrice, which are in the greatest danger, surveys should be conducted at least quarterly during the initial phases of the recovery program. Populations of the fountain darter and San Marcos salamander, species in a relatively more stable condition, should be monitored twice or more per year. As recovery activities progress, these schedules could be modified.

A better knowledge of the biological and ecological factors influencing the protected species is important for developing the most effective management approaches. For example, the Service believes that the relatively large number of potential predators and competitors artifically introduced into the San Marcos ecosystem is having an effect on the native species, but the severity of this threat is not clear. Research into the impacts of exotic species could provide guidance as to whether control procedures should be initiated or whether the avaliable resources should first be concentrated on more critical problems. Basic information is needed in a number of other areas, including diseases and parasites, conditions for reproductive success, survivorship patterns, and aquatic habitat characteristics.

Maintaining a healthy San Marcos ecosystem will be possible only as long as the Edwards Aquifer is not depleted. Numerous State and Federal agencies, including the Edwards Underground Water District, Edwards Aquifer Research and Data Center (EARDC), Texas Department of Water Resources, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Soil Conservation Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service, have conducted and are continuing to conduct studies on the characteristics and functioning of the aquifer. More data are needed, however, on factors that are likely to affect the uninterrupted flow of the San Marcos Springs. Dr. Albert Ogden, of the EARDC, with support from Region 2 of the Fish and Wildlife Service, has collected preliminary data indicating that flows from the San Marcos Springs could be maintained by local natural recharge, augmented by construction of artificial recharge structures.

Without the cooperation of all agencies involved with managing use of the aquifer, recovery of the San Marcos species is remote. Any controls on groundwater pumping or requirements for water conservation would be imposed only with the concurrence of the involved local, State, and Federal agencies. The Fish and Wildlife Service and the City of San Marcos believe that conserving the San Marcos River ecosystem can, and must be, compatible with carefully managed human uses of the water. San Marcos has taken a strong initiative in protecting the river. Since the Edwards Aquifer is the main water supply for the cities of San Marcos, San Antonio, and several other cities in southcentral Texas, it obviously is in the interests of area citizens to ensure that the aquifer does not run dry or become contaminated.

Although the San Marcos ecosystem is primarily a springrun, surface run-off from the surrounding watershed strongly influences the aquatic habitat. As urbanization increases, greater water quality problems can be expected unless measures are taken to handle stormwater and street run-off, occasional spills from the sewage treatment plant, and other sources of wastewater. Pollution from herbicides and pesticides, if found to be a threat, also will have to be addressed.

Because their numbers are so low and their habitat so restricted, the San Marcos species could be extirpated by a single catastrophic event, such as a chemical spill. As a precaution, the recovery plan advocates establishing captive populations for future use in restocking. Such a program would begin with the gambusia, which is in the greatest peril.

"Tubing," canoeing, swimming, and other forms of recreation are becoming increasingly popular along the San Marcos River. The combined impacts of these activities on the ecosystem are unknown; however, at least part of the reproductive difficulties suffered by the Texas wildrice can be traced directly to people knocking over and damaging the plant's emergent seed heads. Recreational use patterns should be documented, particularly as they relate to the wildrice flowering season, so potential management alternatives may be drawn to accommodate both recreation and conservation.

Once conservation of the San Marcos Springs and River ecosystem is ensured, and studies show that the rare animals and plants are responding favorably, reclassifications or delistings can be considered.●

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONALISM IN CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, powerful and excellent speeches my col-

leagues made before this House during the last week emphasized something not all of us have been willing to face, and something Sandinista officials have been saying openly for years: The Nicaraguan revolutionary regime has never served, and is not to serve, Nicaraguans alone.

We have refused to believe it, as the recent votes have shown. It was thus with bitter irony that I read in this morning's newspapers two more reproofs to our illusions.

First, Daniel Ortega, who some insist has been driven into Soviet arms by U.S. belligerence, announced the very moment after this House voted against aiding the Contras that we would be making yet another trip to Moscow.

Second, newly captured Salvadoran guerrilla documents which reemphasize Communist internationalism in Central America were summarized and published by Roger Fontaine, former senior staff member of the U.S. National Security Council. I submit this brief document summary be published in the RECORD, and particularly commend to my colleagues' attention its first, and its final dozen, paragraphs:

[From the Washington Times, Apr. 25, 1985]

CAPTURED RECORDS REVEAL SALVADORAN REBELS' STRATEGY

(By Roger Fontaine)

El Salvador's Marxist guerrilla leaders believe a Sandinista success in crushing the Nicaraguan resistance would be devisive in their plans to bring down the Salvadoran democratic government, according to documents captured last week.

In a letter addressed to the Sandinista national directorate dated Nov. 24, 1983, the four top Salvadoran guerrilla commanders also expressed support for Managua's diplomatic initiatives because they help President Reagan's opposition in the United States. The letter and other documents seized by the Salvadoran army were obtained by The Washington Times.

Rebel leaders stressed "the internal consolidation of the Sandinista Popular Revolution is the "determining factor for our liberation process."

"At this time, the highest priority for the FSLN [Sandinistas] is to continue and aggravate the wearing away of the enemy forces"—the Nicaragua resistance—"which in turn will allow us to enter that situation with our political and military forces better developed and consolidated, and with a larger capacity to bog down the aggression if it were to happen."

The guerrilla commanders' statement refers to a pledge by the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front, or FMNL, to respond to the introduction of U.S. combat troops in Central America, according to one State Department official.

The guerrillas hail Sandinista diplomatic efforts because they "gain time to help opposition in the United States and to internationally isolate [President Reagan's] aggressive plan towards Nicaragua and El Salvador."

No other reason for their support of diplomacy was listed.

The guerrilla commanders dismiss the importance of their negotiating with the Salvadoran government because "dialogue does not play an important role in our diplomatic battles."

Important diplomatic "battles" listed in the letter included mustering "international pressure" to stop "U.S. intervention."

Rebel commanders also asked the Sandinista directorate for "a much higher level of logistical assistance" since "coordination and cooperation" between the Salvadoran guerrillas and the Sandinistas "is of the highest priority."

"We believe that present circumstances are favorable to take daring steps in this direction," they added.

The documents, according to State Department officials, constitute the richest haul of material detailing the inside workings of the Salvadoran rebels and their relationship with the Nicaraguan government since the capture of a diary belonging to the chairman of the El Salvadoran Communist Party five years ago.

More documents are expected to be released shortly.

They were seized by the Savladoran army in a raid on a guerrilla base camp last week in El Salvador's San Vicente province in which seven guerrillas were killed and a high-ranking political-military section chief Nidia Diaz, was captured.

The camp, according to officials, belonged to the Central American Revolutionary Workers' Party (PRTC), one of five military fractions that belong to the FMLN guerrilla coalition.

The commanders' letter was in reply to a Sandinista foreign commission report given them for comment. The report outlines Managua's diplomatic strategy.

The closeness of their working relationship, according to State Department officials, is demonstrated in the military commanders' letter.

The FMLN commanders who signed the letter included Shafik Jorge Handal, chairman of the El Salvadoran Communist Party, Joaquin Villalobos, head of the Popular Revolutionary Army, Roberto Roca of the Central American Revolutionary Workers' Party, and Leonel Gonzalez of the Popular Liberation Forces.

The guerrilla leaders, all headquartered in Nicaragua, stated their agreement with the Sandinista foreign affairs commission's report and its conclusion that the U.S. election period was "the appropriate moment to influence the American electorate."

"The Sandinista Popular Revolution and the Salvadoran Revolutionary Movement are the most sensitive points in Central America and they could bog down the present Reagan Administration," the letter said.

The military commanders underlined the importance of defeating "the aggressive policy of Reagan" through "the joint efforts of the Socialist Camp, the National Liberation Movements and all the Progressive Forces . . ."

Officials did not explain why the documents, available since last week, were only distributed Tuesday night during the House debate on funding for the Nicaraguan resistance forces. The rebel camp was captured on April 18.

Salvadoran rebel cooperation and assistance to the Sandinistas shows up in another captured document, the hand-written notes of an undated meeting between FMLN and Sandinista officials in which joint efforts were outlined, including contingency planning.

The minutes state that U.S. "aggression" against Nicaragua was inevitable and to be launched "within a few days." They affirm that the common interest of the Sandinistas and the Salvadoran rebels was the "defense of the Nicaraguan revolution."

According to the minutes, cooperation was more than rhetorical. Officals agreed that an FMLN military unit was to receive one month of intensive military training and then be deployed to a border area closest to Nicaragua.

The minutes disclosed that "at the first shots" indicating a U.S. attack on Nicaragua, FMLN propaganda materials and funds are to be shipped from Nicaragua to El Salvador.

The documents also indicated that this would be joint decision of the Sandinistas and the FMLN.

Other captured documents show the Salvadoran rebels are dependent on other Soviet bloc states for training and instruction.

On a page of a captured guerrilla calendar for May 1984 are found names of guerrillas destined for instruction in Bulgaria, the Soviet Union and Vietnam.

Other foreign training was indicated in captured guerrilla personnel files. The cards list names, pseudonyms, sex, civil state, number of children, professsion, schooling, military experience and physical problems.

The last line of each card indicates political and military training. In the file cards made available to the Washington Times, five showed instruction in Cuba, and another said simply "a military course in the exterior."

Another captured document—two pages of hand-written excerpts from a FMLN foreign affairs commission political analysis—reveals a preoccupation with the possibility of U.S. combat troops being deployed in the region.

In paragraph 17, the report says if aggression against Nicaragua begins, "the frontiers disappear."

It characterized the Reagan administration as the most aggressive in recent years and stated that its inverventionism was aimed at Central America and Grenada.

Although the report is undated, it refers to "Our tragic defeat in Grenada"—which one State Department official said indicates the FMLN's "full identification with the Marxists-Leninists in Grenada" and "reaffirms a common thread thrughout the documents, which is the importance placed in communication and cooperation with other communist groups."●

RETIRING W-H BUREAU CHIEF TAKES NOSTALGIC LOOK AT PAST

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this week the readers of the Omaha World-Herald will say goodbye to an excellent reporter and a very fine gentleman. Darwin Olofson, chief of the World-Herald's Washington Bureau, will retire.

Darwin Olofson has reported to Nebraskans and Iowans on actions of the Federal Government and on the Iowa and Nebraska congressional delega-

tions for 35 years. In a sense, he has represented his Nebraska and Iowa readers in Washington longer than any Member of the present congressional delegations. His readers trust him. All of us who know him respect him, and we will most assuredly miss him.

His final weekly column takes a nostalgic look at the Washington he came to 35 years ago and the changes that have transpired since then. I commend it to my colleagues.

[From the Omaha World-Herald Apr. 29, 1985]

RETIRING W-H BUREAU CHIEF TAKES NOSTALGIC LOOK AT PAST

(By Darwin Olofson)

WASHINGTON.—It was diffferent in 1950. Not better, necessarily. Just different.

Members of Congress got $12,500 a year, plus a $2,500 expense account, and were accused of being overpaid. There were some, from the magnola country, who still wore frock coats and their hair at shoulder length.

President Truman was being attacked as a big spender for proposing a $12 billion budget that—horror of horrors—involved a $3 billion deficit.

A previously obscure Republican senator from Wisconsin, Joseph McCarthy, went into political orbit, briefly and fatefully, after charging that 57 Communist Party members were working for the State Department.

It was a time to save your Confederate money, because Southern Democrats controlled the then far more powerful committee structure in Congress. Democrats in the South didn't lose seats to Republicans in those days; they lost them when they died or decided they wanted to go home.

There were 96 senators, because Hawaii and Alaska had not yet achieved statehood, and Nebraska had four instead of three House members.

Congress somehow was able to save the country legislatively by July or August each year, and then quit, rather than staying in session until the holiday season was at hand.

The United States was at war in Korea, while helping to rebuild nations devastated by the world war that had ended only five years earlier.

Washington was a much slower paced, essentially Southern city, a segregated city where the "Whites Only" signs jolted a newcomer from the Midwest.

The only excuse for recalling such ancient history is that there comes a time each week when a column has to be written about something. For this reporter, it is the last column.

There are various ways to measure 35 years in The World-Herald's Washington Bureau. In that period, for example, eight presidents have held office.

Only two of the 100 senators and four of the 435 House members now serving were here in 1950.

Instead of President Truman's $12 billion budget, it is now President Reagan's $974 billion budget, a spending progression that in large part is a reflection of how the government's role has changed.

But the best measurement, a strictly personal one, is the satisfaction that comes from having had one of the best seats in the house from which to watch one national political drama after another unfold over some three decades. Washington never is without a crisis for very long.

Politicians are fascinating creatures, and equally fascinating are the twists and the turns, the intricate maneuvers and the unexpected developments in politics. A Washington reporter who doesn't find that to be so, probably would be better off elsewhere.

This isn't to say that politicians are the brainiest people around, or that they are the most entertaining, responsible, consistent or hard-working. They certainly are not the most modest.

They can be devious and they can be petty. But there also are times, when the chips are down and the stakes are high, that they deliver even which it involves political sacrifices.

They can impress, surprise, amuse and disappoint. Almost always, however, they are interesting as individuals and as the cast on the free world's biggest political stage.

For the most part, members of Congress did not get on Washington's last track by accident. They had something going for them in the talent or personality departments, or both.

By and large, if you had to sit up all night in a bus station with someone, you could do worse than having a person who has made the political big time as company.

If that should happen to you, however, it would be safest to be a bit skeptical about what you're told.

One more thing.

If the several millions of words that have been filed by this reporter in the last 35 years occasionally have made the wonderful and sometimes wacky world of Washington a little more understandable, it has been strictly a pleasure.●

IF THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK IS THAT GOOD, WHY AM I STILL FEELING SO DEPRESSED?

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the economic recovery that President Reagan is fond of talking about and the Government's statistical reports appear to confirm is not benefiting everyone.

Unemployment in my congressional district averages 16 percent and is as high as 25 percent in one county alone. Recently, I sponsored an economic summit and expected 250 people to attend. But actually there were over 800 in attendance. These people know that the area's economy is going downhill despite this administration's grand rehetoric about the recovery.

The most eloquent testimony I have seen of this truth is an article penned by Vicki Williams, a former factory worker, part-time bartender and waitress. It appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer on March 27, 1985, and I believe it should be required reading for all my colleagues.

The article follows:

IF THE ECONOMIC OUTLOOK IS THAT GOOD, WHY AM I STILL FEELING SO DEPRESSED?

(By Vicki Williams)

Isn't it wonderful about the economy? My president tells me that the recession is long since over and the country faces nothing but boom times ahead. My favorite news anchorman says that inflation has been licked and unemployment figures are down again. My local newspaper reports that the government's leading economic indicators are up again—and the stock market continues to rise.

Why does all this blatantly cheerful news have such a depressing effect on me? Because, like so many others, I didn't make it to the station on time when the recovery train pulled out.

FRIEND A GOOD EXAMPLE

And those of us who missed that train—single women, minorities, farmers, steel workers and lower-class working people generally—almost seem to be forming a new subclass of working poor. Our government and our fellow countrymen, who are prospering, seem content to consider us the dispensable Americans—the price that unfortunately had to be paid.

What has happened in my friend's life is a perfect example of what I'm talking about. Before the recession, she worked in a rubber products plant and made approximately $7 an hour. With incentive pay, she could bring home $300 a week or so. Not an abundant living perhaps, according to some standards, but her family could eat well and she could easily make her $300 a month house payment. Further, she had company-paid health insurance, dental insurance, vision insurance and a prescription card, which added security to her life and those of her three children. She belonged to a strong union, the Rubberworkers, which guaranteed that she would remain a part of America's middle-class.

In 1981, she was laid off—a lay-off which turned out to be permanent. Now she is one of those statistics the government uses to prove its point. She is working again full-time and life is back to normal—right? Not hardly. As a bartender, she makes $3.50 hourly. She has no health insurance, no vacation, no retirement plan. She is almost 40 and terrified at the prospect of an accident or an illness in any of her family members. She wonders what she will do when the old car finally gives out, and that $300 a month house payment now seems almost impossible to come up with, though so far she has managed to hang on to the house for the kids' sakes.

Her bills are either the same or more than when she made $300 a week. Even assuming her outgo had remained exactly the same, her income has decreased by 50 percent, and much more if benefits are included. How much stock do you think she puts in the official inflation rate?

The plant where she previously worked recently wrested concessions from its workers by means of threats to move elsewhere. Because of their two-tier wage system, new American Airlines employees now make between 30 percent and 50 percent less than older workers. Greyhound workers accepted concessions.

Multiply these few examples by millions and the inflation rate can be seen for the farce it really is, applicable to only a select group of Americans. Little is ever said on the news or by the politicians about "reverse inflation" but make no mistake, the effects are just as deadly whether they are

the result of steady income and rising prices or steady prices and lower income.

The unemployment rate, which had shown a generally steady decline, likewise paints an inaccurate picture of what is really happening as more Americans go back to work. Can it really decrease by one full job when the newly employed statistic makes only half or less than what he or she previously made? Wouldn't lowering the rate by one half a job result in a more honest, if much higher figure?

When industry employs the kind of number-jockeying the government is now using to convince us of the nation's prosperity, it is called creative bookkeeping. On paper, the balance sheet looks great but the figures disguise a sickness at the core for people like me and my friend do not exist in a vacuum. Our continued unfulfilled desire for a living wage means that we will not be buying houses or new cars or home computers and that affects other Americans whose jobs depend on selling those items.

CAN'T STOP CYNICISM

Even those of us who have so far resisted turning to government aid may yet become a drain on the public if accident or illness strikes a life already teetering on the edge of financial catastrophe.

So despite all the optimistic reports, I remain cynical, for I know that a nation's economy is far from healthy when a large part of its population reads about recovery but lives with recession.●

A VICTORY FOR THE HOUSE LEADERSHIP: A DEFEAT FOR FAIRNESS

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, the House soon will consider the matter of the contested election in Indiana's Eighth Congressional District—and likely will vote to seat Democrat Frank McCloskey.

If the House leadership votes to seat Mr. McCloskey, rather than Rick McIntyre, whom the Indiana secretary of state has certified as the winner, the House leadership will demonstrate, as it has so often in the past, that when its own partisan interests collide with fairness, fairness will lose every time. The men and women of Indiana's Eighth District should have the right to be represented by the Congressman of their choice—but it appears that the House leadership will insist that they be stuck with your choice, Mr. Speaker.

For the last several weeks, but especially in recent days, the House task force has managed to revise the "new math."

That revised "new math" has magically turned a 418-vote McIntyre victory into a four-vote McCloskey victory. Time and time again, the House leadership has promised to "count all the ballots." In conducting the just-completed recount, the task force overrode Indiana State election law, selectively and in a partisan manner counted unnotarized absentee ballots, and stopped the counting process as soon as the Speaker's hand-picked candidate pulled ahead in the balloting.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the recount commission, dominated 2-1 by Democrats, did everything it possibly could to ensure the victory of the Democrat candidate.

The task force has not fulfilled the promise it made to those of us in this Chamber that all ballots would be counted. Instead, it has determined that all ballots are equal—but that those ballots cast for Mr. McCloskey are more equal than those cast for Mr. McIntyre.

Mr. Speaker, fairness has suffered severely in the months since November 1984. And that fact has not been lost on the American people or the news media.

I would challenge you, Mr. Speaker, to visit high schools throughout the Eighth District of Indiana and explain "democracy" such as we have witnessed in this matter to high school students—explaining why it is that their parents can be denied any representation in the House for 3½ months and how it is that their parents' election day decisions can be overturned and ignored by the same men and women in this Chamber who profess to support and strengthen our democratic system.

Mr. Speaker, throughout history, the House always has strengthened and supported democracy. And that is why I never have been ashamed to be a Member of this body, and I never have been ashamed of a vote I have cast in this Chamber. But you and your Democrat colleagues seem determined to stab a dagger into the very heart of democracy: The idea that votes matter, and that men and women have a right to be represented by the person of their choice. I have every confidence that the American people in general, and the people of Indiana's Eighth District in particular, soon will remember that for a long time to come.

To help that process along, I wish to bring to the attention of you and my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the April 24 Dallas Morning News.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 24, 1985]

CONTESTED SEAT: IN THE POISONED WELL

A House task force, composed of two Democrats and one Republican asserts that Frank McCloskey, not Rick McIntyre, won the election for the House seat from Indiana's Eighth District.

It shouldn't shock you to hear that McCloskey is a Democrat, McIntyre a Republican, and that the Republicans are steamed.

Not without reason. Back in November, the election-night count gave the victory to McCloskey, but a recount gave McIntyre a 400-vote margin. McCloskey, the defeated incumbent, was not pleased with the way the recount had been conducted, nor were his allies in the Democratic-controlled House, chief among them Speaker O'Neill and Rep. Tony Coelho.

The Democrats thus refused to seat McIntyre, for the first time in 24 years refusing to accept a state's official recount. Instead they created the three-man task force to supervise yet another recount, which awarded the race to McCloskey—by four votes.

The common-sense wisdom had been that, if things hinged on just a few disputed votes, it should be resolved by a new election. But to O'Neill and Co. McCloskey's four-vote win supersedes McIntyre's 400-vote win, and the case is closed.

Minority whip Trent Lott says that Democrats have "poisoned the well" so much as to make cooperation impossible over the next two years.

However, that may be, the Democrats' behavior is intolerable. There are more tactful ways of stealing elections than convening a congressional task force. A new election is clearly warranted in the Eighth District. Lott and his colleagues should hound the Democrats until just such an election is called.●

RICHARD MEDLEY ON FEDERAL RESERVE REFORM

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, Richard Medley, a pathbreaking economist who until recently was the top staff assistant for the House Banking Committee, has outlined a provocative and, I believe, important proposal to reform the Federal Reserve Board.

I urge my colleagues to consider this bipartisan approach to "democratize" the Fed, and to back the reform efforts of Representatives HAMILTON and KEMP.

The article follows.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 25, 1985]

CALLING THE FED TO ACCOUNT

(By Richard Medley)

The first quarter's surprisingly low growth rate of 1.3% prompted Preston Martin, the vice chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, to warn on Tuesday that the U.S. is on the verge of a mild "growth recession." If a recession, whether mild or serious, appears, it is likely to renew congressional interest in curbing the Federal Reserve's extraordinary ability to shield minutes of its meetings from the public and escape effective legislative oversight of its budget and expenditures. Support for "Fed reform" increasingly cuts across party lines.

By the time any recession begins to have an effect on unemployment, Congress and the administration will have worked themselves into a fiscal-policy gridlock even if their current deficit-reduction efforts succeed. Further budget cuts would be counterproductive and unpopular in the midst of a recession. On the other hand, increased deficit spending—the traditional way out of downturns—is an unlikely option in the face

of continued $200 billion annual budget shortfalls.

BIPARTISAN REFORM EFFORT

That leaves monetary policy. And there, both parties will find not only room to move, but an effective plan of action already laid out. While most politicians, and the public at large, have focused on deficits, a bipartisan group of legislators has been at work on a Federal Reserve reform effort that is both politically attractive and economically responsible.

In the past, reform efforts have broken apart as the Fed skillfully played its congressional critics against each other. But with progressive legislators like Byron Dorgan (D., N.D.) joining forces with conservatives like Jack Kemp (R., N.Y.) in legislative efforts to "democratize" the Federal Reserve, there may not be a way out for the Fed this time.

This effort avoids the traditional legislative penchant for dictating targets, money growth rates and interest levels to the Fed. Instead, it concentrates on making structural changes designed to provide investors, the general public and Congress with more reliable and more timely information about Federal Reserve policy decisions. This isn't congressional "management" of the money supply, but an attempt to force the Fed into accountability.

The decision to dump dogma and consider such institutional changes did not come easily or swiftly. It arose from more than 70 years of attempted Federal Reserve oversight by Congress. In that time, members of Congress have learned some important truths about dealing with, and trying to change, the Fed.

In the past, a combination of intellectual insecurity and a lack of expertise kept Congress foolishly focused on grappling with the arcane processes of Fed policies. With the exception of Sen. William Proxmire and the late Rep. Wright Patman, Congress all but ignored questions about their macroeconomic effects. A lot was learned about the limits of congressional attention spans, but little about what the Fed did, and how it did it.

Congress reached an all-time low in 1975, when it followed the monetarists into the thicket of prescriptive monetary targets by passing Joint Resolution 133. Supporters contended that this would force the Federal Reserve to produce explicit annual monetary targets and help Congress keep tabs on monetary policy.

But the targets proved to be worse than useless to the Congress, which includes few, if any, experts in monetary policy. The Fed used its congressional mandate to erect a confusion of monetary aggregates, which it created and destroyed at will. Congress tried to make sense of these moving targets, as two recessions and a bout of record interest rates staggered the Nation's economy.

Congress eventually learns from its mistakes—appearances aside. And in this case it learned that asking Paul Volcker about "base drift" or M-1 measurement problems is like throwing Br'er Rabbit into the bramble. He seems to go in reluctantly. But once he's in there, you always lose him.

Recently, that lesson has started to change the way oversight hearings are conducted. The 1978 Humphrey-Hawkins full-employment bill required semiannual congressional hearings into the conduct of monetary policy. These hearings have recently shown an encouraging trend away from questions about monetary aggregates, and toward questions about macroeconomic results that both the public and Congress can understand and use in policy or business planning.

Changing the type of questions asked was the first step toward changing the type of legislation directed at the Federal Reserve. Bills currently introduced by a diverse group of lawmakers, including a proposal by Rep. Kemp and Sen. Mack Mattingly (R. Ga.), all show the effect of Congress's new wisdom about the politics of the Federal Reserve Board.

Two provisions stand out in most of these bills. First, a requirement that the Fed promptly announce the policy decisions made in Federal Open Market Committee meetings. This is designed to end the uncertainty and inefficient market churning that now follow important FOMC votes, and to bring more accurate and current monetary-policy information to businesses and investors.

As Rep. Kemp puts it: "Regardless of the particular policy, we need to open up the decision-making process of the Federal Reserve System. There is simply no reason for the Federal Open Market Committee to keep its policy decisions secret for weeks or months after they are made."

The second provision was first embodied late in 1983 by a House Banking Committee monetary-policy report that recommended bringing the Federal Reserve Board's expenditures into the formal appropriations process for the first time. A recent Congressional Budget Office report uncovered an unusual and widely ignored $3.5 billion loan by the Fed to help bail out Continental Illinois. The CBO report was widely interpreted as supporting increased oversight of Fed spending by Congress.

Currently, Congress has no ability to control Federal Reserve outlays and only limited oversight powers. Every year it is given a report that describes general expenditures by the Fed, but only after the fact. In short, a Fed fait accompli.

The former co-chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, Rep. Lee Hamilton (D., Ind.) has introduced legislation that takes a small step in opening up the process. Mr. Hamilton's bill amends the Budget Act to require the president to "submit a budget prepared by the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System for itself and for all Reserve Banks." Rep. Hamilton's bill would not give Congress the power to control Fed expenditures, but it would for the first time bring the Fed budget into public view before the money is spent. While there may always be unexpected demands on Fed spending (as with Continental Illinois), there is still every reason to have normal Fed outlays subject to public scrutiny before they are made.

The most serious objection to these and other Federal Reserve reform efforts is the fear that the Fed will become mired in petty politics, erasing the one check we now have on our macroeconomic policy. Less politely it is said that congressmen have made a mess of fiscal policy, and there is no sense in letting them politicize and destroy our monetary policy as well.

This is not the place to conduct a defense of Congress's economic prowess, although (incredibly) a good case can be made. But it has long been an open secret that the Federal Reserve operates in a thoroughly political manner already.

Every Federal Reserve chairman has also been a part-time politician working hard to maintain the formal structure of Fed independence while bowing to administration pressure on policy directions. From the oft-cited capitulation of the Fed to pressure from President Nixon for looser monetary policy to its quick change in course during mid-1982, the Fed has shown a keen sense of political timing. Nowhere has that been expressed more graphically than during Chairman Volcker's meeting at the Fed last month with state legislators from 15 farm states. According to three legislators present at that closed-door session, the chairman said bluntly, "Look, the fact is your constituents are unhappy and mine aren't."

A SMALL FIRST STEP

The current reform efforts are explicitly designed not to repeat previous congressional attempts to gain control or influence over technical, day-to-day issues of monetary policy. Their intent is to provide better and more complete information about Fed policy and expenditures to Congress and the American people. That is a lower threshold of budget control than exists for other agencies, but the Fed's defenders already are digging in to preserve total Fed independence from oversight.

Those members of Congress trying to "open up" the Fed have recognized their limits as non-economists, and have designed a program that does nothing more than take a small first step toward imposing traditional democratic values on the Federal Reserve. While none of their proposals would directly constrain the Fed's ability to tighten or loosen the money supply, such "sunshine" rules would force the Fed to more fully explain its policies and their predicted economic effects.

It is an effort that should be applauded by the business community, and when the budget fights have abated, enthusiastically passed by Congress.●

OLDER AMERICANS ACT 20TH ANNIVERSARY RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today it gives me great pleasure to introduce together with 73 of my colleagues on a bipartisan basis, a concurrent resolution recognizing the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act which occurs this year.

As an original member of the House Select Committee on Aging as well as a member of the authorizing committee which first developed and later amended the Older Americans Act, it is an honor to pay tribute to the act and the success story it has been over these past two decades.

A central feature of this resolution is its recognition of the critical work performed on a daily basis by the aging network established by the act more than a decade ago. The network consists of the Administration on Aging, State Agencies on Aging, Area Agencies on Aging, congregate and home delivered meals program providers, and other supportive service providers. In addition, those individuals,

and organizations including colleges and universities who participate in the title IV, Research, Training, and Demonstration Programs. All of these individuals and organizations as well as those working part-time under title V of the program and their sponsors are responsible for the success the act has achieved thus far in its history.

An important tribute to the 20th anniversary of the Older Americans Act is scheduled for May 15 sponsored by the Federal Council on Aging. It would be fitting for both the House and Senate to adopt this resolution. I urge those of my colleagues who have yet to cosponsor to do so.

At this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of the resolution for the review of my colleagues. In addition I would also like to place into the RECORD a summary of the history and objectives of the Older Americans Act as printed in a recent report issued by my Subcommittee on Human Services entitled Older Americans Act, a staff summary.

Whereas 1985 marks the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965;

Whereas over its 20-year history, the Older Americans Act of 1965 has provided important social and human services to tens of millions of older individuals in their communities, helping to promote greater independence for them and maintaining their dignity;

Whereas one of the key elements contributing to the successful implementation of the Older Americans Act of 1965 during this 20-year period was the establishment of the "aging network" which consists of State and area agencies on aging, as well as congregate and home delivered nutrition providers and other supportive service providers;

Whereas the Administration on Aging, created by the Act, has served as a purposeful advocate for the concerns and needs of older individuals;

Whereas the Act has provided important funds for research, training, and demonstration programs to improve, expand, and enhance services to older individuals;

Whereas the Act has provided important part-time community service employment opportunities for low-income older individuals, many of whom work in providing services to other older individuals;

Whereas the Act has sought to address the special needs of older American Indians through grants to Indian tribes;

Whereas the programs and services provided under the Act have been more successful because of the contributing role of volunteers;

Whereas the Act has periodically been amended by Congress in recognition of the changing needs of our rapidly aging society; and

Whereas the Older Americans Act of 1965 serves as a model for the development of community-based services which provide alternatives to institutionalization of older individuals: Now, therfore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the 20th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965 and the successful implementation of such Act;

(2) acknowledges the many and varied contributions by all levels of the aging network and recognizes that the Act has achieved its mandate to the extent that it has because of the day to day work performed by the aging network; and

(3) reaffirms its support for the Older Americans Act of 1965 and its primary goal of providing services to maintain the dignity and promote the independence of older individuals in the United States.

THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED: A SUMMARY

OVERVIEW

Congress established the Older Americans Act of 1965 in response to the lack of community social services for older persons. Several subsequent amendments to the Act, the latest of which were enacted in October of 1984, expanded programs created in 1965, and created new programs, including methods for coordinating the numerous social and health care services that have been developed incrementally over the past 17 years.

The Federal dollars appropriated under the Older Americans Act have grown from $6.5 million in fiscal year 1966 to $1,027.6 million in fiscal year 1985. Today, the Act authorizes grants for social services, nutrition services, multipurpose senior center facilities, training, research and demonstration activities, public service employment projects, and health education and training programs.

LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENT

Prior to the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965, older persons were eligible for federally funded social services under general purpose legislation serving all persons meeting the specified eligibility criteria. With the recognition that limited resources could not help all those who were vulnerable, and that older people were being served disproportionately less than younger persons, many groups started advocating on behalf of the elderly. Their actions led President Truman in 1950 to initiate the first National Conference on Aging. Conferees called for all Government and voluntary agencies to accept greater responsibility for the problems and welfare of older people. Further interest in the field of aging led President Eisenhower in 1956 to create the Federal Council on Aging and take steps toward the development of the White House Conference on Aging.

The beginning of a major thrust toward legislation along the lines of the later-enacted Older Americans Act was made at the 1961 White House Conference on Aging. Conferees called for a Federal coordinating agency in the field of aging to be set up on a statutory basis, with adequate funds for coordinating Federal efforts in aging and a Federal program of grants for social services specifically for the elderly.[1]

In response to the White House Conference on Aging, Representative John Fogarty of Rhode Island and Senator Pay McNamara of Michigan introduced legislation in 1962 for the establishment of an independent U.S. Commission on Aging to "cut across the responsibilities of many departments and agencies, and a program of grants for social services, research and training."[2] Since the Administration basically objected to an independent agency on aging, separate and apart from any other agency, the legislation was not passed. Legislation introduced the following year would have modified the 1962 proposal by creating within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an agency equal in stature to the Department's other major agencies. Due to unrelated reasons, the 1963 proposal was not passed.

The Older Americans Act proposal introduced in 1965, however, basically paralleled the proposed Older Americans Act of 1963. Sponsors emphasized how it would provide resources necessary for public and private social service providers to meet the social service needs of the elderly. After virtually no debate, the Act was passed by Congress and signed into law on July 14, 1965 by President Johnson. The President hailed it as landmark legislation and expressed that the Older Americans Act "clearly affirms our Nation's high sense of responsibility toward the well-being of older citizens." He further confirmed that under the Act, ". . . every State and every community can move toward a coordinated program of both services and opportunities for older citizens."[3]

The Older Americans Act of 1965 provided services and programs for older persons through programs of grants for: (1) social services, (2) research and demonstration projects, and (3) personnel training in the field of aging. It also established the Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to administer these grant programs and serve as a Federal focal point for matters concerning older people.

The Older Americans Act Amendments of 1967 and 1969 extended each of the 1965 provisions. Amendments in 1969 also mandated statewide planning for services, and added a program of grants for areawide model demonstration projects as well as the foster grandparent and retired senior volunteer programs.[4]

The 1972 amendments authorized a national nutrition program for the elderly for developing primarily congregate meal projects but also, when possible, home-delivered meal programs.

With the enactment of the 1973 amendments the program of grants for social services was revised to strengthen statewide planning as well as initiate local planning efforts through area agencies on aging. The 1973 amendments also created a National Information and Resource Clearinghouse, and a new Federal Council on Aging. In addition, the 1973 amendments authorized grants for multipurpose senior center facilities, and created a program of grants for community service employment for persons age 55 and older to be administered by the Department of Labor.

Amendments in 1974 basically extended the national nutrition program for the elderly while the 1975 amendments extended existing programs and established four priority social services. Amendments in 1977 required changes in the nutrition program primarily relating to surplus commodities.

---

[1] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Nation and Its People. Report of the White House Conference on Aging. Jan. 9-12, 1961: 278-280.

[2] U.S. Congressional Record. House of Representatives, Jan. 29, 1962; 1371; U.S. Senate, May 17, 1962; 3324.

[3] Remarks by President Johnson upon signing the Older Americans Act, July 14, 1965.

[4] Statutory authority for volunteer programs was repealed in 1973 and reauthorized under the Domestic Service Volunteer Act of 1973. These programs currently are administered by ACTION.

The 1978 amendments again significantly revised the structure of the social services titles under the act with the intention of improving coordination and efficiency at the local level. They placed the grant programs for social services, multipurpose senior center facilities, and nutrition projects under the State and area agency on aging administrative structure, but retained a separate funding authorization for social services and the nutrition program. Grants for multipurpose senior center facilities were funded through the State's social services allotment.

The 1981 amendments clearly reaffirmed the status of the Older Americans Act as a categorical grant program. It expanded flexibility for both State and area agencies on aging in administering programs. Despite efforts to consolidate the funding of title III, separate funding was maintained for "Senior centers and supportive services," (Part B), "Congregate Nutrition Services" (Part C(1)) and "Home-Delivered Nutrition Services" (Part C(2)) respectively. Grants for multipurpose senior center facilities continue to be funded through the State's social services allotment under title III B.

The 1984 amendments clarified the roles of State and area agencies on aging in coordinating community-based services and in maintaining accountability for the funding of national priority services (legal, access and in-home services). They provided for greater flexibility in administering programs by providing for increased transfer authority between Parts B and C of Title III. Also, a new Title VII was added providing for an Older Americans Personal Health Education and Training Program for funding grants to institutions of higher education to develop standardized programs of health education and training for older persons to be operated in multipurpose senior center facilities.

The statutes establishing and amending the Older Americans Act are listed below:

The Older Americans Act of 1965—signed into law July 14, 1965 as Public Law 89-73.

The Older Americans Act of 1967—enacted July 1, 1967 as Public Law 90-42.

The Older Americans Act of 1969—enacted September 17, 1969 as Public Law 92-258.

The Older Americans Comprehensive Services Amendments of 1973—enacted May 3, 1973 as Public Law 93-29.

Amendments to the Nutrition Program for the Elderly Act—enacted July 12, 1974 as Public Law 93-351.

The Older Americans Act of 1975—enacted November 28, 1975 as Public Law 94-135.

The Older Americans Act of 1977—enacted July 11, 1977 as Public Law 95-65.

The Comprehensive Older Americans Act Amendments of 1978—enacted October 18, 1978 as Public Law 95-478.

The Older Americans Act Amendments of 1981—enacted December 29, 1981 as Public Law 97-115.

The Older Americans Act Amendments of 1984—enacted October 9, 1984 as Public Law 98-459.

The Older Americans Act contains seven titles:

Title I sets out ten policy goals aimed at improving the lives of older Americans across a number of areas including income, health, housing, employment, retirement, and community services.

Title II provides the legislative basis for the creation of the Administration on Aging within the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services and established the Federal Council on Aging.

Title III, the largest program under the Act, establishes authority for development of programs to assist older persons (especially those with the greatest social or economic needs) through grants to States, which in turn award funds to area agencies on aging for community planning, supportive, and senior center services, and nutrition services.

Title IV provides authority for development and support of training, research and demonstration programs in the field of aging.

Title V established authority for development of community service employment programs for unemployed low income persons 55 years and over.

Title VI established authority for grants to Indian tribal organizations for the development of social and nutritional services for elderly Indians.

Title VII provides authority for development of health education training programs for older individuals to be implemented through multipurpose senior center facilities.[5] ●

CLIFF GONZALEZ HONORED

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today we acknowledge the extensive talents of Cliff Gonzalez, a young man whose ability, determination and willpower provides inspiration to his generation and ours.

Cliff is a senior student-athlete at St. Raymond High School in the Bronx. Cliff's physical talents are displayed most vividly on the baseball field, where his accomplishments earned him distinction as the New York Post's High School Athlete of the Week. However, Cliff's accomplishments are not limited to the ballfield. Cliff Gonzalez has close to a 90 average and also has a strong desire to attain a college education before fulfilling his dream of a professional baseball career. In these ways, Cliff Gonzalez has earned our respect and our admiration.

I would like to extend my best wishes to Cliff Gonzalez in his future endeavors. For as the following article accurately denotes, Cliff's enormous talents will not end with high school.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 10,1985]

POST HS ATHLETE OF WEEK

(By Steve Barenfeld)

Cliff Gonzalez can do it all—and last week he did.

Gonzalez, a senior centerfielder for St. Raymond HS in The Bronx, went 10-for-16 with two home runs, three doubles and seven RBIs to lead the Ravens to five victories.

For his outstanding performance, Gonzalez, is The Post's High School Athlete of the Week.

Gonzalez, 5-10, 155 pounds, started poorly last week, Batting third, he went 0-for-2 in a 3-2 win over Lehman on Tuesday. On Wednesday, the lefthanded-hitter, who throws righty, went 2-for-3 and drove in a run in St. Ray's 14-0 rout of St. Francis Prep. The next day he again was 2-for-3 with a double and an RBI in a 3-2 victory over George Washington.

But it was Saturday when Gonzalez really started banging the ball. He went 3-for-3 with a homer, two doubles and an RBI in the morning when St. Ray's beat McClancy. Later in the day, in the Monroe Tournament, he went 3-for-5 with another home run and stole his 100th career base in a 27-0 stroll past Norman Thomas.

He doesn't plan on letting up, either.

"I think I can keep up this pace," said Gonzalez, who will be 18 next Thursday. "This is my last year and I want to leave with a bang."

There's no reason why he can't. Gonzalez, who hit .454 last season, is a marvelous athlete who already was considered major league material. But he has gotten better.

"I know I've improved tremendously," Gonzalez said. "This past winter I worked on Nautilus and improved my strength. I'm also smarter and more selective at the plate."

"He's the best player I've ever had," said Raven coach Ron Patnosh, who is in his 18th year. "He does everything. He can run—he goes from home to first in 3.8. He hits for power and average. He has a major league arm."

"I think he has a good shot to get drafted."

So does Gonzalez, but that doesn't mean he"ll go right for a pro career.

"If the money's right—over $40,000—I would sign," he said.

"But if not, I'll go to college,"

Seton Hall, St. John's, Oklahoma State and Old Dominion have offered him full scholarships. But Gonzalez, who has close to a 90 average, would like to go to Yale.

"I'd like to be a business person," he said. "I know they have an average baseball program, but I don't think where you play in college makes that much of a difference. You really develop in summer leagues.

"I've always loved baseball, and my friends get mad at me because I'm always either playing or watching on TV, I'd love to play major league ball and I feel I have a very good shot."●

CAROLYNE DAVIS AND THE HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, how many Americans know the name of the Administrator who manages 9.3 percent of the Federal budget and whose agency buys $90 billion worth of goods and services annually, more than any other agency except the Pentagon? Her name is Carolyne Davis, head of the Health Care Financing

[5] The Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended (42 United States Code 3001 et seq.).

Administration. I think more Americans should know what an excellent administrator she is in one of the toughest jobs in Washington.

At this point, I wish to include in the RECORD, "Carolyne Who?" from Barron's, March 11, 1985.

[From Barron's, Mar. 11, 1985]

CAROLYNE WHO?

CAROLYNE K. DAVIS TALKS SOFTLY, CONTROLS BIG PURSE

(By Thomas G. Donlan)

WASHINGTON.—If the status of government officials were measured solely by the power of the purse at their command, then Carolyne K. Davis would rate a personal table at Maison Blanche. Davis manages 9.3% of the federal budget, and her agency buys $90 billion worth of goods and services annually, more than any agency, save the Pentagon.

By another yardstick—activity—Carolyne Davis also ought to be making headlines. Her agency is in the throes of a nearly thorough overhaul, revamping a major American industry, health care financing, in the process. What's more, the agency's biggest program is limping toward bankruptcy.

Davis heads the Health Care Financing Administration, an arm of the Department of Health and Human Services. HCFA (derisively pronounced "Hic-fa" by some) manages Medicare, the government-financed program of medical insurance for the elderly, and Medicaid, which grants federal aid to state medical programs for the poor. Both have become household words, and their administration has acquired far-reaching ramifications.

Yet, Davis labors in relative obscurity, enjoying scant respect from physicians, who have been known to dismiss her as "the nurse from Syracuse," or politicians, who've labeled her the "handmaiden" of the federal Office of Management and Budget. Both remarks offer further proof, in part, that Washington still is largely a man's town.

A lot Carolyne Davis should care, however. While her husband has run a construction business near Seneca Falls, N.Y., Davis, now 53, has sailed through several careers. Originally a nurse, she earned a Ph.D. in higher-education administration, and went on to run nursing departments at Syracuse University and the University of Michigan, where she ultimately served as associate vice president for academic affairs before joining HCFA in February 1981.

Under her leadership, Medicare and Medicaid have undergone the most sweeping changes since their founding, in the Sixties, as part of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society. Most publicized has been the "prospective payment" program enacted by Congress in 1982, which replaced the well-established hospital cost reimbursement system with a flat payments parceled out according to "Diagnostic Related Groups" (DRGs).

HCFA also reworked the service review system, and now has the power to fine hospitals that waste money or provide poor treatment. And the agency recently approved the use of health maintenance organizations for Medicare recipients, a move which ought to chop 5% off current payout rates for patients who join HMOs.

In her unembellished office on the third floor of the Hubert H. Humphrey Building, which is appropriately located at the foot of Capitol Hill, Davis recently discussed these, and a host of other HCFA and health care issues. The only off-limits subject, she insisted, was her relationship with the Office of Management and Budget.

When Davis arrived at HCFA back in '81, Medicare's trustees foresaw bankruptcy for the Medicare trust fund by 1986. Now, that evil day's been forestalled, potentially until 1994. Davis largely credits the prospective payment program with improving the fund's financial outlook.

"We're buying time," she observes. "We're putting [hospitals] on a budgeted system," in which they know the dollars available to them. There's no more "open checkbook" from Uncle Sam, she adds.

Furthermore, in the federal budget proposal for fiscal 1986 (beginning next Oct. 1), currently under congressional consideration, the Reagan Administration has proposed freezing hospitals' payment levels without adjusting for inflation. (Last summer Congress imposed a 15-month freeze on physician reimbursements, which the Administration wants to extend another year.)

Some analysts, such as Peter Ferrara of the Heritage Foundation, a conservative, Washington-based think tank, believe the proposed freeze is an early sign of "the classic pattern of socialized medicine." First, he says, "the government offers to pay for everything. Then, it tries to regulate to hold down expenses. Then, quality deteriorates."

Davis, on the other hand, offers some economic justifications for a one-year payment level freeze. HCFA, she says, believes some hospitals are "upcoding," or placing patients in the most lucrative diagnostic related groups. The result may be "not sicker patients, but better coding, [and] it's inappropriate for us to pay for that."

Computers may bear the blame for some of this problem. There's been a profusion of computer software written to help hospitals cope with cost control, and some of these programs apparently do questionable upcoding automatically. HCFA's policing the situation, according to Davis, by "very vigorously buying up the same computer programs [as the hospitals], in order to stay ahead of them."

Another reason for freezing payment rates, she notes, is that hospital costs for goods and services have risen less rapidly than HCFA anticipated. "The horror stores that [hospitals] predicted have not arisen," she says. Rather, "they've learned to live within these systems, and are actually showing some profit."

Moreover, she adds, hospital admissions last year were below the agency's initial forecasts, in part because the government encourages the use of freestanding ambulatory surgical centers, rather than hospitals, for minor surgery. Patients treated in this fashion recuperate at home, rather than in hospitals.

Davis also is counting on the revitalized peer review organizations (PROs); government-appointed boards of doctors and nurses who review Medicare claims, to check the system's costs. Cataract surgery, for instance, repeatedly has been identified by the 54 peer review organizations as one of the leading "candidates" for transfer to outpatient surgery. And yet, Davis observes with dismay, "I can tell you that, in tracking such procedures last year, cataract surgery was our leading DRG in terms of volume of in-patient surgery."

She hopes PROs will be able to "educate" hospitals to HCFA's viewpoint. Ultimately, however, although it doesn't flaunt such power, the agency can refuse to pay for more expensive care when cheaper, equally effective alternatives are available.

Davis is even tougher on patients than she is on hospitals. She'd like to see everyone, not just Medicare patients, personally pay more of their own medical costs. The intended result: "If you begin to pay some first-dollar coverage for your care, you begin to think about how you can keep yourself healthier," she believes.

Another complaint: "If people think something costs nothing, they'll use it more." For example, she says, some people go to hospital emergency rooms for acute care because federal programs provide that service free of charge, whereas a visit to a doctor's office costs something. Yet, emergency room overhead expenses actually are two-to-three times greater than the cost of an office visit, and Davis thinks patient charges should reflect that difference.

Another way to make people choose more efficient health care is to herd them into HMOs, which do the choosing for them. Last fall HCFA established new rules for organizing Medicare patients into HMOs; the agency now pays HMOs 95% of existing Medicare costs per patient.

There are more battles, possibly harder ones, ahead for Carolyne Davis and HCFA. High on the agency's agenda is some form of prospective payment for physicians, a notion bitterly opposed by the American Medical Association. HCFA's supposed to make recommendations on this score to Congress next summer, but Davis previewed the agency's thinking in a recent speech.

To cut costs effectively, she told Catholic Church health-care coordinators, "you have to control the volume of physician services." Paying fees for services, however, works the opposite way, encouraging maximum service. Bundling, or making a payment cover a package of services or even an entire siege of illness, is one option being considered.

Another issue awaiting HCFA's recommendation to Congress is the reimbursement of hospitals' capital costs. Critics of the current system claim hospitals still enjoy too much freedom to build new facilities, and Davis clearly is on their side. The subject is fast becoming even more political than prospective payment, owing to the diversity of viewpoints and competing interests among hospitals themselves.

Carolyne Davis, however, no longer is a stranger to politics in the health care field, or on Capitol Hill. Considering what her agency accomplished when she was a new kid in town, it will be worth watching what she can do with four solid years behind her.●

THREE IDAHOANS COMMENDED

HON. RICHARD STALLINGS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to Tammy Rigby of Pocatello, ID, who represented Idaho in the national journalism contest for high school juniors and seniors sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Miss Rigby, 17, a senior at Highland High School in Pocatello, finished first in competition in Idaho. She was given a $150 cash award and a trip to Washington, DC. Miss Rigby finished

fifth in national competition and earned $1,000.

I am proud of Miss Rigby and her concern that disabled people have the option to reach their potential.

I would also like to honor Kelly Boyle, a junior at Bonneville High School in Idaho Falls, ID, who was named the first-place winner in Idaho for his poster design in this competition. Mr. Boyle was given a $100 cash award and a trip to Washington, DC, to attend the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. His poster was commended and displayed by the President's committee.

Rick Juebler, 23, a sophomore at North Idaho College, was named first-place winner in the college poster design contest. He also received honorable mention on a national level.

I would like to commend each of these winners for their efforts in this worthwhile competition. I am inserting a copy of Miss Rigby's excellent speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to share with my colleagues.

PROFILES OF INDEPENDENCE

Milton Carlsen was injured in an automobile accident and received such severe knee damage that for the last two decades he has walked with pain and a pronounced limp.

Ninety-one year-old Zina Hatch lost her eyesight a year ago following a traumatic accident in her home.

Jay Eskelsen, a prosperous businessman, was trimming trees in his yard, when he fell from a limb and was never to walk again.

Sharon Thomas, thirty-two, was born with a serious birth defect which resulted in the amputation of her right leg.

What do these four people have in common? Obviously, all are handicapped, but also all are independent, productive workers. For disabled people as well as for non-disabled people, meaningful employment results in a sense of independence and well-being. Roland C. Grazee, chairman and chief executive officer of the Royal Bank of Canada understood this when he said, "I think we can all agree that when disabled persons are prevented from making their full contribution to society by unnecessary physical and mental barriers, this constitutes a tragic waste of human potential and productivity."

Carlsen, a high school social studies teacher, stepped over his physical barrier to become the head golf coach and, more recently, the assistant girls basketball coach at his school. He also serves his school as chairman of the social studies department and is a leader in the local Education Association. This teacher has maximized his abilities and minimized his disabilities.

"I feel useful in the world when I work. It makes me feel good," said Zina Hatch about working. Mrs. Hatch cares for her one and one-half year-old great-grandson and she is thankful for this opportunity. Although her eyesight is dim, her mind is keen. She has an incredible ability to remember poems, songs and stories learned long ago and uses that ability to teach the little boy. Not only is she a great teacher, but she continues to cook for her family and makes crocheted gifts for them. She cannot see the work, but her fingers remember the patterns. Mrs. Hatch uses her human potential to continue being a useful, functioning individual.

Jay Eskelsen spent several miserable years confined to this home following his accident. Today, although he is still in a wheelchair, he is a manager at Deseret Industries, a business which employs other handicapped people. His employment allows him to support his family and to maintain his independence.

"I get paraded by the executives at A.M.I. because my handicap is so visible and because I'm not afraid of exposure. It annoys me a little—all the picture taking—but I don't really care if it will help other disabled people," said Sharon Thomas, who is an inspector for American Microsystems, Inc. Sharon has not always been this outgoing. In high school she was so shy that she tried to disappear. "It's hard to be invisible on crutches," she said. Idaho State University's Special Services helped Sharon to overcome her fear and to start her on the road to independence. "The people at Special Services insisted that I learn to drive. They also got me my first job as a secretary," said Sharon. She took advantage of the Center of Resources for Independent People (C.R.I.P.) and Cooperative Wilderness Handicapped Outdoor Group. C.W. Hog involvement led her to unlikely activities such as dogsledding, backpacking, horseback riding and her favorite, skiing.

Although she is enthusiastic about life and says she "likes what she has become," all has not been easy for Sharon. She said that she obtained her job at A.M.I by pointing out tax breaks and other benefits the company would receive if they hired her. "They hired me to get the benefits, but they keep me because I can do the work," she said.

Sharon did not receive any special concessions because of her handicap. The nature of the product at A.M.I. requires that all food be kept in the basement to prevent product contamination. To eat lunch Sharon must go down two flights of stairs. "I have fallen down those stairs several times," she said. Her job requires that she sit on a high chair with casters. Before she learned to balance herself, Sharon said she kept falling off the chair. "The company officials asked what they could do to keep me on the chair. I suggested a seatbelt, but I didn't need it," said Sharon.

Three years ago, Sharon married a college friend. At that time she was paying for her own home and buying her own car. Because of her independence, Sharon said that she felt an equal partner in her marriage.

What does Sharon have in common with Mrs. Hatch, Carlsen and Eskelsen? Through participation in the world of work these four people have liberated their human potential and become independent, functioning and contributing members of their community.●

ELIE WEISEL INTERPRETS WORLD WAR II ERA

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, this month people of good will all around the world are celebrating the anniversary of the victory of America and our allies over Nazi barbarism.

No one so eloquently captured the eternal moral significance of that triumph as well as the poet and writer, Elie Weisel.

Mr. Weisel, a survivor of the infamous Buchenwald concentration camp, made the following remarks in an impassioned appeal to President Reagan that the President cancel his scheduled visit to the German military cemetery at Bitburg. Ironically, Mr. Weisel made his remarks at a White House ceremony at which the President had awarded him the Congressional Gold Medal of Achievement.

I wish to share with every Member of Congress and the American people Mr. Weisel's true assessment of World War II and the ultimate debt each of us owes to the more than 300,000 American soldiers who laid down their lives—not merely for their own Nation, but that civilization might not be overcome by the utter depravity of the Nazis.

Mr. Weisel's remarks follow:

ELIE WEISEL INTERPRETS WORLD WAR II ERA

Mr. President, speaking of the conciliation, I was very pleased that we met before, so a stage of the conciliation has been set in motion between us. But then, we were never on two sides. We were on the same side. We were always on the side of justice, always on the side of memory, against the SS and against what they represent.

It was good talking to you, and I am grateful to you for the medal. But this medal is not mine alone. It belongs to all those who remember what SS killers have done to their victims.

It was given to me by the American people for my writings, teaching and for my testimony. When I write, I feel my invisible teachers standing over my shoulders, reading my words and judging their veracity. And while I feel responsible for the living, I feel equally responsible to the dead. Their memory dwells in my memory.

Forty years ago, a young man awoke and he found himself an orphan in an orphaned world. What have I learned in the last 40 years? Small things. I learned the perils of language and those of silence. I learned that in extreme situations when human lives and dignity are at stake, neutrality is a sin. It helps the killers, not the victims. I learned the meaning of solitude, Mr. President. We were alone, desperately alone.

IMPOSSIBLE TO COUNT ALL THE NAMES

Today is April 19, and April 19, 1943, the Warsaw Ghetto rose in arms against the onslaught of the Nazis. They were so few and so young and so helpless. And nobody came to their help. And they had to fight what was then the mightiest legion in Europe. Every underground received help except the Jewish underground. And yet they managed to fight and resist and push back those Nazis and their accomplices for six weeks. And yet the leaders of the free world, Mr. President, knew everything and did so little, or nothing, or at least nothing specifically to save Jewish children from death. You spoke of Jewish children, Mr. President. One million Jewish children perished. If I spent my entire life reciting their names, I would die before finishing the task.

Mr. President, I have seen children, I have seen them being thrown in the flames alive. Words, they die on my lips. So I have learned, I have learned, I have learned the fragility of the human condition.

And I am reminded of a great moral essayist. The gentle and forceful Abe Rosenthal, having visited Auschwitz, once wrote an extraordinary reportage about the persecution of Jews, and he called it, "Forgive them not, Father, for they knew what they did."

OPPOSITE OF LOVE IS INDIFFERENCE

I have learned that the Holocaust was a unique and uniquely Jewish event, albeit with universal implications. Not all victims were Jews. But all Jews were victims. I have learned the danger of indifference, the crime of indifference. For the opposite of love, I have learned, is not hate, but indifference. Jews were killed by the enemy but betrayed by their so-called allies, who found political reasons to justify their indifference or passivity.

But I have also learned that suffering confers no privileges. It all depends what one does with it. And this is why survivors, of whom you spoke, Mr. President, have tried to teach their contemporaries how to build on ruins, how to invent hope in a world that offers none, how to proclaim faith to a generation that has seen it shamed and mutilated. And I believe, we believe, that memory is the answer, perhaps the only answer.

TRIED TO CARRY THEM IN TRIUMPH

A few days ago, on the anniversary of the liberation of Buchenwald, all of us, Americans, watched with dismay and anger as the Soviet Union and East Germany distorted both past and present history.

Mr. President, I was there. I was there when American liberators arrived. And they gave us back our lives. And what I felt for them then nourishes me to the end of my days and will do so. If you only knew what we tried to do with them then. We who were so weak that we couldn't carry our own lives, we tried to carry them in triumph.

Mr. President, we are grateful to the American Army for liberating us. We are grateful to this country, the greatest democracy in the world, the freest nation in the world, the moral nation, the authority in the world. And we are grateful, especially, to this country for having offered haven and refuge, and grateful to its leadership for being so friendly to Israel.

And, Mr. President, do you know that the Ambassador of Israel, who sits next to you, who is my friend, and has been for so many years, is himself a survivor? And if you knew all the causes we fought together for the last 30 years, you should be prouder of him. And we are proud of him.

And we are grateful, of course, to Israel. We are eternally grateful to Israel for existing. We needed Israel in 1948 as we need it now. And we are grateful to Congress for its continuous philosophy of humanism and compassion for the underprivileged.

And as for yourself, Mr. President, we are so grateful to you for being a friend of the Jewish people, for trying to help the oppressed Jews in the Soviet Union. And to do whatever we can to save Shcharansky and Abe Stolar and Iosif Begun and Sakharov and all the dissidents who need freedom. And of course, we thank you for your support of the Jewish state of Israel.

But, Mr. President, I wouldn't be the person I am, and you wouldn't respect me for what I am, if I were not to tell you also of the sadness that is in my heart for what happened during the last week. And I am sure that you, too, are sad for the same reasons.

SPEAK TRUTH TO POWER

What can I do? I belong to a traumatized generation. And to us, as to you, symbols are important. And furthermore, following our ancient tradition, and we are speaking about Jewish heritage, our tradition commands us "to speak truth to power."

So may I speak to you, Mr. President, with respect and admiration, of the events that happened?

We have met four or five times. And each time I came away enriched, for I know of your commitment to humanity.

And therefore I am convinced, as you have told us earlier when we spoke, that you were not aware of the presence of SS graves in the Bitburg cemetery. Of course you didn't know. But now we all are aware.

May I, Mr. President, if it's possible at all, implore you to do something else, to find a way, to do something else, to find a way, to find another way, another site? That place, Mr. President, is not your place. Your place is with the victims of the SS.

Oh, we know there are political and strategic reasons, but this issue, as all issues related to that awesome event, transcends politics and diplomacy.

The issue here is not politics, but good and evil. And we must never confuse them.

For I have seen the SS at work. And I have seen their victims. They were my friends. They were my parents.

Mr. President, there was a degree of suffering and loneliness in the concentration camps that defies imagination. Cut off from the world with no refuge anywhere, sons watched helplessly their fathers being beaten to death. Mothers watched their children die of hunger. And then there was Mengele and his selections. Terror, fear, isolation, torture, gas chambers, flames, flames rising to the heavens.

ONLY THE KILLERS ARE GUILTY

But, Mr. President, I know and I understand, we all do, that you seek reconciliation. and so do I, so do we. And I too wish to attain true reconciliation with the German people. I do not believe in collective guilt, nor in collective responsibility. Only the killers were guilty. Their sons and daughters are not.

And I believe, Mr. President, that we can and we must work together with them and with all people. And we must work to bring peace and understanding to a tormented world that, as you know, is still awaiting redemption.

I thank you, Mr. President.●

TRADE FAIRNESS WITH JAPAN

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, on March 30 of this year the Reagan administration allowed the voluntary auto import restraint agreement with Japan to expire. I have consistently voiced my opposition to that decision and would like to take this opportunity to insert an article I wrote for the Kansas City Star on April 7, 1985, entitled "Fighting for Trade Fairness With Japan, Not Protection."

FIGHTING FOR TRADE FAIRNESS WITH JAPAN, NOT PROTECTION

(By Marcy Kaptur)

During the 1950s in America's heartland, the big debate among kids being hauled to school in yellow buses was whether your family drove a Ford or a Chevy. Folk culture. Midwestern boys are born with innate mechanical abilities; girls get temporary drivers' licenses at 16.

In Toledo, where I was born, the old Kaiser Jeep Corporation manufactured the Jeep that helped win World War II. Jeep was synonymous with America. In 1985, Jeep—now renamed American Motors—is a 49 percent French-owned firm in partnership with Renault.

When I travel from Toledo to Washington, I pass through Toledo Express Airport where a Chevy is on display. On its nameplate are the words "Made in Japan." When I arrive in Washington and stroll through the D.C. airport parking lot reserved for members of Congress, or the parking lot where I live in the nation's capital, I read the nameplates of Toyota, Nissan, Honda, Peugeot, Volvo, Volkswagen. These nameplates have begun to transform America's industrial heartland.

Though Chysler, Ford and General Motors have component plants in my district, they are downsized to meet the obvious "new market realities." For example, the Saturn project GM plans to build in America is a modest scale plant of about 200,000 compacts per year, costing $450 million. This, however, is a minimal amount as compared with GM's 1984 profits of $4.5 billion.

In fact, GM, Ford, and Chrysler intend to invest capital abroad again this year to meet the competition. The big three auto firms have adopted an invest international posture, as well as the "Korean connection strategy" to import low-priced sub-compacts from Korea rather than tool up their own production in the U.S. As a result the America of the 1980's is drastically changing.

Voluntary restraints, imposed in 1981, were meant to limit the number of Japanese imported cars allowed in the U.S. to give the U.S. auto industry the needed time to bounce back. In 1984, Japanese auto imports were restricted to 1.85 million cars (it actually totalled 2.2 million), a $19 billion share of the U.S. market.

In 1984, therefore, about 20 percent of the 8 million cars sold in the U.S. were of Japanese origin. The VRA, although an imperfect mechanism because it was not specifically linked to U.S. investment and wage agreements, was imposed.

The Reagan administration has determined that higher after-tax profits of $10 billion earned by U.S. auto companies in 1984 are reason enough to lift the voluntary restraints. Will lifting the VRA contribute to the long-term health of the U.S. auto industry, or to America? I think not. The lifting of the restraints, absent any alternative, will serve only to exacerbate the decline of the U.S. auto industry.

The removal of the VRA will serve only to further open U.S. markets to world competition at a time when the fragile U.S. auto industry is still in a struggle to remain on American soil. The industry has made steady progress regaining competitiveness, but has a long way to go.

First, U.S. production volume is down. In 1978, 9.1 million U.S.-made cars were sold in America; in 1984, 7.9 million U.S.-made cars were sold in America. For some time, the U.S. production trend has been down and that means an erosion of the U.S. auto-producing base.

Second, recent higher U.S. corporate profits in autos were the result of the mix of sales as the market moved in the short term

to larger models since gas prices have temporarily moved down. Accordingly, profits are less the result of increased sales volume than of changes in product mix.

Third, the U.S. auto industry is making strides to become more competitive. Productivity is up 35 percent. The number of things wrong per 100 vehicles has decreased by 55 percent. And, since 1980, nearly $60 billion has been invested in capital improvement and research and development. This despite the fact that the recession of 1982 cost the industry $20 billion in cash flow. Finally, over the last four years, U.S. car price increases have consistently trailed inflation.

Lifting of the VRA will force U.S. corporate investment abroad, and cost us jobs in America. Since 1974, $110 billion was invested by all U.S. companies abroad, including auto companies; by 1984, that amount doubled to a level of $221 billion. International companies do not need America anymore. In truth, they only need to sell in America.

Because of market uncertainty, U.S. manufacturers have had to put recent profits into the "cash-in-hand category" or to acquire new-cash holdings, rather than make the type of massive investment in America that would spell fundamental change in the industry.

The U.S. trade negotiators should not give up on autos and the VRA as a powerful lever to get trade fairness with Japan. The fact is that the U.S. trade deficit in 1984 with Japan is over $36 billion, of which $19 billion is autos. Outside GATT, Japan has erected trade barriers (over 2,500 of them) to U.S. products and services.

Though the voluntary quota idea may not have been the wisest course to pursue to achieve auto trade equity with Japan, it was the only lever this country had. It resulted in predictable import penetration levels, as well as spurred over $2 billion of Japanese investment in America (a strong indication of the willingness of Japan to take steps to keep their part of the American market). Any change in the current auto agreement should be predicated on opening Japanese markets to American products and services where barriers have been erected over two decades.

Fighting for trade fairness is not protection. It is common sense. Because the Japanese auto industry has an excess capacity of more than 2 million units, there will be tremendous competitive pressures within Japan not to exercise self-restraint in its exports to America. The U.S. sub-compact market—3.5 million cars last year—is the largest in the world. Why give it away? Let's get something for that valuable commodity.●

THE IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, this week I reintroduced the Immigration Reform Act that I sponsored in the last Congress as H.R. 4909. It is now H.R. 2180. Like its predecessor, it addresses the major issues requiring reform. Like its predecessor, which enjoyed the support of a great many Hispanic, civil rights, and immigration reform advocacy groups, it deserves full consideration by Congress.

This bill contains proposals developed over months of consultations. Its drafters were familiar with the problems presented by the present situation, but also were aware of the potential that even greater problems would flow from some so-called solutions then under consideration. Unlike other proposals, it does not compromise the best interests of Hispanics, the civil liberties of all Americans, or our Nation's democratic ideals that mandata that we treat immigrants and all those within our borders with fairness and humanity.

I think it is important to note the major premises on which this legislation rests. First, is that immigration is in the best interests of this country—a major finding of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy. Alarmists have tried to make the case that immigrants, both those here legally and those here illegally, are a drain on the economy and seriously displace American workers. From this shakey premise, they would justify draconian restrictions on legal immigration that would prevent residents of the United States from being reunited with their families legally, in some cases, for decades. As the law now stands, a woman lawfully admitted as a permanent resident from Mexico 8 years ago would only now be able to anticipate her husband's joining her in the immediate future, and a permanent resident from England has to wait about a year before being reunited with a spouse.

As for the economic impact of immigrants, various studies, including several recent surveys specific to my State of California—one by the Urban Institute and one by the Southern California Association of Governments—have concluded that there is little evidence of job displacement by immigrants, but substantial evidence that the economic effects are overwhelmingly positive.

A second major premise of my bill is that the number of individuals immigrating to this country does not amount to a crisis situation, nor is it unprecedented. All the rhetoric about the phantom hordes is just that—rhetoric. In fact, a demographic analysis of the decade of the 1970's revealed that the flow of non-U.S. citizen emigrants—(former U.S. immigrants leaving the United States who did not become naturalized citizens)—was roughly equivalent to the flow of undocumented immigrants counted in the 1980 census—1.2 million emigrants compared to 1.5 million undocumented immigrants. Moreover, more than 100,000 U.S. citizens are counted as immigrants to other countries each year.

I do not mean to minimize the extent of the problem of illegal immigration or to say that we ought not to be concerned that immigration restrictions are not being strictly adhered to. I strongly support efforts to tighten up enforcement of existing laws and increase the efficiency of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Yet, I must oppose legislative overreactions that would adversely impact law-abiding Americans without actually improving the situation. Employer sanctions is such a proposal. It calls for a dramatic change in our immigration laws, yes, but drama is not what is needed. What is needed is not change for its own sake, but realistic approaches that will have a good chance of being effective. Employer sanctions are simply not such an approach. You are all familiar with the GAO report on the failure of similar laws in other countries. More recently, a law review article put out by Stanford Law School this year agrees that sanctions will not work.

An additional factor that cannot be ignored is the united Hispanic opposition to such proposals. That fact was brought home to me very clearly by the response to my earlier immigration bill, H.R. 30. By including a modified form of sanctions in that bill, I hoped to test public opinion to see whether it might be acceptable to the Hispanic community, so long as it included a serious attempt to deal with their legitimate concerns about resultant employment discrimination and employee identification and screening procedures. It is now apparent to me that the answer to that inquiry is a resounding "no." An attempt to deal with those problems is clearly not enough. Unless and until a form of employer sanctions can be devised that guarantees effective protections against and remedies for employment discrimination—if such are possible—the Hispanic community stands united against them.

The extent of illegal immigration that I previously referred to also has implications for the legalization proposal contained in my bill. I do not believe in the accuracy of estimates that up to 12 million applicants would come forward to be legalized. Not only have estimates of the total number of undocumented immigrants been grossly inflated, in my view, but also estimates of the number who will apply and the number who will meet the criteria for eligibility have been exaggerated. One aim of H.R. 2180 is to protect those who do come forward and should be considered eligible for adjustment to legal status from arbitrary denials and from undue risks and hardships while their applications are pending. Certainly they should be allowed to work to support their families.

A comprehensive legalization program would also allow more Immigration Service resources to be allocated directly to preventing future unlawful

immigration, and provide useful intelligence based on those who apply that can be used to develop more effective law enforcement strategies. My bill would also authorize increased enforcement resources, especially at the border. It also calls for internal reforms that have long been needed to improve INS, including better training of personnel and more attention to its service activities.

A third premise of the new bill is that this country does not need a new temporary foreign worker program, particularly within the agricultural industry. The history of protective labor laws within that industry—most recently the notorious rejection by this administration of the need for field sanitation standards—is rife with examples showing how difficult it is to put such laws in place. More important, the history of the Bracero Program shows also that it is virtually impossible to ensure widespread compliance with those laws that are enacted.

I am including a summary of the bill at the conclusion of my remarks. I urge all Members to review this legislation, which I consider a responsible proposal for immigration reform.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 2180—IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT OF 1985

[Introduced by Mr. Roybal on Apr. 23, 1985]

TITLE I—CONTROL OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

PART A—PREVENTING DISPLACEMENT OF DOMESTIC WORKERS BY UNAUTHORIZED ALIENS

SEC. 101. Supplemental authorization of appropriations for enforcement of labor laws.

Provides for a supplemental authorization to the Department of Labor for increased enforcement of certain labor laws, as they relate to violations involving undocumented workers under the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Occupational Safety and Health Act, with a particular emphasis on areas with a concentration of such unlawful activities; and to the National Labor Relations Board for increased enforcement of labor-management laws:

$25 million for fiscal year 1986.

$30 million for fiscal year 1987.

Directs the Secretary to develop a plan within two months for supplemental personnel and resources for fiscal year 1986 and to develop a revised plan for fiscal 1987.

SEC. 102. Enhanced enforcement of labor laws.

Establishes a civil penalty not to exceed $10,000 for willful violations of existing recordkeeping requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act, or knowing violations of such requirements after receipt of a notice of a violation. This provision shall apply to violations occurring after the date of enactment.

Adopts an administrative mechanism for determination of a penalty, taking into consideration the size of the business and the gravity of the violation.

PART B—IMPROVEMENT OF ENFORCEMENT AND SERVICES

SEC. 111. Supplemental authorization of appropriations for enforcement and service activities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

States that two essential elements of the program of immigration reform and control established by the Act are (1) an increase in the border patrol and other INS enforcement activities, and (2) an increase in the service activities of the INS.

Provides for a supplemental authorization for enhanced INS services and enforcement activities; and for start-up costs associated with the legalization program: $80 million for fiscal year 1985.

Provides overall authorization levels for INS activities, including sufficient funds for the expansion of the enhanced service and enforcement program begun in fiscal year 1985:

$710 million for fiscal year 1986, and

$725 million for fiscal year 1987.

Provides that a significant portion of any additional appropriations will be available to improve INS delivery of services, including timely processing of petitions and applications.

Provides that any increase for enforcement activities should be used predominantly for border area patrol staff.

Directs the Attorney General to develop a plan within two months for supplemental personnel and resources for fiscal year 1985; and to develop revised plans for fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987 for enhanced enforcement and services.

Sec. 112. Unlawful transportation of aliens to the United States.

Establishes criminal penalties for knowing smuggling of aliens to the U.S. for commercial advantage or private profit.

Sec. 113. Report on establishment of anti-smuggling program.

The Attorney General, jointly with the Secretary of State, shall initiate discussions with Mexico and Canada to establish formal bilateral anti-smuggling programs, and report to Congress within one year on the progress made in establishing such programs.

Sec. 114. Treatment of immigration emergencies.

Directs the Attorney General to provide for a contingency plan on the allocation and management on INS resources in the event of an immigration emergency and on providing assistance to affected States and localities.

Authorizes the Attorney General to request necessary urgent appropriations provided that the President has determined that an immigration emergency exists and has certified that fact to the Congress.

Sec. 115. Program of in-service training.

Directs the Attorney General to provide for in-service training programs to familiarize INS personnel in contract with the public with the rights and varied cultural backgrounds of aliens and citizens in order to safeguard the constitutional and civil rights, personal safety, and human dignity of all individuals with whom they have contact in their work.

Sec. 116. Enhancement of community outreach within the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Provides for enhanced responsibilities for the INS community outreach program at the district level to provide outreach to the district population, to: improve services, including naturalization, address community problems, and investigate complaints of INS abuse of authority. Allow INS to secure the assistance and services of community and voluntary organizations in furthering the improvement of services, particularly those related to naturalization.

Sec. 117. Liability of owners and operators of international bridges and toll roads to prevent the unauthorized landing of aliens.

Limits the liability of owners and operators of international bridges, under current law, for failing to prevent the unauthorized landing of aliens, by exempting persons who act diligently and reasonably to comply with the law.

PART C—ADJUDICATION AND ENFORCEMENT POWERS AND PROCEDURES

Sec. 121. United States Immigration Board and establishment of administrative law judge system.

Creates an independent agency within the Department of Justice, a 7-member United States Immigration Board (USIB) to hear and determine appeals from nearly all final decisions of administrative law judges, as well as review of certain exercises of discretionary authority, imposition of administrative fines and penalties, and determinations respecting bond, parole and detention.

Authorizes the Chair of the Board to appoint administrative law judges to hear cases of exclusion, deportation and suspension of deportation, adjustment of status (including legalization under Title III of this Act), rescission of adjustment of status, asylum, and such other immigration cases as the Attorney General may designate.

Sec. 122. Arrest, search, and detention authority of Service officers and employees.

Revises the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) to clarify the authority of INS personnel to conduct detentions, arrests, searches and interrogations, to set the standards for the proper exercise of that authority, and to provide various procedural safeguards for persons detained and arrested and subjected to deportation proceedings.

Major provisions require speedy bail determinations, advisement of rights in English and in the person's native language, open hearings, and a prompt administrative or judicial determination after an arrest of the sufficiency of the evidence to initiate deportation proceedings.

Sec. 123. Effective dates and transition.

Provides the general rule that changes made by Part C of Title I take effect upon enactment, and exceptions for proceedings initiated before implementation of the administrative law judge system. Requires the President to nominate the members of the United States Immigration Board within 45 days of enactment.

Sec. 124. Technical and conforming amendments.

Changes the INA to reflect the change in title of special inquiry officers to administrative law judges.

TITLE II—REFORM OF LEGAL IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

PART A—IMMIGRANTS

Sec. 201. Providing additional immigrant visa numbers of natives of contiguous countries.

Provides 40,000 visas each for Mexico and Canada with the unused portion available to the other country.

Sec. 202. Change in colonial quota.

Increases the colonial quota from 600 to 3,000.

Sec. 203. Report on admissions and numerical limitations.

Requires a comprehensive Presidential report to Congress every three years on the impact on the U.S. of immigration.

Sec. 204. Miscellaneous changes.

Permits natural fathers to petition for entry of their children, without the need for legitimation or adoption.

Extends to certain self-supporting retirees the waiver of numerical limitations provided to non-preference investors.

Permits university researchers to be treated as faculty for purposes of the certification process.

Revises the requirement of continuous physical presence in the U.S. during a 7-year period for suspension of deportation to permit certain brief, casual, and innocent absences.

PART B—NONIMMIGRANT TOURISTS

Sec. 211. Visa waiver for certain visitors.

Authorizes the establishment of a 3-year pilot program for the admission of foreign tourists without the need to obtain a visitor's visa, with up to 8 countries.

PART C—NATURALIZATION

Sec. 221. Providing option of administrative naturalization.

Confers jurisdiction on the Attorney General to naturalize persons as citizens and permits an alternative administrative naturalization procedure in addition to the current judicial one.

Sec. 222. Waiver of English language requirement for individuals over 50 years of age.

Eliminates the English language requirement for naturalization applicants over 50 years of age.

Sec. 223. Eliminating six months residence requirement in a State for naturalization.

Eliminates the requirement that the petitioner have resided within the State where the petition was filed for at least six months preceding naturalization.

TITLE III—LEGALIZATION

Sec. 301. Legalization.

Provides that the Attorney General shall adjust to permanent resident status aliens who:

1. Establish that they entered the U.S. before January 1, 1982, and have resided continuously in the U.S. since that date;

2. Apply for adjustment during the 18-months application period to be established within 6 months of enactment;

3. Are not otherwise excludable, i.e., are admissible as immigrants, with limited exceptions, subject to the following provisos:

—Certain grounds for exclusion may be waived for specified reasons in the public interest

—An alien may not be excluded as likely to become a public charge if the applicant can demonstrate a good employment history without reliance on public cash assistance;

4. Have not been convicted of any felony in the U.S. (other than certain immigration law violations) and have not assisted in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality or political opinion; and

5. Register for the draft if required to do so.

Directs the Attorney General to established eligibility requirements by regulation and to publish guidelines for the approval of applications that:

1. Liberally construe the requirements for eligibility;

2. Provide for flexibility in determining continuous residence, allowing for brief and casual trips abroad;

3. Permit absences of 45 days or less annually without loss of continuous residence; and

4. Accept the use of affidavits of witnesses to establish continuous residence.

Allows the Attorney General to waive the requirement of continuous residence in cases of undue hardship to the alien, or his or her family.

Makes applicant subject to criminal penalties for knowingly and willfully making false statements.

Provides for transitional legal status protecting applicants from deportation and permitting them to work legally and travel abroad and provides aliens apprehended before the end of the application period the opportunity to apply for adjustment.

Provides for administrative and judicial review of denials of applications for adjustment.

Protects the confidentiality of individually indentifiable information contained in any application.

Restricts eligibility for federal benefits, with the exception of certain essential benefits, for a 5-year period beginning on the starting date that continuous residence was established.

Sec. 302. Cuban-Haitian adjustment.

Provides for a separate program of adjustment to permanent resident status for a specified class of Cuban-Haitian entrants who arrived in the U.S. before January 1, 1982.

Sec. 303. State and local assistance.

Provides for 100% reimbursement to state and local governments for the costs of providing public assistance to legalized aliens and for costs of providing public health services to legalized aliens and applicants for up to 4 years.

Provides for assistance to states for providing educational services to legalized aliens for the same period.

Sec. 304. Cooperation with State and local governments.

States that the Attorney General, Secretary of Labor, and Secretary of Health and Human Services will consider recommendations of advisory groups established by state and local governments.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION

Sec. 401. National Commission on Immigration.

Establishes a 3-year commission to study and seek solutions to certain immigration problems, reporting to Congress on:

1. Push and pull factors affecting unauthorized immigration (and specifically considering the affect of the development, in partnership with Latin American countries, of reciprocal trade and economic development programs of mutual benefit);

2. Incentives for employers to use unauthorized aliens;

3. Reliance of the agricultural industry on temporary employment of unauthorized aliens; and

4. Backlogs in approved immigrant visa petitions.●

FIDELITY TO SIGN FIRST REVERSE ANNUITY MORTGAGE IN NEW YORK STATE

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Fidelity New York Savings & Banking Center of Garden City introduced the first reverse annuity mortgage [RAM] in New York State. This creative approach to financing will enable many of our senior citizens to retain their homes and, at the same time, provide them with needed financial assistance to meet the rising costs of everyday living. This is an excellent example of how our Nation's financial institutions can work to meet the needs of private citizens. I comment Mr. Thomas Dixon Lovely, Fidelity New York's chairman and CEO, for his leadership in promoting this innovation in banking, and I hope other banks throughout the country will follow in similar efforts.

At this time, I'd like to share a press release from Fidelity New York which provides further details on reverse annuity mortgages.

FIDELITY TO SIGN FIRST REVERSE ANNUITY MORTGAGE IN NEW YORK STATE

Fidelity New York, a $1.5 billion Savings and Banking Center introduced the first reverse annuity mortgage "RAM" to be signed in the State of New York today. The reverse annuity mortgage provides a monthly income to eligible homeowners over 60 years old. Nassau County Executive, Francis T. Purcell, has helped to spearhead enabling legislation, valid for all New York senior citizens.

Today, Fidelity will issue the first mortgage to a Long Island senior couple. Thomas Dixon Lovely, Fidelity New York's Chairman & CEO stated that he hoped all banks will begin to provide a true community service to retired citizens who try to live on a fixed income while expenses rise. He explained that many homeowners living on Social Security, plus limited private income or pension, find that combined real estate taxes, energy costs, maintenance and food costs have risen so dramatically as to seriously impact their standard of living. Mr. Lovely noted that "they may live in a home originally costing $15,000 or so, which may now be worth $165,000. The RAM mortgage enables them to receive payments from the bank each month of several hundred dollars; reversing the old procedure of making monthly payments to the bank when they first purchased the home."

Rising costs for older people can seriously drain income and savings damaging their living standards. Through the simple plan of reverse mortgages we can now offer a regular monthly income to qualified senior citizens. Individuals are eligible if income does not exceed $28,230 or $32,400 for a couple. Assets, excluding the house, should not exceed $50,000. Fidelity is happy to receive applications and works in conjunction with Family Services Association of Nassau County.

Mr. Lovely went on the state "that RAM mortgages are good for all concerned; the bank makes a modest profit, the senior citizen can remain in his home and have a more dignified standard of living and the community benefits by not losing its long term residents. Hopefully, more banks will begin to make RAM loans available." Mr. Lovely paid tribute to the efforts of Nassau County Executive Purcell, the Department of Senior Citizen Affairs and the Family Services Association of Nassau County.

Mr. Lovely feels "We have a debt to our older residents who built our communities. Our monthly annuity income plan is one way the bank should reinvest in the community." Fidelity New York is the oldest federally chartered savings institution on Long Island with 20 branches in Nassau, Suffolk and Manhattan.●

OUR NATIONAL DEBT

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has written a letter to the Speaker regarding the national debt. He is very concerned about this problem and proposes a solution in his letter.

I am happy to request that it be printed in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues.

The letter follows:

JOHN K. NAGY,
Lake Ariel, PA, April 26, 1985.

TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: Since I started to write my book in March, 1984, I was concerned and started to watch the newspapers who the big lottery winners were and the amount they won. These figures are from our local newspapers. Only since July, 1984 to January 10, 1985. These figures are those who won over a million dollars in the states of Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois, the total in six months comes to $1,108,630.54 that shows that millions of people are buying lottery tickets.

Why the Federal Government that is paying interest on the National Debt of over $153.8 billion dollars and is doing nothing to pay the debt? But only the interest! It appears that the debt is a good investment as long as Uncle Sam has the money to pay over one hundred and fifty three billion dollars to Foreign Investors. I believe that money that should be used for the numerous needs for our nation's health, education, toxic waste, garbage pollution and many more problems that we have no money for—until the well goes dry—and it will go dry! With imports coming in putting our own people out of work, money that we still have going out to foreign wage earners while we have up to 8 million U.S. citizens out of work. They are not earning money, not paying any income tax or social security tax, how long can our nation keep this up without going broke. Where will Uncle Sam get the money to pay the retired army, navy and all servicemen who gave all they had for our Country. You and I as good loyal Americans must stand up and do everything we can to see that our nation remains free and free from our National Debt which will destroy our nation. Money must be earned to replenish what goes out. If cuts are to be made, a good place to start is to make a way to pay off the National Debt that is the big one. This is the well I want to see go dry!

As a person who has lived under President of these United States since 1900 and as a person who has held public office, in the community that I lived in, I believe I still have a right to defend this country, my country, your country, and to let the public know, how one grass roots person sees the debt of this nation growing higher and higher and nothing being paid to reduce it. The newspaper's report on October 26, 1984 shows that the U.S. Government paid on the $1.59 Trillion debt—the interest only of one hundred and fifty three billion dollars ($153.8)—nothing on the debt. A Washington report dated August 16, 1984 has a prediction of $2.3 Trillion debt by 1989. What will our interest come to then? It is no wonder that our U.S. Government has no money for its domestic needs. Our U.S. dollars going out of our country and nothing coming in! If we keep this up, congressmen might not get a pension when they retire! Our National Debt will eventually dry out the well.

If we keep imports coming in and 8 to 9 million of U.S. people out of work what can we expect! In March, 1984 I wrote a book called "How to Pay Off the National Debt". Since 46 states by law have a lottery to raise money our National Debt could be paid off. By selling ($1.00) one dollar tickets just for that purpose until the debt is paid, then use the $153.8 billion paid on interest for the needs of education, health, pure air, water, sewers, sanitation, garbage disposal, acid rain all our country's needs and more. Let us do something! Times goes on, before it will be too late.

As those who fought and gave their lives that made this nation we enjoy so great. We must do our part, as soldiers to preserve that we are proud that we are Americans and of our Freedom.

Thank you, a senior American,
JOHN K. NAGY.●

JOB OUTLOOK FOR WOMEN AT STATE AND AID

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, which I cochair, has a longstanding commitment to seeing that the Federal Government is exemplary in its efforts to expand women's opportunities for employment and promotion. In 1980, the caucus asked its research arm, the Women's Research & Education Institute [WREI], to conduct an examination of the status of women in both the civil and Foreign Services at the Department of State.

Last year, we issued a report entitled "Women at State" which represents the results of this thorough examination of how women fare at the Department of State. Overall, the findings were disappointing. While there has been progress in some areas—progress that has continued since the study was released—the report concluded that the State Department has been particularly slow at admitting women to its senior levels. In fact, only 3 percent of senior Foreign Service officers in 1981 were female.

Based on the findings of this report, I included language in the report on the State Department authorization recognizing that the State Department has not made sufficient progress over the last decade in realizing equal employment opportunities for women, and urging the Department to review its personnel policies to determine their impact on equal employment opportunities for employers in both the civil service and Foreign Service. Similar language was included in the fiscal year 1985 State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill by my colleague, Representative BOGGS.

On a related matter, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an article from the Washington Post on April 18, 1985, concerning the results of an unofficial study by women employees of the Agency for International Development. The conclusion is similar to the findings of the "Women at State" report: the Agency for International Development continues to hire far more men than women for professional career jobs and promotes them into the senior Foreign Service at more than six times the rate of women.

INSIDE: THE STATE DEPARTMENT—JOB OUTLOOK NOT IMPROVING, AID'S WOMEN EMPLOYES SAY

(By Peter Alsberg)

An unofficial study by women employes of the Agency for International Development has charged that AID continues to hire far more men than women for professional career jobs and promotes them into the Senior Foreign Service at more than six times the rate of women.

The 30-page study, entitled "A Profile of Women in AID; The Challenge Continues," was compiled by the Women's Action Organization (WAO), which seeks to improve career opportunities for women in the State Department, U.S. Information Agency and AID.

Recruitment and promotion of women long has been a contentious issue at all three agencies. In 1979, the WAO issued a study of women in AID that has been regarded as a rough gauge of the problems facing women seeking careers in foreign policy. The thrust of its new report is that things haven't improved very much since then.

Marilyn Zak, the WAO vice president for AID, said that has been the case even though AID Administrator M. Peter McPherson and Deputy Administrator Jay F. Morris "generally have been very supportive and sympathetic" to women's aspirations.

In fact, Zak, who is AID's human right coordinator, said that latest report indicates that as the number of women in AID has grown, the problems of fitting them into AID's organization also have grown.

Specifically, the report contends that there has been a tendency to shunt women into such specialized areas as health and nutrition, rather than what Zak calls "the fast track fields leading to senior administrative posts." The report also notes that a big increase in female political appointees has inflated the number of women at AID without significantly improving the advancement opportunities for women who want to climb the agency's career ladder through the Foreign Service or civil service.

The report also expressed concern that the Reagan administration's proposed personnel cuts will hit hardest at women employes, who often have less seniority than men.

And, echoing what also is an interesting problem for the State Department and USIA, the report focuses on "the new Foreign Service phenomenon" of married couples, and the difficulties of finding assignments for both spouses either overseas or in Washington.

In a gingerly worded reply, AID said it "continues to look for constructive approaches to remove any remaining barriers and will continue to encourage the input of groups like WAO." The statement maintained that any personnel reductions will be achieved through attrition so that women "will not be disproportionately affected."

The statement also took exception to the WAO report's statistics. It argued that an "analysis of our AID work force should be based on total representation and not on selected sub-categories as presented in the WAO report."

According to AID's reckoning, 36 percent of the agency's employes are female, with women averaging 34 percent of the "entry-level professional career candidates" and 50 percent of the interns. In terms of advancement, AID said, "since 1978 the representation of women, at the GS-15 and FS-1 level has more than doubled," even though the number of AID employes dropped 15 percent.

In response, Zak said, "The AID management gets those figures by lumping together women who are political appointees with Foreign Service and civil service members because it makes the numbers look better. But taking such a lump sum is misleading, particularly in the way that political appointees skew the percentages in the top ranks.

"Those women who have come into AID as political appointees have been very supportive of the career women employes," she said, "but they should be looked on as a separate category and not be used to carry the figures for all the women in the agency when you're trying to get an accurate picture of whether women making a career in AID can aspire to top positions."

According to the report, 11 of the 263 members of the Senior Foreign Service at AID are women, as are 36 of the 602 with the rank of FS-1 and 92 of the 651 with FS-2 rank. Of those in the civil service, 31 of the 133 AID employes with the rank of GS-15 are women. Only three of AID's overseas missions have a woman director.

"We are using the figures provided by AID management, even though different parts of the bureaucracy disagree on what is an accurate data base," Zak said. "But we feel that no matter how you look at the figures, they point in one direction: the gap has not narrowed in five years, and if things don't change, it will only get worse as more and more younger women seek to make careers in the foreign aid field, as more and more of them marry Foreign Service officers or other officials and question why they should have to choose between their own and their husbands' careers." ●

NEW ELECTION ONLY ANSWER TO INDIANA DILEMMA, SAYS NEWSPAPER EDITORIAL

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Pulitzer Prize-winning Philadelphia Inquirer has called editorially for the only fair resolution of the Richard D. McIntyre-Frank McCloskey controversy over election to Indiana's Eighth Congressional District seat—conduct a new election.

As a Republican who has worked for more than 16 years under a Democrat House majority, I assumed naturally that House precedent would be followed and Mr. McIntyre seated despite the closeness of his victory. Mr. McIntyre was duly certified by Indiana law. The House majority, however, refused to seat Mr. McIntyre—contrary to House precedent—and embarked on a course that could lead only to a bitterness and divisiveness that this body can ill afford in trying to cope with issues of importance to our Nation.

The actions and decisions of the special House task force, created to resolve the dilemma, only added fuel to the anger and frustration of Republican Members. I need not point out what has been cited time and again. Suffice to say, any seating of Mr. McCloskey will leave raw wounds that will serve only to hamper the orderly business of the House and impede its legislative schedule.

Republicans are not being petty. I should note that my Democrat colleagues might try putting themselves in the place of the minority for a number of years, We've been discriminated against on committee ratios and committee staff members, bulldozed on voting procedures, and ignored on the Republican legislative agenda.

Is it any wonder that the McIntyre-McCloskey dispute raised Republican frustration to an all-time intensity?

I ask my Democrat colleagues to read the Inquirer editorial closely. Hardly a mouthpiece for the Republicans Party, the Inquirer succinctly lays out the case for a new election.

In addition, I appeal again to my Democrat colleagues that a certain amount of comity between the majority and minority parties is essental if the House is to conduct the people's business. Let's not traumatize the House with a decision to seat Mr. McCloskey that can lead only to more disruption and enmity.

I feel strongly that a new election is the only answer to resolve this dispute. So strongly do I believe that I feel the House of Representatives should appropriate the funds necessary for a new election if the State of Indiana protests or balks at the cost. The issue runs that deep in ensuring the integrity of our constitutional processes and the element of fair play which we as Americans value so highly.

A copy of the April 24, 1985, editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer is inserted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I urge all my colleagues—regardless of their views on the contested election—to read it:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 24, 1985]

LET INDIANA VOTERS DECIDE

The U.S. House of Representatives is being disrupted by its Republican members, who are hopping mad at what they say is the theft by the Democrats of a House seat won fair and square last November by a Republican. In protest Republicans are sowing confusion, delay and disorder into House procedures.

Such tactics, aside from being thoroughly un-Republican, are deplorable, but they have focused attention on the GOP's grievance. It appears that they may have a case. On election night, Democrat Frank McCloskey appeared to have won a closely fought House race in Indiana's Eighth District by 72 votes. A recount in one county pushed his Republican opponent, Richard D. McIntyre, ahead by 34 votes, however. Despite complaints from Mr. McCloskey about 5,000 contested ballots, Indiana's secretary of state, a Republican, certified Mr. McIntyre the victor.

The Democratic-majority House refused to seat Mr. McIntyre, despite another recount showing him winning by 418 votes. Instead the House Administration Committee formed a three-member task force, composed of two Democrates and one Republican, to do its own recount. Seven two-person teams of auditors from the respected General Accounting Office did the counting and proclaimed Democrat McCloskey the winner on April 18 by four votes.

That would seem to settle the matter, except that more than four contested ballots favoring Republican McIntyre were thrown out by the task force on 2-1 party-line votes.

Article One, Section Five, of the Constitution empowers each house of Congress to judge the elections of its members. The Democrats intend to seat Mr. McCloskey next week, and doubtless have the votes to do it.

Yet after so many contested recounts and partisan power plays, the only way to purge the taint of suspicion that either party stole the seat is to hold a new election, and the sooner the better. For until this is resolved, those voters have no voice in the House.●

JUST A BIT OF NEVADA WIT

HON. HARRY REID

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, for the amusement and edification of my colleagues, I am passing along a bit of the poetic wit and wisdom of Reid B. Gardner, a friend and constituent from Las Vegas, NV. Reid's words are fine/His rhymes sublime/Better than mine/Without further adieu/Here's a sample for you:

Richard Nixon, in reflection
Wondered where he'd lost direction
In fame's forest, found that he
Had climbed up higher than his tree.

I'm working hard for ERA
Tho I'm sure some will abuse it
My reasons are both strong and clear
We married men could use it.

The weather today, to be succinct
Didn't turn out the way I thinkt.

The early bird, he gets the worms
And feeds them to his mate
My wife was never fond of worms
So I just sleep in late.

The Hebrews wandered 40 years

Across the desert soil
They hunted manna every day
When they should have looked for oil.

THE QUESTION OF ARMENIA

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 24, 1985

● Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is once again an honor to join with my colleagues in remembering the fate of Armenians who suffered and died 70 years ago in a terrible tragedy of world history.

In recent weeks we have heard much about Hitler's Holocaust against the Jews. It is good that we are reminded of this terrible event. But at the same time, our show of grief, of resolve, and of anger should not be limited to one group of innocent victims. Whenever the force of the state has been used to bring about the deaths of members of one race or one ethnic group or one religion—or one social or economic class as defined by Marxist-Leninist ideology—we must remember and speak about it. Not speaking about these things or denying they happened doesn't solve anything. We're not blaming anyone today for what happened years ago—unless they were directly responsible. All we're saying is "Don't forget."

But, remembering these various atrocities, like the one we commemorate today, should not be an end in itself. And it must never serve as an excuse for further atrocities, in revenge. We cannot revenge the deaths we speak of—but we can learn from them. We can work to see that similar crimes do not happen in the future.

From the Soviet gold mines of Kolyma where millions died from starvation and sheer exhaustion; from the plains of Anatolia where so many Armenians died under horrible circumstances; from the Nazi death camps; from the forest of Katyn where even now the Soviet Union is trying to disguise its sole responsibility for the coldblooded murder of Polish prisoners of wars, from the Ukraine, where millions were starved to death as matter of Soviet policy—from all of these places, and others throughout the world the voices of the innocent cry out—remember us. We are doing that today.●

INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC DRUG TRAFFICKING—A GROWING PROBLEM

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, an article in the April 25 edition of the Washington Post reports that two more Americans are believed to have been killed in Guadalajara, Mexico, at the hands of reputed drug kingpin Rafael Caro Quintero, who was recently apprehended by Mexican police. Quintero is also believed to have been responsible for the brutal murder of Drug Enforcement Administration agent Enrique Camarena Salazar. Quintero is now believed to have been involved in the alleged murder of two Americans whom Quintero and his cohorts suspected of being DEA agents. According to the Washington Post article, Quintero invited the two Americans to a local restaurant in Guadalajara for dinner. The two Americans were then alleged to have been accused by Quintero's men of being DEA agents. They were then allegedly beaten, then stabbed by Quintero and his men. To date the bodies of these two Americans have not been found.

Mr. Speaker, this incident disturbs me greatly. The murder of a DEA agent and now this incident, further underscore the tragic fact that international and domestic drug trafficking is becoming a growing problem and one that must be addressed. The arrogance of drug kingpins like Quintero and the number of Mexican law enforcement officers involved in illicit drug activity is further evidence that this problem has reached catastrophic proportions. The lives of our DEA officials—both abroad and in the United States—are in constant peril from "hit squads" sent out by internationally known drug kingpins. Most tragically, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the heightened activity of drug trafficking across the country and across the world—translates into more poisonous drugs on our streets. Drug abuse among our youth has been characterized as this Nation's fastest growing problem. As a drug counselor for 10 years, I am acutely aware of the tragic consequences of drug abuse. Not only does it destroy the minds and bodies of our precious youth—the future of our Nation—but it also causes immeasurable suffering to the families of the victims.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that those international and domestic drug kingpins, who have arrogantly been increasing their activity and brutally taking on our law enforcement agents, are the ones who are ultimately responsible for the poisoning of our youth. They are the ones who are ultimately responsible for jeopardizing the very fabric of our society. They must be stopped. America must get as tough as possible and be as diligent as possible in combating illicit drug activities. The big time dealers must be caught, convicted, and put away for a long time. If they kill or threaten the lives of innocent civilians or our law enforcement officers, then they should be subject to the death penalty.

At this time I would like to site some statistics compiled by the Drug Enforcement Administration which reveal that drug trafficking is becoming a growing problem and is becoming increasingly more violent in nature. In fiscal year 1983, the DEA and Customs' Department's Joint Task Force Group in Florida reported two seizures of heroin totaling 0.4 kilograms; 412 seizures of cocaine totaling 3,555.6 kilograms; 606 seizures of cannabis totaling 874,083.6 kilograms; 10 seizures of methaqualone totaling 160,470 dosage units; and 13 seizures of other narcotic drugs totaling 39,092 dosage units. The figures for fiscal year 1983, released by the Florida Joint Task Force Group also reveals the massive scope of illicit drug activity in the State of Florida alone. During fiscal year 1983, the task force reported the following figures regarding seizures of assets involved in illicit drug activity: 79 vehicle seizures; 194 vessel seizures; 27 aircraft seizures; 143 currency seizures totaling $2,590,964; and 351 weapons seizures. These figures indeed are disturbing. Especially when one considers that they reflect a marked increase from previous years, and that these drugs are swiftly moved to the streets where the find their way into the hands of our youth.

The DEA reports that the number of domestic arrests by DEA officials increased 25 percent from fiscal year 1980 to fiscal year 1983, reaching its highest point in 5 years. The DEA must be commended for the fine job it has done and for the dedication and courage of its agents. They need our help. If they arrest a suspected drug kingpin, we must take steps to ensure that the suspect does not jump bail—as they so often do—and that the suspect stands trial for his crimes. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 994, the Controlled Substances Penalties Act of 1985, that would stiffen the penalties for those convicted of drug trafficking or smuggling in large amounts. My bill would also deny bond in cases involving large amounts of narcotics. My bill would also provide judges with the death penalty option for second offenders who murder either an innocent civilian or law enforcement officer in the course of arrest—based upon highjacking provisions in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

Mr. Speaker, recent events and DEA statistics show that international and domestic drug trafficking has become a dangerous problem. Drug abuse continues to destroy our youth and ravage families. Action must be taken—I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 994 and work hard for its passage.●

NICARAGUA AND DRUGS

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the image makers are doing all that they can to put a pretty face on Comandante Ortega and company. The basic fact, however, is that the Communist government is denying fundamental liberties to the Nicaraguan people, and is exporting both revolution and drugs in this hemisphere. The following New York Times article provides interesting details on the Sandinista involvement in the processing and export of drugs.

In recent months, well paid public relations firms have tried to convince the Congress and the American public that the Sandinistas are almost angelic. They have tried to cover up the seamier side of life in today's Nicaragua. They have directed attention away from support of guerrilla and terrorist groups in the region. They have blamed all of the Sandinistas' failings on the existence of the Contras. They have ignored the fact that the Sandinistas are practicing and preaching Marxism-Leninism and, as such, are dedicated to the destruction of our open democratic system.

Not unlike the chameleon who can easily and quickly change colors, the Sandinistas are putting on an image of respectability and decency. They are masters of timing. They know how to manipulate our media. They know how Americans can be swayed by evening news broadcasts and newspaper articles. They offered peace initiatives on the very eve of the Contra vote here in Congress. What masters of deception!

With these concerns in mind, I strongly recommend the following article on Managua's drug connection to all of my colleagues in the Congress. It is certainly food for thought. Let's wake up and call a spade a spade. The Sandinistas are clearly Communists dedicated to the export of their sorry revolution to the Rio Grande River.

The New York Times article follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1985]

PANEL HEARS DETAILS LINKING MANAGUA AND DRUGS

(By Joel Brinkley)

WASHINGTON, April 19.—A Senate subcommittee heard detailed evidence today showing purported links between the Nicaraguan Government and international narcotics trafficking.

A former drug trafficker, James A. Herring Jr., who has acted as a Federal informant, testified that he worked with Cuban Government officials and with the American fugitive Robert Vesco to help the Nicaraguan Government build a cocaine-processing laboratory near Managua.

Mr. Herring said that he had worked with members of the Nicaraguan military and that Nicaragua's Interior Minister, Tomás Borge, had offered his personal thanks for helping with what Mr. Borge called "our project," whose purpose was to earn foreign currency for Nicaragua's troubled economy.

The Customs Commissioner, William von Raab, and a Justice Department official both said Mr. Herring had passed lie-detector tests, adding that their agencies had corroborated large elements of his story through investigations.

Follow-up investigations from evidence Mr. Herring provided resulted in the indictments of 11 Americans on drug trafficking and related charges, they said. Mr. von Raab testified that these recent developments had "the potential of making Nicaragua a significant producer of cocaine."

Federal officials have charged for several years that cuba is involved in drug trafficking, despite repeated denials from Havana.

The first allegations of Nicaraguan involvement came last fall. But until now, Federal officials have said they were unable show that the trafficking was the work of the Nicaraguan Government and not just corrupt Government officers.

Today, however, Mr. von Raab told the Children, Families, Drugs and Alcohol Subcommittee, "We now know without any doubt that the Nicaraguan Government is directly involved."

NICARAGUA DENIES CHARGES

Nicaraguan officials have denied the drug trafficking charges, calling them ridiculous, and a Nicaraguan official repeated the denial today.

John C. Keeney, a Deputy Assistant Attorney General, testified that Sandinista officials decided in 1983 "to establish Nicaragua as a major cocaine exporter."

They began by purchasing coca paste from members of the Colombian guerrilla movement M-19, Mr. Keeney and others said.

Colombia is the world's largest producer of cocaine, and the M-19 guerrillas, who have ties with Cuba, have long been thought to be involved in trafficking. A United States investigation last fall showed links between Colombian drug traffickers and a Nicaraguan official, Frederico Vaughan, who was said to be an aide to Mr. Borge. Mr. Vaughn was indicted in Miami.

SAYS HE WAS ALWAYS GUARDED

Next, the officials testified, the Nicaraguans brought in an American expert to show them how to process coca paste to make cocaine. That expert was Mr. Herring, who said he had been involved in drug smuggling for some time. In the course of his work, he said, he became acquainted with Mr. Vesco, who lived in Cuba. United States officials have previously charged that Mr. Vesco has been involved in a variety of smuggling activities with the Cuban Government.

An associate of Mr. Vesco took Mr. Herring to Nicaragua in 1983, where Mr. Herring said he "gave them advice on setting up a cocaine-cutting lab for the Government."

He added that "they were setting it up on a rice farm the Sandinistas had confiscated" from Anastasio Somoza Debayle, the former dictator.

He said the Sandinista officials whisked him through customs immigration whenever he entered or left the country and that while working at the lab he was always guarded by armed, uniformed Sandinista soldiers.

The first processed cocaine from the laboratory was shipped to Europe, he said, and another witness, Jitze Kooistra, said he worked directly with Nicaraguan Government officials to arrange the sale. Mr. Kooistra was later arrested in the United States and is serving a term in a Federal prison in Florida.

A Customs Service official said Federal officers believed that the Nicaraguan cocaine laboratory was still operating, although they could not be certain.

Senator Christopher J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, sparked an angry exchange with the subcommittee's chairman, Senator Paula Hawkins, Republican of Florida, when he said it "does the public a disservice" to pretend that "Nicaraguans are the only government officials to have ever been implicated in international narcotics trafficking schemes."

Recent investigations have produced similar allegations against Government officials in Mexico, El Salvador, Bolivia and the Bahamas, among other nations.●

CENTRAL AMERICA

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, our country has long resisted change in Central America. Last night's House vote against military aid to the Contras confirms that most Americans want a change. They don't buy the administration's rhetoric that the Contras are "the moral equivalent of the Founding Fathers." They want to preserve our interests, but they sense the old ways will no longer work.

Military escalation is part of the problem, not the solution. Our 30-plus interventions in the area since 1900 have not produced longrun stability and peace. Military aid has always allowed the right wing to think it didn't need to compromise. Guatemala, where the CIA intervened 31 years ago to depose a socialist government, today faces a simmering revolt repressed by a rightist dictatorship.

The Reagan policy won't put the Contras back in power. No one I talked with during my recent trip to Central America believes the Contras can win. The Contras can't win because they lack the political identity required to advance their cause. $14 million won't change this. $80 million hasn't.

The administration's harsh rhetoric strengthens Sandinista hardliners. The CIA-backed minings and assassination manuals, the Contra attacks on civilians and our President's bellicosity deny Sandinista moderates the oppor-

tunity to present a credible political alternative to their own people. We invite the extremism Reagan complains of.

Reagan hasn't faced the hard reality that Americans won't support armed intervention unless it is clear that other possibilities for settlement have been exahusted. And they haven't. Why hasn't he relied more extensively on other tools at his disposal? And why does he recognize the regime if he believes it illegitimate?

The American people want a policy that offers us prospects for constructive change. They want to attempt negotiations before plunging us into a war.

The negotiations initiated by the Contadora nations of Venezuela, Colombia, Panama, and Mexico represent an excellent start. An agreement along the lines suggested by the Contadora group would require the Sandinistas to expel foreign military advisors, keep foreign military bases and offensive weapons out of the country and desist from exporting arms. We would need to insist on provisons to ensure that the Sandinistas are not violating these terms. If violations occurred, we could take steps to isolate them diplomatically or suspend trade. As a last resort, the Rio treaty would give us a legal foundation for the use of military force.

Today we need a demonstration of our commitment to negotiations.

We face two alternatives.

The Michel substitute would direct the Agency for International Development to dispense $14 million in aid to the Contras. It would not prohibit U.S. aid from being provided by other agencies such as the CIA. The CIA's record under Reagan—its failure in the past to inform Congress and the American people about its actions in Nicaragua—suggests to me that we could not be sure how this money would be used. Most significantly, MICHEL would allow the use of contingency funds for military operations after October 1, 1985.

The Hamilton substitute, on the other hand, initiates a new policy. It provides no funds for paramilitary operations, but it does not rule out use of military options in the future. It directs $10 million in assistance to Nicaraguan refugees through the International Red Cross or the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. It directs $4 million to the implementation of a Contadora agreement. This will signify both our concern about the region and our support for a negotiated settlement.

I will vote for the Hamilton substitute. It better promotes negotiations.

For all of the complexities in Central America, the choice confronting us remains relatively simple. We can continue to focus on military solutions, even if this only expands and perpetuates the conflicts. Or we can support negotiated solutions.

The harsh rhetoric of the Reagan administration fosters nationalism among some Americans, but the record shows that for all the noise and bellicose language, we are not moving toward peace in this region or with our other adversaries around the world.

Policy changes do not come without risks. But an unwillingness to see change in Central America will only deepen the mire—not only in current wars but in conflicts to come. If we do not help resolve the region's differences peacefully, we will inevitably share the cost of its turmoil.●

ONE WORLD, RICH AND POOR

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues an excellent keynote address by the Honorable Bradford Morse, Administrator of the U.N. Development Program and Director of the U.N. Office for Emergency Operatations in Africa, before the International Development Conference in Washington, DC, March 20, 1985. His speech, entitled, "One World, Rich and Poor," is profound and thought-provoking. As a former member of this Chamber, his words, are, no doubt, of interest to us all.

"ONE WORLD, RICH AND POOR"

If there is some dispute about who originated the concept and the term "Third World", there is little doubt that millions of people first learned to think about "One World" from the book with that title by Wendell Willkie, published in 1943 in the middle of the greatest global carnage humanity had ever experienced. Much of what he set down following a world air tour undertaken at President Roosevelt's suggestion remains fresh and apposite, even extraordinary prophetic, to this day. Listen for a moment to a few extracted passages:

"There are no distant points in the world any longer . . . I learned by this trip that the myriad millions of human beings of the Far East are as close to us as Los Angeles is to New York by the fastest trains . . . Our thinking in the future must be worldwide . . . Men and women all over the world are on the march, physically, intellectually, and spiritually . . . they are beginning to know that men's welfare throughout the world is interdependent . . . even our present standard of living in America cannot be maintained unless the exchange of goods flows more freely over the whole world".

Wendell Willkie's sense of a global interdependence that would be complex, fragile, and volatile, was far ahead of his time, and indeed we could use his voice today. Four decades after his warning, some 600,000 Americans lost their jobs from only three years of suddenly declining purchasing power among the developing countries; and it has been estimated that if developing-country economies had instead been able to maintain their rates of growth of the 1970s, instead of disemployment another half a million Americans would have found new jobs in the export sector alone.

Indeed, on all sides as we survey what we have accomplished since the first of these International Development Conferences 33 years ago, we see the evidence of these characteristics—complexity, fragility, and volatility. We witness it with grief in Africa, where drought and famine threaten thirty million people, and among them some ten million have had to abandon their homes and lands; Africa, where the very soil and vegetation reveal their fragility as much before the pressure of population and cropping patterns introduced by colonists as from the cycles of climate; Africa, where such remarkable gains since 1960 as the doubling of school enrollment, and the doubling of doctors and nurses in proportion to population, are promptly and thoughtlessly forgotten in the tides of catastrophic news. We witness the same fragility and volatility of our deeply interdependent economy in the sudden, devastating impact of high interest rates and new trade barriers in the North, on all the gains that developing countries had been making: a 1,100 per cent increase in capital formation between 1950 and 1980; an average increase of 400 per cent in Gross National Product over the same period; a 1,500 per cent increase in skills formation.

This picture is grim, but it is not in the least hopeless; and I do not assert this merely because I am by nature an optimist. I assert it because, if it had to come this way—if we had to have a period of multiple and interlocked crises to open minds just that much wider about our one world, and to consolidate our experience of the devlopment process—then we do indeed now have the crises. From Wendell Willkie's prophetic warning of the coming interdependence of the American economy with the South to the economic difficulties which indiscriminately struck all countries—rich and poor—in the early years of this decade there is no excuse whatever for tunnel vision on the international economic and financial dimension. And we have ample experience of success and failure in national development to analyze and on which to build, and on which I will concentrate this morning.

We do not need to search for whole new panaceas. We need more than anything to pay renewed attention to some simple, but crucial factors in development which have tended to fall by the wayside in the search for more glamorous answers. And such renewed attention should begin with people—especially the tens of millions of small, poor farmers and their families. Despite the pleas of some of us over so many years, these people slipped from the focus of development strategies that were predicated upon the Western model of industrial urbanization in which they seemed marginal because in any case assumed to be destined to migrate to cities and towns as part of "progress". From that one wildly inappropriately transferred macro-premise, we can trace an entire chain of neglect, and of urgently needed remedial action.

First, we must regain respect for small farmer families; for their energy, for their ancient wisdoms replete with the technologies of survival and sustainable production, and for their productivity and their cost-effectiveness which was so wrongly assumed to be less than that of the larger modernised farm. And it is no accident that what I have just said seems to be common between

the heartland of this great country and the heartlands of the Third World: we are more "one world" in frailty of judgment and policy than is sometimes perceived.

From this regained respect, the chain of other neglected needs comes into sharp relief. In the little time we have left according to the frightening rates of projected migration to cities, we must redirect development to reach the small farmers—where they are, as they are. As the Africa food deficit strikingly indicates, there must be new pricing policies that provide incentives for small farmers and, for as long as food imports are necessary, that ensure such imports do not erode the value of their produce.

Long buried within these neglected equations, and as another casualty of the original model, I cannot overemphasize credit—small-scale credit on criteria small farmers can meet, and at interest they can afford. As an example of this need, in Zimbabwe in 1978 only some 3,000 smallholders received agricultural loans: by this year, an estimated 95,000 smallholders will receive credit for their agricultural necessities. And this strategic redirection, combined with new decentralised seed and fertilizer and tool distribution points, and grain depots, not leased assisted by USAID, assuredly accounts for the country's recent dramatic production increases when some rain blessedly fell last April.

In Bhutan, the Capital Development Fund, an arm of the United Nations Development Programme, has been helping some 8,000 small farmers with the tiny amounts they actually need for seed, fertilizer, livestock and tools, but which such people all across the Third World have seldom been able to obtain—in Bhutan averaging only $95 a season per family. And to dispel another myth, the repayment is excellent—above 95 percent—which goes into a revolving fund to assist another 30,000 small farmers.

We also need vastly more credit for women: in Honduras, UNDP with the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Food Programme, is helping several hundred women with low-interest credits for small-scale productive projects including technical training, and designed to provide a framework for further support by the United Nations Voluntary Fund for the Decade for Women, and NGOs.

I hope you will already have mentally noted that these missing ingredients in development all have one strange characteristic—the moment you state them they seem so utterly obvious that it is hard to believe thay are not by now intrinsic, almost automatic considerations in development designs. But they have not been. Another classic example of this phenomenon is post-harvest storage. How on earth have so many millions upon millions of dollars been invested in reaching for higher vertical yields and for increased growing acreage, while 15 to 25 percent of present production has continued to be lost as a result of pests, right under everyone's eyes? Again, I submit that the essential answer is that the eyes were not on the main source of the harvests—the small farmers.

The chain of need thus brought back into focus continues. If development is once directed out to where the great mass of people live in abject poverty, then you decentralize and intensify training in farming techniques that the small farmer can adopt. You also decentralize the training of primary health care personnel, so that those who get the training come from the rural areas where they are needed, instead of trying to force already-urbanised graduates of urban schools to work in the countryside. And you decentralize small-scale and artisanal industry, and the training that it too will need to take root in rural areas. Rural feeder roads, reafforestation, and small-scale irrigation and drinking water supply systems also suddenly come into focus as very strategic—and do not need capital-intensive investment: UNDP's Special Public Works Programme with the International Labour Organization have to date generated over 10 million workdays in some 45 countries, with lasting development benefits and community-mobilized self-help to sustain them.

In all of this, there is the perennially elusive need for coordination, at two levels: the international and the design-level.

We simply must help developing countries from being overwhelmed by week-after-week, visitations by uncoordinated missions from all over the donor North, exhausting the same handful of planners in successive rituals of airport meetings, briefings, answering largely the same questions, then trying to cater to the individual sectoral enthusiasms and different procedural requirements of each mission, entertaining them, seeing them off, and rushing back to their offices to try to do some operational work before the next plane is due to land and disgorge the next mission.

At the design level, we have simply got to respond to the long-accumulated bad experience of projects planned so narrowly that they lack the crucial cross-sectoral reinforcement. Again, this need for holistic development design and budget-planning is so obvious that it seems almost ritual litany once stated. Yet to this day it remains a crucial weakness in numerous development projects. We must challenge all institutional and sectoral chauvinism (not least the UN System which is also only human), and the constantly debilitating effect of our artificial compartmentalizing of development. We must open minds, to "see things whole".

Above all, we must open our minds so that we can literally "see" people who have for too long been almost invisible; "see" women as economic agents not just wives and mothers; "see" communities for the repositories of practical knowledge that they really are, and for the cumulatively vast resources of human energy for self-help which have lain relatively untapped because of the official disdain of centralised minds for nongovernmental leadership and initiative. Development design and programme formulation needs human feasibility study; development needs to be planned with the intended actors and beneficiaries, consulting them about what is feasible for them to undertake, in what time-frame, and what first. Again, this seems desperately obvious to many when stated; but the lack of attention to it would suggest it were heresy.

I have used the term "heresy" quite deliberately, because we need to liberate ourselves from the surprisingly tight and narrow set of assumptions that modern growth-economists and theoreticians have elevated to almost holy writ out of scarcely more than a hundred years of operating experience of the urban-industrialised technology—and money-oriented model. We need to start asking, far more often, "Who said that such and such is a universal prerequisite of progress for all societies, everywhere?"

For example, who said that the practice of barter is primitive and must be replaced by the use of money for all exchange everywhere if development is to begin to take place? The impact of this single proposition on national and local economies and poor families and the dreadful extra burdens imposed upon trade among nations, above all upon poor nations trying to enter world trade markets, come into focus the moment the heretical question is asked.

Who said that modern, improved homes must be built with artificial factory-made materials, or they will not be modern and will not be capable of improved shelter? This notion has been picked up almost wholesale by people in developing countries. It has entailed incalculable costs in precious foreign exchange for imported cement and corrugated iron roofing for a minority, while masses of people were left waiting for such "modernity". Yet, as UNDP-supported projects have been proving, it is entirely possible to innovate and improve in traditional indigenous building materials, like adobe, at low cost and with large-scale local employment of people.

Yet again, who said that the entire accumulated technology in pharmaceuticals evolved in the Third World over millennia, should be ignored and disdained as primitive quackery, to be replaced by massive imports of factory-made drugs or of drug factories? Well, we lost years in that field, until it could become respectable for the World Health Organization, with UNICEF and UNDP, to begin building lists combining modern, and numerous, traditional indigenous medicines which were found upon testing to be entirely valid, safe, and low-cost.

And finally from so many such questions that emerge out of the trial and error of development these last 35 years, who said that people must achieve literacy—be able to read and write—before they can become agents of their own development? We would all agree, everywhere, that human innovation advances exponentially through printed communication. But does that mean the total neglect of the power of the spoken and the heard word, and of the latent development energy of the masses of poor people who have rich and vibrant oral cultures and forms of learning? A modest UNDP-supported project in Mali, making no earth-shaking claims, is quietly building audio cassette libraries of practical development information, run by each community asking for a library; and they are already dedicating garden plots to finance the repurchase of batteries for their cassette recorders, so deeply do they feel that these libraries belong to themselves.

I hope that in posing these questions and citing these examples of appropriate response, no one will have misunderstood my meaning. I am not advocating a return to the past, nor a dismissal of modern economic organization and technology. I have not suggested that any one of the ingredients, for sound development I have cited has been totally neglected by everyone—or, by the way, always remembered in UNDP. Nor I am urging that any of them is "the new key to development". I am opposed to excessive enthusiasms of all kinds in development work. What I am urging is that we pay much more attention to the simple factors—things that are not glamorous yet make straightforward common sense, the moment they are identified. And I am certainly urging a general intellectual liberation—in the South, from the inherited premise that progress means blindly copying everything in the North at whatever cost (cultural, financial, ecological); and in the North, a lib-

eration from the deeply ingrained faith that it has all the right answers for development anywhere, if it has made so much progress so quickly in its own countries.

We must accordingly strengthen our perceptive capacities along the entire spectrum of development—and recheck our language to see what that, too, may reveal; for language both reflects and reinforces prejudices. Doubtless this will be addressed in the development education and communication components of this Conference which I am delighted to see in the programme. We should never, for example, have adopted the term "aid" to describe official development co-operation: it connotes and promotes images of charitable donations involving real deprivation by donor governments and their tax-payers; whereas the combination of spending these "aid" funds at home, and helping to develop purchasing power in developing countries, makes even grant funding as much of an extension and expansion of Northern domestic economies as expressions of compassionate charity. We should also stop using the term "technology transfer", because it connotes moving technology from those who have it to those who have none—and wholesale at that: technology selection and adaptation by developing countries is what we must support and advance.

I am not even sure that the term "development" gives us a deep enough understanding of what the developing countries have really been facing. For what they have really faced—involving everything from recovering their cultures to defining the nature of their needed indigenously designed institutions; from their agricultural policies to where they had roads and telegraph and where they didn't—has in many cases been "post-colonial reconstruction" and then development.

Let us also be more careful with sweeping references to "mis-management" and "corruption"—uttered in donor countries in a curious special way, as though intrinsically different from the mismanagement and corruption daily reported in many donor countries themselves. Of course there is corruption, and of course there is mismanagement in developing countries. I sometimes wonder whether some of the donor-country commentary about this doesn't have a note of special disappointment in it—as though some people in the Western world somehow hoped that liberated peoples in the South had a chance to start "from scratch", would do better than the West, and would all behave like saints before so much poverty. The answer of course is that they never could start from scratch; and there never was any reason why, as human beings like the rest of us, endowed both with nobleness and frailty, they should be able to avoid the weaknesses that plagued Western societies at comparable states—and that still do even amid our enormous affluence and much-vaunted standard-setting. Mahatma Gandhi was, not a Third World, but a global exception—and even he said that he was "only a politician trying to be a saint".

Although I know that media professionals dislike hearing this, it is also profoundly disturbing that the kindly generous, caring citizens of the donor countries—who are proving their solidarity all over again over Africa—are so seldom allowed to read or hear or see on their screens any good news from the South. Even over the Africa emergency, it is evident that scarcely anyone knows of the special self-help initiatives and sacrifices being made by Africans to help their fellow-citizens in distress. It is vital for development educators and nongovernmental organizations to find new ways to convey achievement by the developing countries, progress in our North-South partnership, amid all the problems and difficulties which themselves are means of positive development education.

And so, I come back to Wendell Willkie, a remarkably perceptive man who left us so soon after his unforgettable book had reached around the world in nearly three million copies in the midst of war. Urging that, and I quote him, "Our Western world and our presumed supremacy are now on trial. Our boasting and our big talk leave Asia cold", he went on to make one of the most powerful appeals then to be heard, even before the United Nations had been born. It has a healthy democratic, modest ring to it for a very proud United States even today. He wrote

"When I say that this world demands the full participation of a self-confident America, I am only passing on an invitation which the peoples of the East have given us. They would like the United States and the other United Nations to be partners with them in this grand adventure . . . the chance to help create a new society in which men and women the world around can live and grow invigorated by independence and freedom".

That is surely our agenda today, in this forthieth anniversary year of the United Nations. This Conference convenes in "one world, rich and poor", to build upon our successes and learn from our failures, so that the day will come when we can really meet in one world—rich in a universally energised humanity; rich in cooperativeness; tranquil amid real disarmament; one world where the word "poor" has been retired into history books.

It is a dream within our grasp—in which we have nothing to fear but complacency; nothing to lose but the weakness in our present economies. it is an "all-win" challenge in a positive-sum game which our children the world over have a right to expect us to overcome.

We cannot expect their forgiveness if we make it their inheritance.●

HONORING ROYCE SMITH

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, how pleasurable it is to be able to laud and commemorate a resident of my congressional district who has combined all of the noble aspects of community service, professional attainment, family achievement and a fulfilling life. We are pleased to join family, friends and associates of Royce Smith in saluting him on the occasion of his retirement from government.

Very few individuals can take with them the satisfaction which comes from duty faithfully performed. But Royce Smith is able to do this based upon his record as Belleville councilman, Belleville mayor, member of the Wayne County Board of Commissioners and managing director of the Wayne County Department of Public Works.

Many people are satisfied to achieve either in the private sector or in public office holding. Seldom do we see the remarkable blend of both public and private achievement, intertwined with responsible partisanship on behalf of the 15th District Democratic organization.

We know that Royce and his family now look forward to his well-earned respite from his official duties. But in another sense he will never depart from the special job and pleasure he derives from his family and the satisfaction he derives from assisting others.●

THE TREASURY'S TAX PROPOSAL WOULD HURT OHIO OIL AND GAS INDUSTRY

HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department's new tax proposal would severely impact the oil and gas industry in my home State of Ohio—an industry which just enjoyed its finest year ever. I rise today to express my opposition to three major components of the Treasury's plan that would have wide-ranging negative effects in the oil and gas industry in Ohio.

The Treasury's tax plan includes three proposals that I am very concerned about. They are: First, loss of intangible drilling cost deduction; second, repeal of statutory depletion; and third, elimination of investment tax credit. These three proposals, if enacted, would be a severe blow to the fiscal health of Ohio's oil and gas industry. A recent survey by the Ohio Oil and Gas Association regarding the Treasury's proposals revealed some disturbing information. If enacted, these proposals would have the following effects: First, expenditures for oil and gas production in Ohio would decline by 72 percent; second, the number of new wells in Ohio would decline by 71 percent; third, revenues paid to related industries in Ohio would decline by 54 percent; and fourth, employment in the industry in Ohio would be cut by 43 percent.

While all of the above facts are quite disturbing, I am most concerned about the unacceptable amount of jobs that would be lost and the grave reduction in oil and gas production in Ohio. In my home district the unemployment has been one of the highest in the Nation for several years. The State of Ohio is struggling to catch up with this so-called economic recovery. The oil and gas industry had been a steady part of Ohio's economic growth. If the

above mentioned proposals by the Treasury Department were enacted, 3,266 fewer wells would be drilled in Ohio and over 7,000 Ohioans would lose their jobs. The effects of these proposals would not be isolated to Ohio—630,000 jobs would be lost nationally and investment capital for drilling in the United States would decline by $10 billion. This would ultimately add to our already severe trade deficit problem and have a significantly negative effect on the national economy.

I urge all of my colleagues to oppose these proposals by the Treasury Department and with me to bring forth a tax plan that is fair and equitable and one that will not discourage the growth and expansion of vital American industries.●

NICARAGUA—A CONTINUING PROBLEM

HON. JOHN MILLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the House has ended for the moment, a lengthy and heated debate on the proper response of the United States to the political situation in Nicaragua.

Many issues were raised during the debate, including the possibility of direct U.S. involvement, the deplorable atrocities attributed to each side, the reliability of various experts and partisans, and the amount of money under consideration. But I believe the crucial issue before the House was whether the United States should help the forces seeking a more democractic form of government for Nicaragua, whether we should keep a hands-off approach, or whether we should seek closer ties with the Sandinista government.

I feel the answer is clear. When given the choice of aligning ourselves with a Communist regime intertwined militarily and economically with the Soviet Union and Cuba, doing nothing, or supporting groups which espouse democratic ideals and economic opportunity, I believe the United States must take the lead in promoting democracy and freedom. This is especially true in the case of Nicaragua, where the national security interests of the United States and other Central American countries are so directly affected.

It is unfortunate, but true, that the Sandinista government, which the United States originally supported after we helped remove Somoza, has broken its promises of reform. It promised fair and open elections, yet junta member Bayardo Arce admits that the elections were a propaganda ploy and that the Communist Sandinistas had no intention of handing over or sharing power with their opponents. It promised political pluralism, yet the army, the militia, and the police are the private property of the ruling political party. It promised to remain nonaligned, yet in addition to inviting some 10,000 Cuban, East German, Bulgarian, and Soviet advisers to the country, the Sandinistas have also accepted some $300 million per year in Soviet bloc aid to build up the largest and best equipped military force in Central America.

On the other side, there are groups which espouse democratic ideals and economic opportunity. These groups are led, for the most part, by individuals who originally helped lead the democratic opposition to Somoza, but now find themselves philosophically and politically at odds with the Communist Sandinistas. These forces, call them Contras or freedom fighters or whatever, I am now convinced, have the will and the capability to carry on, grow in numbers, and effect change for the better in Nicaragua.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot consider the Nicaragua situation in a vacuum. Soviet and Cuban intrusion around the globe pose a serious threat not only to world stability but to our own national security interests. The United States now tries to meet this challenge through a variety of economic, political, military, and diplomatic means. We are now applying to Nicaragua moderate economic, political and, through the Contedora nations, diplomatic pressure. The proposed $14 million in military support to the rebels is a very moderate amount of potential military pressure.

I strongly support our policy of trying to return the Sandinista government to its original goals and aspirations. Our policy is to encourage the Sandinista government to negotiate with the various opposition groups; to end military ties with Cuba and the Soviet Union; to hold free and open elections; to allow a free press and to end religious and racial oppression. Ours is a temperate and positive policy, which, if supported by the American people and by Congress, I believe offers the hope of both improving our own security and redeeming for the people of Nicaragua the promises of the Sandinista revolution.●

MARKET ORIENTATION

HON. ARLAN STANGELAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. STANGELAND. Mr. Speaker, market orientation is certainly the buzz word surrounding this year's Farm Bill.

The administration has gone to great lengths to emphasize the importance of structuring a future farm program that will emphasize achieving new markets for our farm products.

I believe that one area with enormous market potential is being completely overlooked—the production of ethanol.

The fortunate absense of soaring oil prices—such as those occurring during the oil price shocks of 1973 and 1979—has made many view ethanol production as a thing of the past. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Ethanol production continues to be a growing industry. Alcohol produced in the United States for fuel purposes has exploded from an estimated 10 million gallons in 1978 to 410 million gallons in 1984. Sales of the 10-percent gasohol blend are estimated by industry sources at more than 5 billion gallons last year.

The potential market impact of widespread ethanol consumption is astounding. Over 100 billion gallons of gasoline are used in the United States each year. If you assume a 10-percent ethanol mixture, 4.3 billion bushels of grain would be needed. Considering the fact that total U.S. grain production is on the order of 10 billion bushels annually, the market implications for our farmers are obvious.

The increased prices our farmers could achieve through this type of national ethanol fuels program would make price supports, deficiency payments, acreage reduction programs, and other farm program tools a moot issue. A huge market would be opened to absorb the incredible level of productivity that makes American agriculture a modern-day miracle.

The advantages are as enormous as they are obvious. Farmers could produce for a price, farm suppliers would increase their sales, equipment dealers would be rejuvenated, small businesses would pick up, the health of rural banks would be restored, and the hum of American agriculture and our rural economy would be felt throughout the country.

It is easy—too easy—to get complacent about our national energy security during an oil glut and relatively stable fuel prices. But we all know that this is a temporary phenomenon at best. The transition from nonrenewable energy sources to renewable—such as ethanol—is going to come. The only question is whether or not we will be prepared to deal with it in a manner that will minimize the degree of disruption that will otherwise ensue.

During future congressional deliberations on the issue of market orientation, I urge my colleagues to keep in mind the need to further encourage and develop a domestic industry that

may offer our farmers the greatest market potential of all—ethanol.●

AMERICAN DOLLARS?

HON. DOUGLAS APPLEGATE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, while we continue to witness examples day in and day out of the steady erosion of America's foreign trade balance, what with American workers and American companies losing out to foreign imports, it now appears that our own Federal Government has finally decided to throw in the towel and will now give their business to foreign enterprises instead of to American firms.

I have recently been informed that the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, a division of the U.S. Department of the Treasury, has awarded a contract for $8 million to a firm located in Switzerland for printing equipment to be used in the production of American currency. I feel this recent disclosure that our own Government wishes to utilize equipment made outside of this country so as to print American dollars is the ultimate betrayal by this administration of American workers and American companies. The serious nature of America's trade imbalance problem should not be belittled and minimized by an administration that blatantly overlooks American firms when it comes to reviewing bids submitted to our Government. If we are to ever realize an America with full employment and strong and vital enterprises, then the time has come to correct the policy that our own Government has regarding contracts for goods and services.●

JEANNE SLIFKA HONORED FOR HER WORK

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, May 3, 1985, a fine and gracious community servant, Mrs. Jeanne Slifka, is being honored by her friends and the community of Bayonne, NJ.

Jeanne Slifka has recently retired after 13 years service as executive director of the Bayonne Chapter of the American Red Cross.

As a former member of the National Board of Trustees of the National Red Cross, I can attest to the efficiency and dedication of Jeanne Slifka, and esprit de corps she has developed within all those she has touched, and for her compassionate delivery of home service needs.

Jeanne became executive director of the American Red Cross, Bayonne Chapter, after 7 years of volunteer service, including membership on its Board of Directors. She became involved with the Red Cross through Vincent Burke, chairperson of the American Red Cross.

Jeanne has been a civic leader in working for local volunteer groups and charitable organizations since 1946. Her role as an activist on behalf of such causes includes service as president of the Bayonne Hospital Volunteers for 2 years, and chairman of pediatrics, and appointment to the Juvenile Conference Committee.

Jeanne was instrumental in reactivating Mount Carmel Guild of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church, together with the former Pastor, Rev. Ted Zaorski, she became its first president and remained as such for the first 7 years.

She has also served in an advisory capacity to the Executive Board of Mount Carmel Guild in Newark, which assists the handicapped and underprivileged; the Executive Board of St. Dominic Academy, Jersey City, and on the nominating committee of the Pavonia Girl Scout Council.

Jeanne has also served on the Board of Directors of the Conference of Christians and Jews.

For all of her hours of dedicated service, Jeanne is proud of the following awards: American National Red Cross, New Jersey Blood Services, United Way of Hudson County, Bayonne Boy Scout Council and Mount Carmel Guild.

In 1972 Jeanne was selected a "Woman of Achievement" by the Jersey Journal.

On May 1, at St. Andrew's Hall, Bayonne, Jeanne will receive the first annual Civic Achievement Award of the "Irelands' 32," as announced by Leo Hurley, president of the group. The Awards Committee felt that her longstanding record of achievement in the community clearly stamped her as an individual deserving of recognition as this year's achiever.

Jeanne is also a member of the Polish American Woman's Auxiliary and has served as its vice president.

Jeanne Slifka, the former Jeanne Sweeney, is a graduate of Holy Family Academy, a lifelong Bayonne resident whose family has been part of the city for three generations. She lives with her husband, Edward, and is the mother of two daughters.

Jeanne "makes a difference" as indicated in an article written about her in the Jersey Journal, which I would like to quote from:

> Her unique ability to recruit workers has resulted in an increase of volunteers—from 7 to nearly 100 in the last 7 years.
>
> The Bayonne Red Cross is partially funded by the United Way of Hudson County and the National Red Cross, but when more money is needed, Mrs. Slifka is one of the first people to start a drive.
>
> These additional funds raised by activities sponsored by Mrs. Slifka have greatly kept the chapter running.
>
> Expanding the number of blood banks within the city from 3 to 14 is another of Mrs. Slifka's projects.
>
> In addition to offering safety, swimming, First Aid and other courses, the Red Cross is a referral service. I come here every morning and never know what to expect, the executive director said.
>
> Perhaps a message she composed to a local organization best describes her attitude towards her role in the community:
>
> If every task is performed in His [God's] name, it no longer becomes a task—it is a labor of love.

Jeanne certainly lives up to her message, as her friends can attest. They are paying tribute to her with the dinner in her honor chaired by James P. Sweeney, assisted by Patrick F.X. Nilan, president of the United Way of Hudson County, who will introduce the guest of honor.

Bayonne Mayor Dennis P. Collins will be a speaker, joined by others who will tell the story of Jeanne Slifka's life and her great tributes not only to the people of Bayonne but throughout the area.

Jeanne Slifka has reiterated the words of David Grayson:

> To be needed in other human lives—is there anything greater or more beautiful in this world.

Jeanne leaves the Bayonne Chapter of the American Red Cross held in high esteem. The community has had its share of problems, especially dealing with fire victims, in addition to the problems of many servicemen at the Bayonne military base, and the growing older American population and that of the handicapped.

Jeanne Slifka has accepted the challenge of community service with competence and courage. In the few instances where perhaps the desired result could not be obtained, Jeanne gave a message of hope to those in need, reminding them that "everything is done in the world by hope, which urges us on telling us tomorrow will be better."

She echoes the words of Von Knebel who said:

> Hope awakens courage. He who can implant courage in the human soul is the best physician.

Jeanne tells us that she and Ed are planning retirement and will "take it easy." Many who know of her ebullient personality question that statement. However, if she does choose this route, she will be well deserving.

Oscar Wilde wrote:

> "Contentment lies not in the enjoyment of ease—
> a life of luxury—
> but comes only to him that labors and overcomes—
> to him that performs the task in hand and reaps
> the satisfaction of work well done."

If I could describe Jeanne Slifka by repeating the words of a great author, I would choose those of John Burroughs, as follows:

I AM CONTENT

The longer I live the more my mind dwells upon the beauty and wonder of the world * * *

I have loved the feel of the grass under my feet, and the sound of the running streams by my side. The hum of the wind in the tree-tops has always been good music to me, and the face of the fields has often comforted me more than the faces of men.

I am in love with this world; by my constitution I have nestled lovingly in it. It has been home. It has been my point of outlook into the universe. I have not bruised myself against it, nor tried to use it ignobly.

I have tilled its soul. I have gathered its harvests, I have waited upon its seasons, and always have I reaped what I have sown.

While delved I did not lose sight of the sky overhead. While I gathered its bread and meat for my body, I did not neglect to gather its bread and meat for my soul.

I have climbed its mountains, roamed its forests, sailed its waters, crossed its deserts, felt the sting of its frosts, the oppression of its heats, the drench of its rains, and the fury of its winds, and always have beauty and joy waited upon my goings and comings.

I am certain that my colleagues here in the House of Representatives wish to join me today in this well-deserved tribute to Jeanne Slifka, servant of God—servant of mankind.●

1985 AAA SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL LIFESAVING MEDAL RECIPIENTS

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in May, the American Automobile Association whose national headquarters is located in the 10th District of Virginia, is presenting five young people the highest award given to members of school safety patrols throughout the United States, the AAA School Safety Patrol Lifesaving Medal.

The lifesaving medal program was initiated in 1949 by the American Automobile Association to recognize and honor selected school patrol members for their heroic lifesaving contribution to their communities.

Since its inception, there have been more than 270 boys and girls from 28 States and the District of Columbia who have been honored with the lifesaving medal.

An award review board composed of representatives from active national organizations in the fields of education, law enforcement, and safety selects deserving medal recipients from those candidates who have been officially nominated for consideration.

The 1985 recipients of the AAA School Safety Patrol Lifesaving Medal are:

Shelby L. Butler, 11, Pershing School, St. Joseph, Missouri; Mark Gilbert, 12, Nathan Davis School, Chicago, Illinois; Shane M. Swiger, 11, Harden Elementary School, Salem, West Virginia; Randolph Wilson, 10, David Weir School, Fairfield, California; and Garth D. Yohn, 11, Stiegel Elementary School, Manheim, Pennsylvania.●

TEHACHAPI BREAKS GROUND ON FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT

HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1985, the community of Tehachapi in my district marked a long-awaited occasion when ground was finally broken on a flood control project to protect homes, farms, and businesses in this beautiful mountain valley.

The Tehachapi watershed project, when it is completed, will protect more than 3,000 acres of farmland as well as the city of Tehachapi, and it will improve land and water management throughout the watershed while reducing soil erosion.

On April 27, ground was broken at the Antelope Dam site, and a number of local agencies and individuals worked for many years to make this day possible. The Tehachapi Resource Conservation District, Tehachapi-Commings Water District, city of Tehachapi, and Kern County Water Agency have all put forth a sustained effort to make the Tehachapi watershed project a reality.

For more than 25 years, from the very first feasibility study in 1959, the vision and perseverance of men such as Fred Patterson, Bob Jasper, Karl Backes, Darrell Sorenson, and Stuart Pyle has moved this project forward, inch by inch, through 9 Presidential administrations and 14 Congresses, to the groundbreaking at Antelope Dam.

The current president of the Tehachapi Resource Conservation District, Ernest Schaefer, succeeds the district's first president, J.C. Jacobsen, by nearly 40 years. It has been a long time coming, but I am pleased to tell my colleagues that the commendable efforts of everyone involved have gotten the Tehachapi watershed project underway.

April 27, 1985, is a historic day for Tehachapi. Through the partnership of the local community with the USDA Soil Conservation Service and U.S. Forest Service, Tehachapi will soon have the flood protection it has sought for decades. This partnership of Federal and local governments will yield benefits for many years to come.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN E. GROTBERG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. GROTBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was not present and voting during several instances last week. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following way:

On Wednesday, April 24: Rollcall No. 65, "nay."

On Thursday, April 25: Rollcall No. 70, "nay"; rollcall No. 71, "yea"; rollcall No. 72, "yea"; rollcall No. 73, "nay"; rollcall No. 74, "nay"; and rollcall No. 75, "nay."●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM C. LYNCH

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. William C. Lynch. On March 29, 1985, Bill Lynch officially retired from his position as the Sacramento County Assessor after almost three decades of devoted public service. He will be sorely missed.

Bill Lynch first began working in the assessor's office in 1957. He was elected to the position of Sacramento County Assessor in 1970. Bill has handled and managed the integral and sometimes delicate duties of county assessor with integrity and great distinction.

Health considerations have played a major part in Bill's decision to leave the work he enjoys so much. I know that the entire Sacramento community joins with me in wishing Bill a long and enjoyable retirement.●

GALE BARTOW

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished educator, Dr. Gale Bartow, who, for the last 14 years, has served as superintendent of the Blue Springs School District and is a past president of the American Association of School Administrators. Dr. Bartow is retiring after a long and distinguished career in education.

Gale Bartow has come to personify the phrase, excellence in education. He administered the R-4 school district, recognized as one of the most respected in the country, and continued to strive for excellence as president of the AASA. His devotion to quality education for Missourians, and Americans,

is as heroic an act as performed on any battlefield. As one who believes that education is vital to our national security, I am comforted knowing that educators like Dr. Bartow have played an important part in our educational system.

I know American education will miss Dr. Bartow's leadership. However, I am sure that in retirement he will continue to remain active in the education of our Nation's youth. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Dr. Gale Bartow a happy retirement and extending to him congratulations on a job very well done. We thank you, sir.●

CH2M HILL RECEIVES AWARD

HON. RON WYDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to share with my colleagues news of a recent Government award bestowed upon CH2M Hill, Inc., a consulting engineering firm whose headquarters are in Oregon.

CH2M Hill, the seventh largest consulting engineering firm in the Nation, was presented the second annual EPA Administrator's Award for "Outstanding Prime Contractor Achievement" on November 26, 1984. For the second consecutive year CH2M Hill's commitment to involving small-, minority-, and women-owned businesses as subcontractors in EPA-funded work has earned it this recognition.

EPA contracted with CH2M Hill several years ago to manage the Superfund Program dealing with hazardous waste sites in the 29 Western States and territories. Since then, CH2M Hill has successfully sought and obtained the participation of disadvantaged business enterprises, including those run by women and minorities, in its work.

All Americans benefit when groups historically excluded from the business cycle are afforded a greater opportunity to participate. It is through the good work of companies like CH2M Hill that these opportunities are being created.

This is a special award, one which I think CH2M Hill, Inc., should be proud of, and therefore be congratulated.●

IN HONOR OF GREGORY PEKICH

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Congress to a very special person. On May 1, Gregory Pekich, a constituent of mine, will be favored by the National Association of Letter Carriers with that organization's National Hero of the Year Award.

Mr. Pekich risked his life in an attempt to rescue a victim from a submerged automobile which had slid into the Monongahela River during a snowstorm. He was driving by the scene, saw that a car had skidded off the freeway and down a 50-foot embankment into the freezing river. He jumped chest deep into the water and, with the help of another passerby, attempted to release the victim from the car. Tragically, the car door and the seatbelt proved to be insurmountable, and the automobile slipped into the river and sank.

The Letter Carriers National Hero of the Year Award is recognition well deserved. On behalf of those we represent, I want to express our appreciation and respect to him for his courageous effort.●

A TRIBUTE TO THE KIWANIS CLUB OF ARCHER ROAD

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise before my colleagues to call attention to an outstanding community service organization in the Fifth Congressional District of Illinois, the Kiwanis Club of Archer Road, which will soon be celebrating its 50th anniversary.

Since its inception in May 1935, the Kiwanis Club of Archer Road has been serving the Brighton Park, McKinley Park, and Archer Heights communities of Chicago. The work of this small but dedicated group of men has greatly benefited the entire community. Kiwanians, past and present, have given generously of their time and talents to perform hundreds of youth related activities and raise thousands of dollars.

Some of the many projects of the Archer Road Kiwanis Club include: college scholarships to local high school graduates; an annual awards luncheon for the outstanding graduates of local public and parochial elementary schools; funding of local high school area Key Clubs; collecting and distributing canned goods to local families in need; annually sending 50 local children to the Shrine Circus; purchasing band uniforms and equipment for local high school bands; annually supporting the Kiwanis Plymouth Camp for Crippled Children and constructing a new dormitory at the camp; and raising and donating over $10,000 to Spastic Paralysis Research at a local children's hospital.

The success of the club's activities can be attributed to the fine leadership and guidance of its many presidents. From Walter Wolf, the first president, to John Thompson, the current president, the benefit of the club's 50 years of community service is clearly documented in the many awards bestowed on it by the Kiwanis Illinois-Eastern Iowa District and by Kiwanis International.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues will join with me and the residents of the Fifth Congressional District in paying tribute to the Kiwanis Club of Archer Road and thanking them for their outstanding work.●

SMALL BUSINESS INVENTORY SIMPLIFICATION

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to correct a serious tax problem facing many small businesses as a result of a U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Thor Power Tool Co.* v. *Commission,* 439 U.S. 522 (1979). The Court held, in essence, that if a taxpayer continues to hold excess or obsolete inventory in case a customer may need it in the future in order to keep an old piece of machinery operating, for example, then the business man or woman must value that inventory for tax purposes at its cost to him or her or at its sales price, whichever is lower.

I do not argue with the Court's decision in Thor Power Tool because the Court was just enforcing the law. But the law is flawed in that it does not reflect the reality of actual business practice.

Consider the manufacturer or dealer who stocks many parts, rather than selling them for salvage, in order to better serve customers. After a length of time, the odds that someone will buy a part from this stock of obsolete inventory are remote. However, if this business person does not maintain this stock of old parts, a customer might be forced to dispose of a perfectly good piece of equipment because the necessary part is no longer obtainable.

Now, it is clear that a stock of outdated parts is not worth its initial cost to the dealer. But, under current law, a dealer is not allowed to devalue his her or outdated items in accordance with actual business experience.

The bill I am introducing today attempts to correct this situation. It allows for a writedown of obsolete inventory. It will also help to prevent abuses by eliminating the potential for fluctuating inventory deductions for tax purposes.

For years beginning after December 31, 1984, a small business, which is defined as any domestic trade or business with equity capital of $25 million or less, could elect to writeoff its excess or obsolete inventory in a prescribed, balanced manner. After an item has been in inventory for 4 years, it is completely writtenoff for tax purposes. The writeoff would not begin until the second year after the item is purchased. Thus, The deduction will be taken in equal installments in the second, third, and fourth years.

Enactment of this bill will help to achieve some measure of tax equity and simplification for our small businesses at a time when they can truly use some relief under our tax laws.●

ON U.S. POLICY TOWARD NICARAGUA

HON. JAMES M. JEFFORDS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, during 14 hours of difficult debate, the House recently acted upon the administration's request for aid to the Contras. A strong message was sent to the President declaring that Congress and the American people feel the Contras should not be the main instrument of U.S. policy in the region.

There is some concern that by rejecting at this time both military and humanitarian aid to the rebels, we have pulled the rug out from under the administration's position and thus prevented our Government from dealing from a position of strength. I would argue that this certainly is not the case. This series of votes forcefully demonstrates the necessity of forging a constructive and successful policy with regard to Nicaragua and all of Central America.

It is unrealistic to expect the administration to immediately turn away from its primary instrument of Nicaraguan policy. Nor is it in the best interest of stability in the region for us to ignore the Contras from here on. Therefore, it is imperative that we devise a policy which effects a shift in emphasis from military support of the Contras to responsible concern for the problems facing Honduras and Costa Rica in providing for the refugees and preventing erosion of their own domestic stability.

Our first instrument of foreign policy toward Nicaragua must not be military intervention. We have several, more constructive, alternatives in our arsenal. These include trade concessions, health assistance, agricultural development, Peace Corp programs and support for the democratic opposition within Nicaragua. By not supporting the Contras militarily, we will also be in a better position to coordinate trade sanctions or other means of pressure on the Sandinistas with our European allies, as the European refusal to cooperate with us in the past has been based primarily on their objection to our Nicaraguan policy.

There is considerable reason to believe that Nicaragua will respond to these types of incentives or sanctions. We have traditionally been Nicaragua's primary trading partner, and their economy remains heavily dependent upon foreign trade. The Sandinistas have long indicated their eagerness to increase trade with the United States.

While the Soviet-Cuban connection is clearly an operative force in Nicaragua, there are increasing signs that the Soviet Union is not particularly anxious to become involved in substantial economic commitments to Nicaragua. Cuba and the U.S.S.R. have obviously had some disagreements of late on the nature of their partnership and the extent of Soviet financing to be provided for Cuban endeavors in the Western Hemisphere. The refusal by Castro to attend Chernenko's funeral is symptomatic of less than harmonious relations between the two nations. This provides us with the opportunity to use the promise of improved trade relations and the threat of Western trade sanctions to induce the Sandinistas to live up to their promises of pluralism, personal freedoms and neutrality in regional conflicts.

Diplomatic channels provide numerous opportunities for bringing both pressures and incentives to bear on the Sandinistas. The threat of diplomatic isolation by not only the United States but also the countries of Latin America and Europe would be of great concern to the Nicaraguan Government. Turning to incentives, we are in a very strong position to further the peace process and initiatives of the Contadora group by working for a cease fire in the region. We could then insist that the Sandinistas live up to their original promise of nonalignment. The Contras should not be cut out of the negotiation process, however, it is unreasonable to demand that the Sandinistas deal exclusively with them. A balanced policy requires several prongs, that is, negotiations to which the Contras are a party and negotiations which deal exclusively with United States-Nicaraguan relations and Contadora concerns. We must not ignore the useful role that multilateral organizations and our European allies can play in furthering this goal.

The recent House actions must not be looked on as a defeat for U.S. policy toward Nicaragua. Rather, it must be seen as creating the opportunity for development of a positive, productive and humane policy toward our troubled southern neighbors.●

A TRIBUTE TO DAVID McCARTHY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to David McCarthy, police chief of the town of Greenfield, MA, who will be honored on May 8, 1985, with the Greenfield Rotary Club's Vocational Service Award.

This award is presented to a member of the Greenfield area community who has, through his or her vocation, promoted and developed public service. Chief McCarthy more than deserves this recognition because of his continuing, unselfish efforts on behalf of the youth of the Greenfield area, and particularly for his role in establishing Greenfield's "After Hours Teen Center."

Chief McCarthy's work, with and for our young people, is indeed inspirational. As an officer of the law, he has seen, first hand, the consequences of neglected and uninspired youth. Because of this, Chief McCarthy has worked hard to creatively challenge and channel this vast and valuable resource.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to represent such a person in Congress, and am extremely pleased to share with you the reasons for his well deserved recognition.●

MRS. LEE GOLDMAN

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me now in honoring Mrs. Lew Goldman for her years of dedicated service to the educational endeavors of her community and of Queens County, NY.

Lee Goldman's distinguished career has earned her great respect throughout the borough. Since 1970, she has served as a member of Community School Board 26, in northeast Queens. In 1975, she was voted vice president of the board, and subsequently was elected president for two successive terms.

During the years that Mrs. Goldman devoted her efforts to these offices, she continued her involvement in other commendable activities. Lee Goldman is greatly admired for her consistent concern with a wide scope of community affairs. The long list of civic organizations that have benefited

from her wisdom and experience include the Oakland Terrace Civic Association, the Queensborough Library Council, the National Library Week Committee, and the Girl Scout Maple Leaf District.

Despite her dedicated service to these important organizations, Lee Goldman always found time for her devotion to the children, parents, and teachers of District 26. She has chaired the school board's drug abuse education committee, and its capital budget committee, and has served as representative to the consultative council of the central board of education.

For her unstinting service to the community, Lee Goldman has been presented with the Builder of Brotherhood Award from the National Conference of Christians, and Jews, the Community Service Award from Benjamin Cardozo High School, and the 10 Years of Service Award from the New York City Board of Education.

On May 1, Mrs. Goldman will be honored by Community School Board 26 with a special gala testimonial dinner. I ask all my colleagues in the U.S. House of Repesentatives to join me now in honoring Lee Goldman, a woman of extraordinary achievement, and in congratulating her of enriching the schools, the students and the entire community of Queens County.●

PAYING TRIBUTE TO ROBERT MANDERA

HON. DOUG WALGREN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. WALGREN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to call a very special person to the attention of the Congress. Robert Mandera, a citizen from my district, has worked tirelessly on behalf of the American Diabetes Association. On May 1, Mr. Mandera will be honored by the National Association of Letter Carriers and presented with that organization's National Humanitarian Award.

Mr. Mandera has a very personal interest in those with diabetes. His 13-year-old daughter is a diabetic. Each year for the past 7 years, he has spent one weekend conducting his own walkathon, walking from Erie to Pittsburgh—approximately 100 miles—to raise funds for the American Diabetes Association. He alone, through these personal walkathons, has raised over $30,000 for the cause of diabetics.

On behalf of all my constituents, I want to pay tribute to Mr. Mandera's contribution to a very special cause, and say thank you to him for his inspiration and effort to make a difference in the lives of many.●

THE FUROR IS OVER

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, the furor is over. Ms. Eileen Gardner has resigned her position as Education Assistant in charge of the Office of Education Philosophy and Practice. Yet, we must not so quickly dismiss the significance of her views or the fact of her appointment.

Given Ms. Gardner's statement that the handicapped are responsible for their life situation, I think we should consider the dangers of applying 15th-century beliefs to 20th-century problems.

Should we appoint to the Office of Surgeon General an individual who believes in bloodletting for the cure of disease? Should we look to someone who believes the Earth is flat to head the National Science Foundation? In place of our judicial system, should we revert to a system whereby we submerge the accused in water and, if they drown, declare them guilty?

Ms. Gardner's statements clearly imposed an obsolete philosophy on today's education issues. To our credit, the American people would not stand for it.●

A TRIBUTE TO MAJ. JOHN MERIWEATHER

HON. CHARLES WILSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there are some who say age is its own reward. Maj. John Meriweather, however, has never been one to stand still waiting to accept the rewards of age. At 89 young and vital years, he is still working full time as an energetic, productive member of the executive staff of Timberland Savings & Loan in Nacogdoches, TX.

This past weekend I joined many of the major's neighbors and coworkers in honoring him with a tribute to his unflagging contributions in time, inspiration and effort to job and community. The history of these contributions spans at least 70 years—more than a lifetime for many of us.

John Meriweather is a veteran of World War I, where he served in France as an infantry soldier, and of World War II where he achieved his rank of major. After retiring from a sales position with the International Shoe Co. at age 65, the major worked for 18 years at Stone Fort National Bank in Nacogdoches. Retirement from that position brought him to his current post as senior vice president and public relations and investment officer at Timerland Savings & Loan.

During these many years, he also found time to head the local Chamber of Commerce, marry and raise a family and, sadly, take care of both an invalid wife and daughter as only a devoted husband and father can.

It goes without saying that this is a man worthy of our respect. He has weathered the horrors of two wars, both the sadness and joys of life and the technological reshaping of his world. Yet after nearly nine decades he continues to meet each day looking forward to new challenges.●

A SALUTE TO NIH

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring my colleagues' attention to an important event that will be taking place in January 1986 in my district of Montgomery County, MD. That is, a "Salute to the National Institutes of Health," sponored by the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation.

The timing of this event is most appropriate as NIH approaches its 100th birthday in 1987, as is the theme of the salute—"Bethesda, the Healing Well"—blending the concept of the biblical healing well with the location of NIH itself. This will serve to emphasize the striking advances in health care, including innumerable new insights into human disease, for which NIH has been responsible in their laboratories and clinics in Bethesda, MD.

Dr. Lewis Thomas, president emeritus of the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, stated in a recent reference to the National Institutes of Health:

> As social inventions for human betterments go, this one is standing proof that, at least once in awhile, Government possesses the capacity to do something unique, imaginative, useful and altogether right * * *. It has, in short, been a success story from start to finish, although the finish is, I trust, nowhere near. The NIH laboratories are something for the Government to boast about, to dine out on, and to be immensely proud of. It is my hope that the same intelligence and good taste will be displayed for the institution's future as were used to build the magnificent instrument now at hand.

As the Federal agency entrusted with the development and progress of research in the biomedical sciences, NIH has enjoyed the consistent support of Congress. I am sure that we can wholeheartedly agree with Dr. Lewis' sentiments as we celebrate this outstanding achievement.●

THE FRUIT AND FLOWER CHILD CARE CENTER

HON. LES AuCOIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the anniversary of a child center in my district which, for the past 100 years, has given a number of children in Oregon an opportunity and positive environment for growth, socially, emotionally, physically, and intellectually. The Fruit and Flower Child Care Center celebrates its anniversary today, April 29, with an alumni organization of more than 10,000 students.

One of the many events which will take place during the anniversary celebration stems back to the origination of the center—in 1885, a group of eight girls began delivering baskets of fruits and flowers to shut-ins and patients in area hospitals. In 1906, the mission began the child care center in response to the growing need for child care, due to the increasing number of women entering the work force. This week, again children will uphold the tradition of visiting local nursing homes with gifts of fruits and flowers just as their founders did 100 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Fruit and Flower Child Care Center for their dedication to creating a safe, nuturing, and educational environment for so many children in Oregon for the past 100 years. I hope that the valuable services they provide to the families and communities of Oregon will continue.●

SBA—A SUCCESS

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, in our current national debate over President Reagan's proposal to kill the Small Business Administration, the voices of America's small business people too often are not heard over the argumentative din among bureaucrats, partisan spokesmen, and representatives of various interest groups.

The Des Moines Register recently printed a meaningful letter from a successful and respected Iowa businessman, John Dodgen, president of Dodgen Industries in Humboldt, IA. Mr. Dodgen's experience provides us with a valuable lesson, and I am pleased to recommend a portion of his letter to my colleagues for their consideration:

These comments are in response to Mr. David Stockman's statement in the Senate Small Business Committee, wherein he said: "The SBA should be abolished. Why should the government subsidize one small business at the expense and in competition with another businessman who has saved his money and invested at his own risk?"

In my opinion, Mr. Stockman's desire to reduce the budget either won't allow him to understand the role that SBA has played in developing and nurturing the small-business enterprise in America, or his biases and views are so perverted that he doesn't want to trouble himself to investigate the absolutely super role SBA has performed in providing the otherwise unavailable seed capital that has literally been the salvation of small business in America and the stimulation of untold millions of jobs which would not be here today without SBA.

In my own company's case, there would be 60 families out of work in Humboldt, without SBA.

As a small businessman, this is the most regrettable letter I ever felt (obliged) to write concerning a government official.●

RECEIVES GOLDEN JUBILEE AWARD

HON. TONY COELHO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, Sir, at this time I would like to take a moment to recognize one of my more outstanding constituents. In recognition of his 50 years of service to the trucking industry, Opie Wallace was presented with the Golden Jubilee Award by the California Trucking Association at its 1985 annual convention.

This gentleman arrived in Chowchilla, CA in 1935. He took a job hauling sack grain at $2 a day. Ten years later he had saved $5,000 and purchased a truck and trailer, founding Wallace Trucking. Today, Wallace Transport is one of the largest carriers of agricultural products and groceries in the State of California. The success of this company can be directly traced to the hard work and dedication of its founder, Opie Wallace.

Mr. Wallace has devoted a considerable amount of his time to a variety of civic activities and has worked extensively with trade associations involved with the trucking industry. He is a longstanding member of the California Trucking Association, and served as its president in 1979.

I hope you will join with me in congratulating Mr. Wallace on this well deserved award. He is a man who has earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues, and who deserves ours as well. Opie, I thank you for all your efforts on behalf of the trucking industry.●

HONORING THE BISHOP McCORT BASKETBALL BANDWAGON

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, we have seen many examples in recent years of communities pulled together by the dynamic success of sports teams.

We had such an event recently in Johnstown as both the boys and girls basketball teams at Bishop McCort High School pursued State championships.

The boys team, led by Coach Tim Koshute, compiled an overall 25 to 5 record. They won the UPJ Mountain Cats Tournament, the West Central League, the District VI Class AA Championship, and were State finalists in the PIAA Class AA Championship.

The girls team led by Coach Rob Eckenrod, compiled a 27 to 3 record, including winning the Windber Athletic Boosters Association Tournament, the Steel City/Crusher Classic Tournament, and were District VI Class AA Champions, and PIAA Class AA State Champions.

What is most important is that from knowing many of these families of these young athletes and many of the youngsters themselves, that through this experience they helped to shape the character, dedication, and hard-working attitude that will translate into success for them not only in athletics, but in the classroom and in their working careers and family development.

I extend my best wishes to all the team members, support staff, and coaches, and thank them for the thrill they gave to our community. It is an experience we will all remember.●

BANQUET MARKING REV. FRANCIS A. DOBRYDNIO'S RETIREMENT

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to your attention the contributions of an active and valued member of the Hazleton, PA, area. Rev. Francis A. Dobrydnio is stepping down as pastor of St. Stanislaus Church in Hazleton after a long career of service to his church and the community. He will be succeeded by Rev. Thomas D. Skotek, who is currently pastor at St. Casimir's Church in Freeland, PA.

Reverend Dobrydnio was ordained in 1943 and had served as an assistant pastor at Most Precious Blood Roman Catholic Church in Hazleton before coming to St. Stan's. As you may recall, Father Dobrydnio also recently returned from Calcutta, India where he spent 5 days with Nobel Peace Prize winner, Mother Teresa. I had the pleasure of bringing his trip to your attention here in the House just a few weeks ago.

Francis A. Dobrydnio was honored at a special banquet last week. His contributions to the parish and the community have earned him the well-deserved appreciation and affection of all who know him. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this fine gentleman to your attention once again.●

TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS X. BATTERSBY

HON. RAYMOND J. McGRATH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize Mr. Francis X. Battersby, a distinguished public servant.

On the evening of May 3, 1985, Walter Ruina, president of the H.H. Arnold chapter of the Air Force Association, named Francis X. Battersby as their man of the year. The chapter chose to honor Frank as an individual that has spent his life fulfilling the spirit of President John F. Kennedy's request for Americans to "Ask not what your country can do for you, but, rather, what you can do for your country."

Frank began his career of service in 1939 when he joined the Sperry Gyroscope Co. He then moved into Government service as both a member of the military and as a high ranking civilian employee of NASA. During the past 25 years Frank has been a driving force within the Air Force Association. He has been a leader in promoting the association's objectives to insure that the public is informed as to the objectives and problems of the Air Force and our country.

The chapter on that gala evening said to Francis X. Battersby, "well done."●

KEEPING DEFICIT REDUCTION THE TOP PRIORITY

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent essay by our former colleague, Barber Conable. Writing in the April 29, 1985, issue of "U.S. News and World Report," Barber hits the deficit problem nail squarely on its head. His article is especially timely in view of the President's national address last week on the same topic.

As Barber points out, "It's hard to get good government with a bad budget plan," and he also argues that we should not permit tax reform to distract us from the most important task—cutting the deficit—even if the dirty work of deficit reduction "involves unnecessarily painful decisions."

The essay follows:

THE NEW BREED VS. THE PURITANS

(By Barber Conable)

Do deficits make a difference?

There's a new breed of politicans who say they don't—that you can have it all and not pay for it. Don't suffer, they say; just vote for tax cuts, new programs, more of everything for everybody, and enjoy the satisfaction of knowing you're doing the right thing. Growth is joy, and the avenue to growth is to use every tool of Government to stimulate the economy.

Until now, the problem has been America's Puritan heritage—that dour, unhappy feeling that goes with having to exercise restraint for fear of the hangover. Politicans of this tradition see a downside of gloom and pain when they could be focusing on a rosy future.

Is the new breed of politicians exercising the power of positive thinking, or are they living in a fool's paradise?

We've come to the time of year when we should be considering how to pay for our own governance rather than sending the bill to our grandchildren. Among the oldtimers, budgeting is the real stuff of Government in that it requires setting priorities and making a serious effort to get program spending and tax revenue into the same monetary ballpark.

The Senate Budget Committee, after a good deal of anguish and some unpopular decisions, has worked out a compromise with the President that is at least $52 billion closer to that ballpark, and it is to be complimented for its effort. The House Budget Committee can be expected to react to some of the things the Senate Budget Committee suggests, but in a bicameral legislature each house is entitled to seek its own formula. Even in the Senate a lot remains to be done, and a certain amount of disorderliness will occur on the Senate floor as next year's candidates try to back away from some of the toughest budget decisions. Expect interest groups to be active—and who can blame them?—as they fight for their share of the budget pie. If any one of them gets a bigger piece, somebody else, now or later, is going to pay for it by receiving less.

That's what it's all about, tradeoffs. If people are more productive, the pie may grow, but there are limits to growth. Low taxes don't guarantee growth if the Government is borrowing so much of the American people's (and the foreigners') savings that high interest rates become a restraining factor. And if the dollar is losing value because the Government is printing the money rather than borrowing it, thus taking savings indirectly, the nominal resulting growth is really cancerous.

You have to pay for what you get; it's as simple as that. And hope that what you're paying for isn't snake oil. Tough decisions have to be made at times other than budget season, but it's hard to get good government with a bad budget plan. So those who believe in representative government should be giving Congress their undivided attention now for maximum effect.

Unfortunately, tax reform is being used as a distraction by those who believe budgeting involves unnecessarily painful decisions. Taxes are important, too, but the ultimate burdens on the people are determined more by what we spend than by how we tax. Unless you have a confiscatory tax system (we don't) you normally can't raise more money by reducing taxes. Already, some people are saying we shouldn't get hung up on "static revenue neutrality" in designing the new tax plan, which is a cute way of saying we should cut taxes further to stimulate the economy. How can you have a more stimulative budget policy than to borrow almost a quarter of what you spend, which is what we're doing, and that at a time of relative prosperity?

It may appear unpleasant or puritanical, but most of the real decisions of Government are tough ones. True growth usually results from a willingness to defer some degree of current pleasure and to invest the savings from the deferral in a better future. If this sounds simplistic, at least it's not as dangerous as eating the seed corn.●

IN HONOR OF THE SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF HIGHLAND TOWNSHIP, MI

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to recognize Michigan's Highland Township, which is proudly celebrating its 150th anniversary this year. As Highland's representative in Congress, it is an honor for me to officially record Highland's sesquicentennial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

At the time of its founding in 1835, Highland was so named because it was thought to be the highest land in the settled part of Michigan. The township was organized by an act of the territorial legislature on March 17, 1835.

One of the first buildings in Highland Township was the school, built the same year as the town was founded, a symbol of the historic dedication of Michigan's people to education. Soon after, several churches were organized to satisfy the spiritual and social needs of the early Highland citizens. These citizens were quite civic minded: one action they took at their first township meeting was to raise $25 for the support of the poor during the current year.

In 1871, the Pere Marquette Railway was complete and brought an impetus to trade to the villages of Highland

and Clyde. The small villages had schools, stores, and post offices. Highland also had a grain warehouse and a pickle factory. Clyde offered a lumber yard, offices for Western Union and the American Express Co.

By 1950, Highland Township consisted of four hamlet-type communities: Highland, East Highland, West Highland, and Clyde. The population had grown to about 4,000 and farming was no longer the principal way of life. It had become a rural suburban area, with only a handful farmers and a few small industries.

As the 1960's and 1970's arrived. Highland became more and more attractive to newcomers seeking a country setting near more urbanized areas. The population more than doubled, increasing to 13,476 in 1976, and 16,958 in the 1980's. It is expected that Highland's population may exceed 25,000 by the year 2000.

It is an honor for me to recognize the people of Highland Township, who continue to enjoy and preserve small-town and rural life today, just as fellow township residents did before them. Highland's people have worked hard to make their sesquicentennial a yaer to remember and cherish. I am happy to join them in marking this anniversary, and in looking back over their history as a township. They share in a rich heritage of the thriving towns and villages all across America, where much has grown and changed, but much has remained the same.●

HONORING THE MEMORY OF UNION MEMBER MIKE QUEVEDO

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 29, 1985

● Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1985 the Laborers' International Union of North America, local 300, will be dedicating their newly acquired building in the memory of Mike Quevedo, Sr. This honor is very fitting for a man whose dedication to the service of working men and women will be long remembered.

Mike Quevedo joined local 300 in 1938 and served as the secretary-treasurer and business manager. His record as a labor leader shows his understanding of the plight of working people and his compassion toward his fellow man.

He is survived by his wife, Josephine and three children, Mike, Jr., Maragret and Ricardo. His son Mike is following in his footsteps by serving as the current business manager for local 300.

Mr. Speaker, the dedication of this new building in honor of Mike Quevedo is a fitting memorial to a man who devoted his life to the service of his fellow laborers. I ask my colleagues to join me in giving our best wishes to the family of Mike Quevedo, Sr., who can be very proud of the contributions of his remarkable man.●

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 Tuesday, April 30, 1985, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 1

9:00 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.
SR-485

*Judiciary
To hold hearings on pending nominations.
SD-226

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

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

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on recent changes in the financial services industry.
SD-538

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Consumer Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
SR-253

Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the Veterans' Administration home loan guaranty program.
SR-418

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to conduct an analysis of agriculture policy options for 1985 farm legislation.
SR-328A

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
Closed briefing on Afghanistan.
S-407, Capitol

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

Armed Services
To hold hearings on the President's Chemical Warfare Review Commission.
SR-222

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider the nominations of Helmut A. Merklein, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, Theodore J. Garrish, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Congressional, Intergovernmental and Public Affairs, J. Michael Farrell, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Energy, and Joseph F. Salgado, of California, to be Under Secretary of Energy, and other pending business; to be followed by hearings on S. 979, to extend the expiration date of titles I and II of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.
SD-366

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to mark up S. 53 and S. 652, bills authorizing funds for programs of the Clean Water Act, and other related measures.
SD-406

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nomination of Vernon A. Walters, of Florida, to be the U.S. Representative to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador, and the U.S. Representative in the Security Council of the United Nations.
SD-419

Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 473, to impose a temporary moratorium on hostile takeovers of domestic petroleum corporations.
SD-226

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, and the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior regarding the White House.
SD-138

Select on Intelligence
Closed business meeting, to resume markup of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence community.
SH-219

Conferees
On H.R. 1869, to repeal the contemporaneous recordkeeping requirements added to the Tax Reform Act of 1984.
H-208, Capitol

MAY 2

9:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Closed briefing on the U.S.-U.S.S.R. arms negotiations on strategic offensive forces.
SR-222

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Nutrition Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for certain child nutrition 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 Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and certain related agencies.
SD-116

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 936, to provide improved protection for investors in the Government securities market, and related measures.
SD-538

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 81, to provide for the appointment of Barnabas McHenry as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, and proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Election Commission.
SR-301

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 aircraft procurement and research, development, technology and engineering.
SD-192

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

Environment and Public Works
Business meeting, to mark up S. 124, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1989 for programs of the Safe Drinking Water Act, including public water systems and protection of underground sources of drinking water.
SD-406

Foreign Relations
To resume hearings on American policy toward South Africa.
SD-419

Judiciary
Business meeting, on pending calendar business.
SD-226

Labor and Human Resources
Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 140, Children's Justice Act.
SD-430

Select on Indian Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up S. 277, authorizing funds through fiscal year 1989 for Indian health care programs.
SD-342

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

Armed Services
Military Construction Subcommittee
To hold hearings on base closures.
SR-222

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Techology, and Space Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the effect of new technologies on industrial competitiveness.
SR-253

MAY 3

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the nominations of Eric Reichl, of Connecticut, Tom Corcoran, of Illinois, and Paul W. MacAvoy, of New York, each to be a member of the Board of Directors of the U.S. Synthetic Fuels Corporation.
SD-366

Finance
International Trade Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 942, to remove trade barriers to U.S. exports of telecommunications equipment and services, and S. 728, to prohibit the entry of Japanese telecommunications products into the United States until Japanese markets are open to U.S. telecommunications goods.
SD-215

Joint Economic
To hold hearings on the employment/unemployment situation for April.
2359 Rayburn Building

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of Douglas A. Riggs, of Alaska, to be General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, to be followed by hearings in conjunction with the National Ocean Policy Study on S. 959, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1986 through 1990 for the Coastal Zone Management Act, and S. 990, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for ocean programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce.
SR-253

MAY 6

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for rail safety programs of the Department of Transportation.
SR-253

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 410, to repeal the Commercial and Apartment Conservation Service.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
*Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Merchant Marine Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 664, to facilitate the competitiveness of exports of U.S. agricultural commodities.
SR-232

2:00 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings in conjunction with the National Ocean Policy Study on S. 958, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for programs of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and S. 991, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1986 and 1987 for fisheries programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
SR-253

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

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on S. 43, to grant line item veto authority to the President on appropriation bills.
SR-301

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 6, S. 875, and S. 876, bills to clarify and improve certain health-care programs and services provided and administered by the Veterans' Administration, and related health legislation affecting veterans.
SR-418

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 Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD-138

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

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the nominations of Marshall B. Babson, of Connecticut, and Wilford W. Johansen, of California, each to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.
SD-430

Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to consider Senate Joint Resolution 81, to provide for the appointment of Barnabas McHenry as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the Federal Election Commission, and other legislative and administrative business.
SR-301

10:00 a.m.
Select on Intelligence
Closed business meeting, to resume markup of proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1986 for the intelligence community.
SH-219

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 Office of Management and Budget, including the Office of Federal Procurement Policy.
SD-124

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

Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up S. 6, S. 875, S. 876, bills to clarify and improve certain health care programs and services provided and administered by the Veterans' Administration, and related proposals, and S. 367, to provide for judicial review of certain administrative decisions of the VA, to codify certain VA adjudication procedures, to improve the VA appeals process, to require the VA to comply with certain rulemaking procedures, and to provide for reasonable fees to attorneys serving as legal counsel for veterans.
SR-418

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 (including the land and water conservation fund), Department of the Interior.
SD-138

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on proposed budget requests for fiscal year 1986 for programs of the Department of Energy, focusing on fusion energy programs.
SD-366

MAY 10

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To continue oversight hearings on proposed budget requests for fiscal year 1986 for programs of the Department of Energy, focusing on conservation and renewable programs.
SD-366

Finance
Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings on health promotion and disease prevention strategies for Medicare beneficiaries.
SD-215

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 366 and S. 534, bills to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and related proposals.
SD-406

MAY 13

10:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking.
SD-419

Judiciary
To hold joint hearings with the Committee on Foreign Relations on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking.
SD-419

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on proposed budget requests for fiscal year 1986 for programs of the Department of Energy, focusing on nuclear energy programs and nuclear waste activities.
SD-366

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

Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on automobile fuel economy standards.
SD-366

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

Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Legislative Branch of the Federal Government.
S-128, Capitol

Foreign Relations
To continue joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking.
SD-419

Judiciary
To continue joint hearings with the Committee on Foreign Relations on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking.
SD-419

10:30 a.m.
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 15

9:30 a.m.
*Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimate for fiscal year 1986 for certain defense programs, focusing on Army modernization.
SD-192

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 related agencies.
SD-116

10:00 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To continue joint hearings with the Committee on the Judiciary on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking.
SD-419

Judiciary
To continue joint hearings with the Committee on Foreign Relations on international terrorism and narcotic trafficking.
SD-419

MAY 16

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SR-253
Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 415, the Handicapped Children's Protection Act.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for fossil energy.
SD-138
Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Legislative Branch of the Federal Government.
S-128, Capitol
Environment and Public Works
Water Resources Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 366 and S. 534, bills to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and related proposals.
SD-406

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings to discuss the Department of Energy's prospective report to Congress on emerging clean-coal technologies.
SD-366

MAY 17

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the deregulation of surface freight forwarders.
SR-253

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

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Legislative Branch Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1986 for the Legislative Branch of the Federal Government.
S-128, Capitol

MAY 22

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

MAY 23

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on efforts to locate missing children.
SD-430

JUNE 4

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulations and Conservation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the impact of imported petroleum products on the domestic petroleum industry.
SD-366

JUNE 6

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Natural Resources Development and Production Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the impact of coal imports on the domestic coal industry.
SD-366

JUNE 10

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Research and Development Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on proposed budget requests for fiscal year 1986 for programs of the Department of Energy, focusing on fossil energy programs.
SD-366

JUNE 11

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Orphan Drug Act (P.L. 97-414), focusing on section 7(b) relating to radiation-cancer liability.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 403, to revise requirements with respect to the issuance of licenses for existing hydroelectric facilities, and S. 426, to provide for more protection to electric consumers.
SD-366

JUNE 12

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To continue oversight hearings on the implementation of the Orphan Drug Act (P.L. 97-414), focusing on section 7(b) relating to radiation-cancer liability.
SD-430

JUNE 18

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the current status of and factors affecting the natural gas market.
SD-366

OCTOBER 1

11:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to review the legislative priorities of the American Legion.
SD-106