HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, June 10, 1985*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

May Your wisdom and protection be with all Your people, gracious God, and may Your guiding hand lead along life's way. Where there is anger, grant understanding; where there is fear, give perfect love; where there is frustration, give patience. We pray, O God, that Your virtues of faith and hope and love will surround us and all people this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 679. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for certain maritime programs for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes.

FACILITIES INITIATIVE

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the seventh, and last, in a series of initiatives which I have been pursuing in an effort to improve the readiness of our Guard and Reserve Forces. I refer to this as the "facilities initiative."

As this Nation continues to place increased reliance on our National Guard and Reserve Forces, we must ensure that adequate facilities are provided. In my opinion, this year's budget request fails to do so. While DOD officials state that there is a backlog of more than $3 billion in National Guard and Reserve construction projects, only 4.1 percent of the total fiscal year 1986 DOD Construction Program will be used to fund Guard and Reserve requirements. Such a percentage is grossly inadequate.

Although I am reluctant to ask for additional funds, I did request that my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee listen seriously to the pleas from the Guard and Reserve communities to provide critically needed relief. They did so, and I am pleased to report that additional funding was included in the military construction authorization bill which will come to the floor for debate in the near future.

One area in which these funds will provide relief involves the growing backlog of minor construction projects within the Army National Guard. These projects include improved firing ranges, additional local training sites, and additional storage facilities for the increase in up-to-date equipment being provided to our Reserve Forces.

The funds will also help eliminate a short fall involving antiquated barracks at naval air stations around the country. Living conditions within these barracks have a definite adverse effect on the job performance of men and women who often drive long distances to perform weekend duty.

Mr. Speaker, although these actions do not nearly address all of the facility needs of our Reserve Forces, I believe they do provide significant relief. While I hope Congress will continue to provide such relief whenever necessary, I also strongly encourage the administration, in future budget requests, to address these needs in a more responsible manner.

APPOINTMENT OF PERSON FROM PRIVATE LIFE AS MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON PUBLIC WORKS IMPROVEMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 104, Public Law 98-501, the Chair appoints as a member of the National Council on Public Works Improvement the following person from private life:

Mr. Peter C. Goldmark, Jr., of New York, NY.

NICARAGUA PERPETRATES ANOTHER CROSS-BORDER INCIDENT

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

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, about the time this past Monday when we were passing a resolution expressing support of Costa Rica's neutrality, Nicaragua was in the process of violating it.

This second cross-border incident in 4 days only serves to reconfirm the Sandinista regime's aggressive intentions. Last Monday, a Costa Rican helicopter flying near the border was fired upon from Nicaragua as it tried to rescue the body of a civil guardsman who had been killed by Nicaraguan soldiers on Friday. Also, on Monday, other Costa Rican civil guardsmen were attacked by Nicaraguan soldiers along the border.

The evidence indicates that Sandinista army soldiers conducted a deliberate and unprovoked attack on a civil guard unit inside Costa Rica resulting in the deaths of two guardsmen and the wounding of nine others. There is no evidence to support the Sandinista claims they were pursuing Contra forces in the area.

The attacks on Costa Rica in the last week following the attack on Honduras last month demonstrate the Sandinistas do pose a military threat to their neighbors. You would think the Sandinistas would have learned something about timing, at least, after Ortega's trip to Moscow. They should at least recognize that provocative acts against their neighbors won't reinforce their case in the Congress as we consider aid to the democratic resistance in Nicaragua.

At Costa Ricas request the OAS has passed a resolution sending a team, including the Secretary General to investigate.

SPYING HAS BECOME AN EPIDEMIC FOR DOLLARS IN OUR SOCIETY

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, according to the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, never before have so many individuals been awaiting trial on espionage charges in the United States. As of today, including the 4 individuals who have been arrested for espionage in the Walker case, there are presently 22 individuals who have been charged with espionage and are either awaiting trial or are on appeal. Spying has become an epidemic for dollars in our society.

In today's Washington Post, Bobby R. Inman, former Deputy Director of the CIA, was interviewed regarding our present crisis in national security due to the increase in instances of spying. Mr. Inman's position is right on the mark. We need to increase the penalty for espionage to life imprison-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ment without parole if the death penalty is not invoked.

H.R. 2697 which I introduced last week accomplishes just that by making the penalty for espionage a true life sentence, one without parole and probation and not subject to suspension.

Traitors need to be physically removed from society never to return. Let's throw away the key.

IMPOSITION OF DEATH PENALTY FOR CERTAIN CAPITAL OFFENSES

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would amend title 18 of the United States Code to establish explicit criteria for the imposition of the death penalty for certain capital offenses.

While the Supreme Court never specifically voided the death penalty, it made abundantly clear in the case of Furman versus Georgia that Congress and the States must explicitly define procedures to be followed in imposing that ultimate penalty.

Many States, including Arizona, acted promptly following that decision, but Congress has never done so. While we have added to Federal statutes crimes covered by the death penalty, we have never enacted the provisions that would make that penalty legal. My bill will correct that glaring inequity. The provisions contained in this bill are, I believe, sufficient to satisfy constitutional requirements for a discretionary capital punishment process.

It is the moral imperative of a just society to express its outrage at crimes so inhumane and heinous that people who commit them forfeit their own right to life. As the Supreme Court stated in the case of Gregg versus Georgia: "The instinct for retribution * * * serves an important purpose in promoting the stability of a free society."

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

PATRICK BUCHANAN: WHITE HOUSE GAFFE DIRECTOR

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan ought to change Patrick Buchanan's title to White House Gaffe Director. He certainly has all the right credentials.

It's obvious why Buchanan is reluctant to talk to the press. It's not that he's shy. It's tough to talk with your foot in your mouth. Some days he gets both feet in.

Recently he is reported to have said that the Reagan tax bill will force women to stay at home. This must be startling news to Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, Prof. Jeane Kirkpatrick, Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole, and HHS Secretary Margaret Heckler, not to mention the more than 50 percent of U.S. families where the female spouse works outside the home.

The point is that increasing the personal exemption is long overdue. I have introduced a bill that increases it to $2,600. It will help small families; it will help large families. It will help families where both spouses work as well as those where one spouse works.

If the resulting increase in family net income means some spouses, male or female, can, by choice, work less—that's fine. If they want to use the extra income to save for their children's education or a family vacation or to hire help in the home, well, that's fine also.

But increasing the personal exemption won't force anyone to do anything.

□ 1210

ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS—50 YEARS OF RECOVERY, UNITY, AND SERVICE

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

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today, at about 9 in the morning, a doctor on his way to surgery was handed a beer to steady his nerves. No, Mr. Speaker, this isn't a story about malpractice. It is a story about recovery.

The physician was the beloved "Dr. Bob," the cofounder of Alcoholics Anonymous. The beer, given to him by a sympathetic New York stockbroker, was the last drink this hopeless alcoholic was ever to take.

Incidentally, Dr. Bob—Bob Smith—performed the operation without a hitch. In all likelihood, his patient didn't know that one of the most significant movements of the 20th century, Alcoholics Anonymous, had just come into being.

The story was a simple one—one alcoholic helping another—and it was to repeat itself over 1 million times over the next 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, the success of this remarkable society in mending the broken lives of so many who have suffered the ravages of alcoholism can only be understood by those who have seen the destruction of this terrible illness and the hope and joy of recovery.

Before concluding, though, I would like to mention the debt of gratitude that AA owes to the late Henrietta Seiberling, the mother of our esteemed colleague from Ohio. In the words of Bill Wilson, AA's other cofounder: "What Alcohlics Anonymous owes to her will always be beyond anybody's reckoning." It was she who brought the New York stockbroker and the Akron physician together.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday's edition of the Washington Post included an exceptional article, by Robert H. Williams, about AA's 50th anniversary, which I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues and insert in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Post, June 9, 1985]

WHEN "DR. BOB" TOOK HIS LAST DRINK, MILLIONS WERE SAVED

(By Robert H. Williams)

"Are you a friend of Bill Wilson?" It's an ordinary enough kind of a question, and it's asked probably a thousand times a day somewhere in the world, and if it doesn't mean anything to you, it is a genial code phrase for at least a million people who know that the late Bill Wilson, also known as Bill W., was one of the co-founders of Alcoholics Anonymous.

The question, innocent enough, helps one AA member identify another in social settings, stores, on the street and at the beach and in the work place. It is usually asked when one AA suspects that another person is also in the fellowship of Alcoholics Anonymous and wants to say hello in that context. The tip-off has to do with some of the outward signs that a man or woman has recovered from alcoholism through the granddaddy of all self-help programs, a set of clear, attentive eyes and the confidence that comes with knowing exactly how and under what circumstances one has escaped an ugly life and an even uglier death.

What Alcoholics Anonymous is is a million-plus souls walking the land freed from the fear of dying of a drug or alcohol overdose, dying an ugly death of bloated liver and yellowed skin, of fiery car crashes or gunfire, much of the latter being self-inflicted. Every AA meeting consists of a handful, or more, of human beings who had, essentially, been written off by society as hopeless.

Most AAs can tell you what day they had their last drink. Many can tell you the hour and minute. All lead up to telling you how they stopped with one version or another of two simple words: "Something happened."

That "something" will be celebrated this month in 114 countries around the world as the fellowship of Alcoholics Anonymous observes its 50th birthday. Monday, the half-century mark for AA, will mark the exact beginning of Alcoholics Anonymous: with the last drink of Dr. Robert Holbrook Smith, a surgeon and co-founder of AA.

That "something" that will be marked has to do with the darkness that comes with the realization that a person has had his last possible ounce of alcohol, white wine, muscatel or Scotch. As the bottom nears for an alcoholic, the normal reactions and feelings of a human being are replaced by an overwhelming fear—blind, unreasoning fear of impending doom. At this stage the alcoholic may be afraid to leave the house, to drive a car, even to leave, yes, the bed. It is a fear of nothing and of everything, a dread that, possibly, retribution (for what?) is at hand.

And finally, after days or weeks or months or years of "maintenance" drinking, keeping

enough alcohol in the system to stave off withdrawal symptoms (such as convulsions, DTs and hallucinations), in the words of the immortal Roberto Duran, the alcoholic will simply say *"No mas, no mas,"* and stop it.

He may accompany this act of the last drink with the magical three words: "Please help me."

This can be reduced to two words, and then one, "Help," and then, AAs will tell you, it is possible to begin the recovery from fear, guilt, anxiety, rage and, if the alcoholic is lucky, many of the physical impairments that go along with alcoholism.

What AA offers to the person who had decided not to drink anymore is in the words of the preamble that is read at the start of every AA meeting. It begins: "Alcoholics Anonymous is a fellowship of men and women who share their experience, strength and hope with each other that they may solve their common problem and help others to recover from alcoholism."

There is little organization in AA, and it has been called the anarchy that works. Groups form, almost spontaneously, and find a place to meet. Many groups meet in church basements, in office buildings, in recreation centers.

At the basic "closed" (members-only) AA meeting a leader presides, reading the preamble, choosing a topic for discussion, or amplifying on whichever of the 12 steps of AA is to be discussed that hour. Generally the leader will relate the subject (it may be "gratitude," or "tolerance" or even "how did your day go?") to his own life and drinking experiences, and tell part of his "drunkalogue" to the group, which may number from five or six to as many as 40 or 50 or more members.

Each person in the meeting, then, may have the chance to address the subject, or just "dump," if he chooses, telling of a current problem with wife, dog, lover, boss or cab driver. Most experienced AAs say they find most of their real problems within themselves, and that the catharsis of "dumping" helps the solution to present itself.

"Open" meetings, which may be attended by anyone (few sightseers are reported at meetings around Washington), are less candid and more general in nature than the closed meetings, and at the third type of meeting, the "open speakers' meeting," a leader might bring two alcoholics who will each tell his story for about half an hour: how he began drinking, what it was like, how he got to AA and how life is today. Almost invariably, the point of surrender to the powerlessness over alcohol is expressed in a phrase very close to "Something happened."

The story of this remarkably successful organization starts with William G. Wilson, a riches-to-rags stockbroker and Wall Street hustler. He had been diagnosed as a hopeless, chronic alcoholic, doomed to apparently endless hospitalizations and then mean death or insanity. In one of these hospitals, Wilson in November 1934 had what he described later as a spiritual experience, and never had another drink.

He had been hospitalized several times before, and this last time, in October, he was 39, drunk, impotent, angry and depressed, and after a flash of light that filled his room, he was to live a life of service to others and die sober in Miami Beach on Jan. 24, 1971, at the age of 75, at which time his full name, picture and story were carried by the media worldwide for the first time. He had been, well, anonymous.

After preliminary recovery, but still shaky (experts in the field of alcoholism estimate, that it takes a month of sobriety for every year an alcoholic drank, just to clear his system of the physical effects of booze), Bill W. went to Akron on a business trip. The trip turned out to involve results other than what our protagonist had expected, and he found himself craving a drink, a typical alcoholic response to unexpected events. He knew he would drink again unless—unless what? Then it came to him that if he could find another alcoholic to talk to, perhaps the two of them could do what he alone could not.

He made a few telephone calls, and through a rather involved route found "Dr. Bob" Smith, another "hopeless" alcoholic.

Bill W. had been exposed to the Oxford Group, a sort of spiritual predecessor of AA, which had had only limited success in helping anyone get sober. One of the things he had learned is that an alcoholic will listen to another alcoholic who knows what he's talking about when it comes to booze, and no one else. And in Akron that evening in May, 1935—dry only a few months—Bill W. knew he was doomed if he could not find another alcoholic, drinking or not, to talk to and, if possible, help.

So exactly what transpired between Bill W. and Dr. Bob—who had been drinking alcoholically since medical school—was that the latter found that he was not alone nor was his problem unique, and that here was somebody who had been there and knew the territory and could show him a way out. Bill W. wore the mantle of total credibility. And Bill W. not only found an alcoholic to help. In the course of helping Dr. Bob, he lost his desire to have just one drink.

That seems to be the basis for the simple magic of AA: The laughter in the rooms where anonymous alcoholics gather is the laughter of those who have been at the gates of hell and been restored; the men and women there laugh at their own problems and understand those of the newcomer.

The founding date of June 10, 1935, for Alcoholics Anonymous was selected because that was the day of Dr. Bob's last drink. This last drink Dr. Bob had was a bottle of beer Bill W. slipped the good surgeon on his way into the hospital to perform an operation. This last drink was to steady his hand.

Dr. Bob was to die, sober, in November 1950, 15 years later. It is is estimated that he personally treated more than 5,000 alcoholics during that period of his life, at no charge, and that he was never free of the compulsion to drink until his last breath, a rarity among those who recover from alcoholism in the fellowship he helped create.

His last words to Bill W. were said with a wink: "Remember, Willie, don't louse it up. Keep it simple."

The remarkable thing about AA is how it has been kept simple and functional by its members—men and women who are notorious for their talents at complicating, say, a two-car funeral.

The simple part of AA is that it offers 12 steps to recovery, the 12 steps that have formed the basis for almost every other program of "self-help," including Neurotics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, Impotents Anonymous and similar groups for overeaters, cancer victims and gamblers.

The steps are all "suggested," which recognizes the alcoholic tendency to resist authority in whatever uniform it appears. And alcohol is mentioned in only one of them, the first: "We admitted we were powerless over alcohol, and that our lives had become unmanageable." It is suggested to newcomers that this step is the only one of the 12 that can ever be done perfectly.

An AA member has got to cut some sort of a deal with himself and a "higher power" about the business of drinking. Bill W. said he had a literal spiritual experience, with a blinding flash of light. Most AAs enjoy what is called a spiritual "awakening," a simple coming to accept that there is a power greater than one's self, a power that can lift the compulsion to drink alcohol and, by extension, much, much more.

So a prospective AA member is told that, yes, the AA program might work for him if he stopped drinking, and it is usually at this time that "something happened."

It might be in the middle of a moonless night when a man who had been unable to go without an infusion of ethanol for four hours for the past 10 years pours his white wine (reduced to this from half a gallon of bourbon a day because of decreased tolerance) back into the jug and decides to be serious about not drinking. "Something happened," he will report after a comfortable period of sobriety.

Or a housewife who has been chained by Scotch whisky to her isolated bed for five years might look through the cobwebs of a treatment center window and know that all she has to do is go downstairs and join the group to begin her recovery. "Something happened," she will report after she has taken some new place in society.

That "something" is that, when an alcoholic is able to admit utter defeat and utter powerlessness over alcohol, he is stripped, at least temporarily, of that will power that has failed him so often and so dramatically. He is forced to rely on something else: a power greater than himself.

AA emphasizes to newcomers that this decision to stop drinking need be only for today. You can drink tomorrow, if you choose, but just for today you don't have to. This is very simple stuff, but remarkably effective with people who for years had begun every grocery list with liquor.

Now Alcoholics Anonymous is not your run-of-the-mill social gathering, and I have never heard of anybody saying, for instance, that the bowling alley seems to be crowded tonight, why don't we go see what one of these AA meetings is like?

If some kind of black light were to be rigged at the door of one of those church basements, it would certainly detect a footprint on the seat of the pants of almost everybody coming in, at least for the first visit. The footprint might be that of a spouse, a lover, or a judge, but more frequently an employer, because the job, ergo the wherewithal, is that important.

But those who get there and stay find that once they have admitted that they are powerless over alcohol there is some help. It begins there, with the surrender. The AAs don't ask anybody to believe in God, or anything else. What you can believe is that yesterday morning you had to have a drink to get your day started and today you didn't.

This is where the magic begins, magic in terms of the workings of the mind and soul. As it begins to dawn on a new AA member that he hasn't had a drink now for a day—two days, a week, 10 days, what? a month!—he can see that although the rest of the steps do not mention alcohol, they have built into them a formula for stripping away the sorts of thinking and behavior that led to the escape-drinking that led to the compulsive-drinking that led to the swollen liver

and the red eyes that looked back at a hated face in the mirror.

Don't drink, say your prayers and get to a meeting is the admonition given to new members. There is more advice to come:

Get a sponsor (someone to begin to trust, for once in your life, and explain to you what the program is and maybe tell you the next thing to do is brush your teeth).

Read the Big Book. ("Alcoholics Anonymous," written by Bill W. and Dr. Bob and the first 100 AAs to get sober. It was first published two years after AA's founding; it sold its 4 millionth copy this last winter.)

Keep coming back, keep it simple, first things first, easy does it, one day at a time, until the cynical drunk begins to suspect he's a victim of a bumper-sticker mentality.

He is also told he should get to a meeting a day for at least 90 days. At the end of that, he may be told, if he isn't fully satisfied "your misery will be fully refunded."

It isn't hard to find 90 meetings in 90 days in the D.C. area. There are an estimated 1,000 meetings a week here now.

The magic of AA is simply a relationship between people that works. Psychologically, it involves a sort of transference that would make most shrinks suicidal with envy. As a prospective fellow of AA begins to recover from the effects of continued ingestion of a toxic substance, he looks around and usually "connects" with one person in one meeting. That person will have that certain something—the clear eye, the stride, the self-confidence and the self-esteem and the apparent joy of living. He will express this by what he says during the meeting and afterward. And the newcomer will want all those things.

This may be the person the newcomer asks to be his "sponsor"—a member more senior in terms of years of sobriety who is available to steer the newcomer into the steps of the program and provide a ready ear for all sorts of personal problems, the way Bill W. learned with Dr. Bob.

This connection need go nowhere, not even sponsorship. But, once made, it is transferable, first to several members of the group and then to the group itself. (Many AAs urge newcomers who consider themselves atheists or agnostics to use the group as a power greater than themselves for the time being.) In extreme cases of recovery, the transference is then made from the group to the entire AA fellowship and then, saints preserve us, to society in general.

This connection/transference is made during the meetings, where at the same time the underlying principles of the AA 12 steps are toyed with and examined and teased and discussed endlessly (but an hour at a time, the AA propensity in this area being to start and stop meetings on time, unlike the churches many AAs fled). The principles, not so oddly, are tolerance, patience, honesty, open-mindness, willingness, humility, gratitude and other things taught Boy Scouts but forgotten quickly by those whose reluctance to grow up emotionally can lead to serious chemical substance abuse.

Not everybody gets to Alcoholics Anonymous. There are an estimated 300,000 to 400,000 alcoholics in the Washington metropolitan area alone, according to Joe Wright of the Washington Area Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse. Of these, 35 percent, or 40 percent at the outside, may touch a form of help, if nothing more than counseling with a clergyman, or AA, or perhaps formal treatment at a hospital. The other 60 percent will continue their course of untreated alcoholism to its abysmal end.

Of the lucky 40 percent, better than half will go back to the booze and stay there until dead or insane.

Of the remaining 20 percent, 10 will find and make the sobriety grade for three to five years, and the other 10 will vacillate in and out of AA (members call this "slipping" or "relapsing"), with 5 percent eventually getting more-or-less permanent, or at least long-term, sobriety in AA. A 1983 survey found 30 percent of the members women, with 20 percent of all members under the age of 31.

And none of them will ever graduate. Nobody ever gets completely well in Alcoholics Anonymous. When you are cured, one old-timer said, they hang you on a hook in the packing house. Nobody ever graduates, although many sober up and never go back to meetings. Sobriety is viewed there as a process, not an event. A few go back out there after long years of sobriety, and it is a lot harder for them to get back on track than it is for those who relapse early in their first brush with newfound sanity.

See, the deal cut with a higher power in the middle of the night is to put the cork in the bottle, the plug in the jug. That is up to the alcoholic to do, a day at a time. The steps of the Alcoholics Anonymous program are intended to give the alcoholic a way of life based on gratitude to whatever that power was that made the dark go away.

THE ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS WAY

These are Alcoholics Anonymous' 12 suggested steps of recovery:

1. We admitted we were powerless over alcohol—that our lives had become unmanageable.
2. Came to believe that a Power greater than ourselves could restore us to sanity.
3. Made a decision to turn our will and our lives over to the care of God as we understood Him.
4. Made a searching and fearless moral inventory of ourselves.
5. Admitted to God, to ourselves and to another human being the exact nature of our wrongs.
6. Were entirely ready to have God remove all these defects of character.
7. Humbly asked Him to remove our shortcomings.
8. Made a list of all persons we had harmed and became willing to make amends to them all.
9. Made direct amends to such people wherever possible, except when to do so would injure them or others.
10. Continued to take personal inventory and when we were wrong promptly admitted it.
11. Sought through prayer and meditation to improve our conscious contact with God as we understood Him, praying only for knowledge of His will for us and the power to carry that out.
12. Having had a spiritual awakening as the result of these steps, we tried to carry this message to alcoholics and to practice these principles in all our affairs.

TAX CODE FAIRNESS TO WORKING WOMEN

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, once again a spokesperson for President Reagan's administration has revealed the administration's appalling insensitivity and ignorance about working women.

I refer to the statements this weekend by the President's Director of Communications, Patrick Buchanan, that the President's tax plan encouraged what he termed "traditional" families, with a working husband and a stay-at-home wife.

Mr. Buchanan's comments ignore the fact that 53.9 percent of adult women are in the labor force or seeking to enter the labor force. And why do a majority of adult women work? The answer is so obvious you would think even the administration could figure it out. Economic need. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics the majority of women who work do so because of economic need, and half of these working women have children. Shouldn't the Tax Code be fair to them too?

Apparently, Mr. Buchanan's comments are just fine with the administration. The official response from the White House—silence. But the working women of America are becoming used to the Reagan administration's silence on their needs.

FAMILY EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ACT

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, in recent years there has been a great deal of discussion, both nationally and in Texas, about the need for improvement in our educational system. There are problems at every level; elementary, secondary, and college, and the one problem common to all is too much Federal control.

The more the Federal Government funds local education, the more it is able to dictate how our local schools are run. The more the Federal Government funds college education, the more it is able to dictate who can go to college. In both instances, family involvement is greatly diminished, and that is the first problem that needs to be addressed.

How can we get family responsibility back into education? One way is to make it easier for families to fund their own children's educations, rather than allowing the Federal Government to tax money with one hand and pass it out with the other.

Last week I planned to introduce legislation to eliminate the Federal middle man. The Family Education Assistance Act of 1965 would allow parents to set up special tax-free education savings accounts [ESA's]. Parents, or students themselves, could contribute up to $1,500 per year to an

ESA. The principal and accrued interest would remain tax-exempt as long as the account was being used for legitimate educational expenses—tuition, room and board, etc. The funds from the account could be used to send students to any college, university, or vocational school; public or private.

Judging from the widespread support of individual retirement accounts [IRA's], education savings accounts should prove popular. The more that families use ESA's, the less the demand for federally funded student loans and grants. That would return control back to parents, while also helping the overall economy by providing incentive for savings.

My bill would make the application of Federal programs more fair. I recently spoke with Secretary of Education William Bennett during an Education and Labor Committee hearing, and he agreed that it is wrong to tax a single mother, or a janitor working two jobs, to provide money for a doctor to send his children to expensive private colleges.

ESA's eliminate the inherent unfairness of Federal programs, and puts the responsibility in the hands of the parents—the ones who care most about their children's education. When parents have greater choice in the education of their children, the educational establishment will respond to the powerful force of competition. When parents are able to secure a child's education based on quality rather than availability of Government funds, the quality of our public school systems will vastly improve.

Just as Federal intrusion in the marketplace distorts priorities and quality, so it does in the field of education. The enactment of the Family Education Act of 1965 will give parents greater freedom in deciding where their children will attend school, and how well those schools will be run.

FARM FAMILIES LOSING WHAT THEY WORKED SO HARD TO CREATE

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

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, at some farm meetings I held in North Dakota a while back, one farmer stood up and said something I want to share with the Members of this House. He said if there was one success in this country that we could trumpet to the world, it would have to be the development of the most effective food producing system in the history of civilization. But that farmer added, if there is one shame we must confess to the world, it's that we allowed so many family farmers who produced that food to go bankrupt because of failed public policies.

This is the year that the Congress is going to write a new farm bill. We have a chance to reform those failed policies. Here's tangible proof that we need to do that. One farmer near Dickinson, ND, clipped out of newspapers within a 90 mile area, all of the auction sale notices for a 30-day period. He sent them to me to demonstrate how many family farmers are losing their farms. Here are those clippings. Each and every one of them represents a young man or woman or a farm family losing what they've worked so hard to create.

This country had better wake up before it loses its most valuable asset. Family farmers are the strength of this Nation, and yet we have Government programs that reward the giant agrifactories and force the little guys out of business. That's a disaster in public policy that I hope we can remedy this year. These people deserve a chance to make it, and America needs to have them make it.

TAX REFORM SHOULD BE FAIR TO ALL FAMILIES

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

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the President had made a big point that his tax reform plan is pro-family. Now we hear from his White House Director of Communications, Pat Buchanan, that the plan is really pro-family for one kind of family: The traditional family type with a breadwinner husband, a homemaker wife, and lots of children.

While this kind of family deserves tax reform like any other, the fact of the matter is that less than one out of four American families fit the traditional mold. The fact is that husbands were the sole earners in only 22 percent of all American families last year. The fact is that the number of husband and wife two-earner families has grown from 34 percent of all married couple families in 1970 to 52 percent in 1984. The fact is that nearly 60 percent of married mothers with children under five are in the work force. The fact is that the number of families maintained by the mother alone has nearly doubled over the last 10 years, and now account for nearly one-fifth of all families.

It is fine for this administration to claim to be pro-family, and I am, of course, pro-family—but to truly be pro-family, you have to recognize that families come in many varieties. I, for one, intend to work for a tax reform package that is fair to all families, and not one that will make life more difficult for the women of this country who work hard outside the home to help support their families.

TAXPAYERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

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

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, it's a simple case of mistaken identity—according to the Internal Revenue Service.

That's what they told one of my constituents, after he spent months trying to find out why a lien had been placed against his property.

It seems that the Internal Revenue Service had intended to place the lien on another man by the same name—but had acquired my constituent's Social Security number instead—and slapped the lien on him—"by mistake."

The problem—now months old—still has not been corrected. The Internal Revenue Service still has not acted—and my constituent's credit has been jeopardized—all because of a "mistake."

This is not the first time such an error has occurred, nor is it the only example of why I introduced the taxpayers' bill of rights—a bill designed to prevent the Internal Revenue Service from violating citizens' rights.

For example—my bill requires the Treasury to prepare a public statement of taxpayers' rights and obligations. If deprived of such—the taxpayer could take legal action against the Internal Revenue Service personnel who abuse those rights. And—taxpayers who prevail in an appeal before the tax court would be awarded costs.

My bill has other provisions to protect taxpayers from being threatened by the Internal Revenue Service. This legislation is exactly what its name describes—the taxpayers' bill of rights.

Isn't it about time?

□ 1220

PROPOSED AMENDMENT SEEKING ANSWERS ABOUT SDI

(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 placed in the amendment box for H.R. 1872 the following amendment which I believe is a sound legislative proposal. It reads:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1872 AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. BENNETT OF FLORIDA

At the end of Title II, add the following new section:

Section 207(a). That at the time of submission to the Congress of the requests by the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1987 expenditures for the Strategic Defense Initiative, said Department shall inform Congress as to:

(1) What probable responses can be expected from potential enemies should the Strategic Defense Initiatives be carried out to procurement and deployment, such as what increase may be anticipated in offensive enemy weapons in an enemy's attempt to penetrate the defensive shield by increasing the numbers or qualities of its offensive weapons;

(2) What can be expected from potential enemies in the deployment of weapons not endangered by the Strategic Defense Initiative, such as cruise missiles and low trajectory submarine missiles;

(3) The degree of the dependency of success for the Strategic Defense Initiative upon a potential enemy's not deploying anti-satellite weapons;

(4) Whether it would be in the best security interests of the United States to share our discoveries in the Strategic Defense Initiative studies with potential enemies as a way of discouraging their offensive weapons buildup, as has been suggested by the Administration; and

(5) The cost estimates for the proposed Strategic Defense Initiative, not only in research and development but itn procurement and deployment,

(b) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorizations in Section 201(a) for research, development, test and evaluation, the sum of $25,000,000 shall be available to the Department of Defense to complete the studies required for the information sought in Section 207(a).

Mr. Speaker, I have attended the House Armed Services Committee briefing and hearings on the strategic defense initiative. My impression is that if this plan is carried out it will be the most expensive project ever undertaken by mankind. As a fiscal conservative that worries me some; but not enough to reject the plan if it is valid. What I heard the witnesses say left me with questions which I have addressed in this amendment. I sincerely hope that it will be adopted because the American people and our national security are at stake.

For instance, what percentage of missiles fired at U.S. targets will get through, despite the proposed defensive weapons? Wouldn't a cheap answer by an enemy be just to multiply the missiles sent our way; or to concentrate on weapons not addressed the SDI, like cruise missiles? It has been urged that it would be frustrating to the enemy not to know which of his ICBM's would arrive on a particular target. But considering that each would probably be worse than 100 Hiroshimas wouldn't the damage be nevertheless unacceptable to us? Would the SDI then encourage a response that would be affordable to the enemy but devastating to us? We should get answers to questions like this and the others asked in order to be sure that the chartered course really assists our security.

PAT BUCHANAN'S BRAND OF "CONSERVATISM"

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

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan has had a problem. To try to pacify his right wing, which gets a little uneasy when he gets excessively chummy with the regime of Communist China or hesitates to repudiate SALT II, he has brought Pat Buchanan aboard.

But there is a problem with that. Pat Buchanan's most recent public statements before joining the White House included a defense of the apartheid regime of South Africa and an attack on the anti-Nazi effort of the Justice Department, so they tried for a while to have Pat Buchanan there and not let him say anything publicly. But that did not work because people wondered why the Director of Communications was so noncommunicative.

So they let Pat Buchanan out, and I think they are going to have to put him back in again because on Friday he announced that one of the major reasons for the President's tax bill is to punish such neosocialist States as the State of California and also to protect the traditional family as he defines it. In other words, men and women and young people in this country can benefit financially if they live their private lives and govern the most intimate details of their lives in a way that Pat Buchanan approves.

Now, individuals are entitled to whatever views they want about traditional family or nontraditional family or family traditions, but for the Federal Government, as Pat Buchanan tells us, to say that the Tax Code shall be used as an instrument to dictate to people or influence people in the most intimate details of their private lives is an extraordinarily intrusive action.

I had thought genuine conservatism sought to keep the Government out of certain areas. Having a Federal tax proposal which Pat Buchanan tells us is intended to impose his particular views of whether or not a wife should work and how many children people should have, if that is genuine conservatism, then Caspar Weinberger is a management efficiency expert.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, last January I accepted an invitation to give the commencement address for the 1985 graduation ceremony of Whitesburg High School in Whitesburg, KY. The date: June 4, at 8 p.m.

I was indeed pleased to have been invited to give the commencement speech to the 193 Whitesburg High School graduates and accepted for a number of reasons, including the fact that the school is my wife Carol's alma mater.

It so happened that I missed the vote ordered on House Joint Resolution 192, to designate April 24, 1986 as "National Day of Remembrance of Man's Inhumanity to Man."

I would have voted "no" on House Joint Resolution 192. I do not believe Congress should become involved on an annual basis in passing a measure that would embarrass Turkey, an important NATO and political ally of our country. Indeed, I believe Members of Congress should try to be friendly to both Americans of Armenian and Turkish descent.

Attempts to pass House Joint Resolution 192 under suspension of the rules failed last Tuesday.

I urge the promoters of this resolution to abandon their efforts during this 99th Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 7, 1985.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
The Speaker,
U.S. 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 a sealed envelope received from the White House at 3:55 p.m. on Friday, June 7, 1985, and said to contain a message by the President whereby he transmits the eighth annual report of the National Institute of Building Sciences.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF BUILDING SCIENCES—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 Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs:

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of Friday, June 7, at page 14845.

THE LAKERS BRING NBA TITLE BACK TO LOS ANGELES

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, in the words, of the famed poetess Marianne Moore: "I am troubled, I am dissatisfied, I am Irish." More appropriate words could not have been written to describe the fate of the Boston Celtics following their sound drubbing by the mighty Los Angeles Lakers. Behind the guns of Kareem, Magic, Worthy, Rambis, and the "Big Mac," the team that hark's from the city of Angels rose to the occasion yesterday to win their second NBA championship in 4 years. This time, the guardian angel prevailed.

The Lakers proved that they are the best team in basketball. And as always, there it talk of an impending dynasty. After watching the Lakers' poise, talent, and aggressiveness, this is no doubt true. Congratulations are in order for the Los Angeles Lakers. But for the rest of basketball—just a warning that the best is yet to come.

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker I rise at the outset of this week, given the opportunity to do so, before we go into a rather crucial period with respect to whether or not the Congress is going to sanction the up to now undeclared Presidential war that has been carried on by President Reagan in Central America for about 2 years and a few months. We have surrounded that area with the heaviest military presence in the history of that part of the world.

Simultaneously with his announcement of the deployment of those forces some 2½ years ago, he announced the formation of what he called and described as a bipartisan Commission on Central America. On it he named several Members of the Congress, some from the House including the distinguished majority leader, and some from the Senate including the Senator from Texas, Mr. BENTSEN. Also on that array of Members was the distinguished colleague who happens to be the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Matters of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

At that time in my area, the big news was that the President had also chosen the very illustrious and dynamic mayor of my city of San Antonio.

At the time that the announcement was made of the formation of the commission, the President in the next breath announced the deployment of the massive military presence in that part of the region of the new world on both the Pacific as well as the Caribbean sides.

Since then we have had a number of our active duty servicemen killed while serving in some yet to be precisely defined capacity. Along the Honduran-Nicaraguan border we have had some fatalities and some of them have been enshrouded in quite mysterious circumstances.

In the beginning, the President stated categorically that in his opinion the regime in power, the so-called Sandinista group, was antithetical to the best interests of our country, that he had information to show that there was a very heavy presence of both Cuban Castroite forces as well as Russian. He then went on ahead and had some television presentations of what were supposed to be sites for aircraft landing, and also brought in the question of Granada. Now this was in anticipation of what transpired that grabbed the headlines shortly after the murder of the 241 marines in Beirut. At that time the headlines were not focused on Central America except sporadically as various events took place in the other Central American neighboring country of El Salvador, so that never have we had a clear coherent picture as we have progressed from stage 1 to stage 2, 3, 4, and 5 in Central America, because the big issue, which also was sporadic—if I recall correctly, in 1982, in June, the big headlines had to do with the disturbances in Lebanon and the fact that the President saw fit to send a smaller contingent of marines, and then with them some Italian and French. But they were pulled out as soon as it looked as if there was some order restored. But then followed the developments that were bloody, very disturbing and apparently the President felt that the national interests dictated that he deploy 2,000 or more marines battle equipped into Beirut.

The ostensible purpose was actually as first outlined, two reasons. One was to try to preserve the order, especially after the massacres in the Shatila and Sabra refugee camps, or refugee camps, whichever point of view one wants to look at that from.

Second, to shore up the Gemayel regime. At that time I raised a question and directed a letter to the President asking in lieu of the fact that the matter was still in a very disturbing state in Central America and that he had also requested a somewhat small increase in the official number of military advisers that he wanted in El Salvador, though unofficially I had good reason to know, I had been very faithfully and credibly informed that the actual number of our active duty military was about some five times greater than what the official count of so-called advisers was given to the Congress, but the counts when taken were not taking into consideration the moving out temporarily from one area into another across the border say into Honduras or temporarily for some yet to be described purpose in Costa Rica or just outside of the boundaries of El Salvador for the count. As soon as the count was taken, we had a redeployment of a greater number of active duty military; I mean special forces elements and others. Some of them were actually going out into the field, even though they were in an advisory capacity and the fact that they were equipped for conditions that would have made it incumbent under the 1974 War Powers Limitations Act for the President to report within 60 days to the Congress, which fact he has never done; so that in the meanwhile in addressing my letter to the President, the question was I think fundamental: "What is the mission of the marines in Beirut, Mr. President?"

He never replied, because this is the first President of six that I have worked with that does not reply to a Congressman's letter; rather, he has some unknown staff aide say that they acknowledge receipt of the letter; but subsequent to that, and if I remember correctly, the month of December 1982, one newspaper reporter in asking that question finally elicited a reply for the record and the President said they were there for the purpose of peace keeping mostly, particularly peace keeping.

It was after that and the refusal to get any kind of a credible answer, either from the Defense Department itself, the State Department or the executive branch, that I took the floor and kept asking the question, because anybody even superficially acquainted with the complex situation historically and otherwise in Lebanon knew that the Gemayel regime was only one of four factions; so that if we sent warriors—the marines are not diplomats, as I pointed out to the President. They are not politicians. They are fighting men. They are trained for that purpose. They are soldiers, so that if we call upon soldiers to carry out a function, it is a fundamental promise that the mission must be crystal clear, that you cannot go and continue to go, as we have in these encounters, ranging all the way from the Korean, even though there there was perhaps somewhat of a coherent policy, inasmuch as we did not go in unilaterally. We went under the aegis of the United Nations; but particularly in Vietnam and particularly I would say preceding that, and I think the first evidence to me of what I have been worried about since the 1947 Reorganization Act was the Bay of Pigs. I felt and I said so at the time, though I never thought I would be in the Congress at the time, that there was something fundamentally flawed, that that would not have happened under the old War Department system, under the old Secretary of War setup, because if we have entered

an era in which we have complex social-political-military problems, if we reach the point where we have failed diplomatically, and no country ever resorts to the soldier unless he has first failed diplomatically, and if we have confessed our failure in diplomacy and therefore call in the military, it is essential that we have a clear, coherent policy; for "If the trumpet soundeth an uncertain sound, then who can truly rally to the call to fight?"

And this is exactly what happened. The objectives were muddied. Nobody really understood the fundamental purposes. Men were dying in the meanwhile; some were, some were not.

And, of course, you do not have to be an expert to know that we would have terrible social divisiveness in this country. It just shatters me to think that we have learned nothing from those experiences. And I thought that certainly, even though the fragile set of signs, the Reorganization Act of 1947 that created the Defense Department, I felt certainly that a Commander in Chief would adhere or certainly be amenable to a unanimous advice on the part of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. These are the top professional military. Our country has invested in them huge sums. We set up all of these service schools. We set up the academies, and these are the graduates of these academies, and these are the experts.

Yet in the case of Beirut the President for 14 months willfully, callously, totally disregarded the unanimous advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the Marines had no business under those circumstances in Beirut.

We live in a day and time in which leaders will accept responsibility tirelessly, as they did after they had the post mortem and they called the poor military and said, "Hey, you better investigate," and "How could this have happened, how could you have allowed this to have happened?" And they said, of course, that it was this, that, and the other. But the truth of the matter was it was not until then that it was publicly found out, though I knew before, and that is why I had been speaking, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had advised against it solidly; there was no division among them. And the reason was simple. You do not have to be a military expert to know that if you are surrounded by hostile forces and you are placed in a sort of a hollow and the rim of the hollow is hostile, that you do not have much of a chance to fight out militarily and that sooner or later you are going to have a tragedy.

Yet we live in a day and time in which the leaders say, "Well, yes, I must take technical responsibility." But they will not accept blame. And it is the same thing now happening in Central America.

The reason for my rising is that it is a calculated course for catastrophe. And the House is going to be asked in about 24 or 36 hours to vote money which actually, in terms of dollars, when the proportion was $14 million, well, anybody that knows much about approriations around here knows that the $14 million could hardly have been the issue. The President has found money with which he has funded, contrary to the mandate of the Congress, the so-called Contras. He has made extensive use of his executive budget, the discretionary budget, if you please.

The discretionary budget of the President, the same President who is asking us to cut back on everything from food stamps to housing, his discretionary budget has increased 750 percent in less than 2 years, and it coincides with the cutoff of funds to the Contras as mandated by the Congress, even though under the procedures that an executive has, he can transfer funds within his executive discretionary budget, and he has done so and has increased that amount 750 percent, 7½ times, in less than 2 years.

As a matter of fact, he used that discretionary fund authority to pull $10 million from the National Park Service so that he could computerize the White House kitchen for the family, not the regular White House kitchen, but the family White House kitchen, and also to refurbish some things there, while he is asking us to zero out all of the housing rehabilitation programs for the Nation, especially the poor and the moderate income.

So what with these contradictions I will not be much surprised, given the skill with which the public pressure can be applied, and the same fears aroused that Members fear that if they do not back up the President, why the Communists are liable to take over, and what do you want, to have them on the Texas border next? Why, certainly, what side are you on.

Well, this is the same thing that was asked during the Vietnam War, and I think that a word to the wise is more than sufficient. I believe, though, that upon serious and sober consideration the facts should be coldly evaluated. Is the money, whether it is $14 million or $38 million, as was approved in the other body last week, the issue? No, it is not.

The issue is whether or not the President will be able to escape the responsibility of accountability under the War Powers Limitation Act for a vote favorable along the line of the Republican controlled Senate action last week which would mean that we are giving our imprimatur of approval to a Presidential war that will only increase exponentially as we go into the near future.

Now let us think what that means. While you take this action, I want to take this time to anticipate to you, my colleagues, that you are in effect prescribing the formula for an irreversible conduct of this country that will forever vulcanize the New World. We will not only not have learned anything from our immediate history with respect to the use of military, but we have learned nothing about the history of the motherlands and fatherlands from which we all precede, the ancient divisions which still have us sunk in the mire of those hatreds and animosities that are historical, embedded in central Europe, even in Western Europe, and the consequences to us here.

I think the significant thing is that the President's actions, and I will not say policy because none has really been developed, the President's actions thus far with respect to Central America specifically, or Latin America generally, have not gained the support of any country, either in the New World or the Old World. None of our allies in Europe support us, not a one. None in the New World, including Canada, support us.

The only countries that have made sort of chuckling signs when our diplomats pressure them are what I call the aid junkies, the ones that are addicted to our aid and are totally beholden to our aid, at least the ruling classes in those countries are at this point. They are the only ones.

But in the context of the group we call the Latin American republics of 21, they do not loom large at all. In fact, practically no significance, now or at any time in the past. So that what I am saying today is this: that if the President insists, as I think he irreversibly is committed to, I think the investment has been too great for him to reverse, we have poured in just in El Salvador about $2 billion just in the smallest country, and we have not won there yet. We have been lulled into thinking that we have a moderate regime.

The truth of the matter is that at this point, even as I rise to speak today, it is our helicopters, our Huey attack helicopters, that are murdering peasant women, children, infants even, all in the name of controlling the so-called Marxists, which are not in any heavy presence in El Salvador.

□ 1250

You have five different rebel groups. The least numerous and significant at this point is the so-called Marxist-Leninist. But we insist on trying to do what we accuse Russia of doing in Afghanistan.

At this point we have made minimal use of our troops, unlike the Russian invasion of Afghanistan. But in Nicaragua we are on the verge, we are on the threshold of intervening unilaterally. If I am any judge about what the course of events have been in just the

last 2 weeks, there is no question in my mind whatsoever, and last week I put into the RECORD the absolute proof reflected in a sort of, what was intended to be, a private message from the President to some Members of the Congress but, somehow or other, as most things will, got leaked, in which he said that failing any other way he would not rule out and would probably be using direct American intervention. Now, when we talk that way and given the investment thus far put into this venture we ought to at least think rationally, practically, and realistically. What is it we are talking about, let us say militarily? In order to overcome, in Nicaragua, where what we have is the result of a civil war and an election result that took place last November, like it or not the President did not like that election even though he liked the one we paid for in El Salvador; but like it or not, the group in power now in Nicaragua were duly elected. Like it or not, some of them have been and have always said they were Marxist-Leninists, Socialists, whatever you want to call them, but also in the forefront of that regime are three or four Catholic priests, other men that we would call moderates in our terminology, also heavily present and still are in the councils of that Government.

The significant thing is that the people support the regime. We may not like that but that is the fact. We may not like Castro and we may be very much against him but we must admit that he continues to have the overwhelming popular support of the Cuban people. It is the same thing in Nicaragua. No government that does not feel secure would hand out the arms in the variety, quantity as the Nicaraguan Government has to the peasants up in the north fighting against the invasions, the atrocities committed by the men the President says are the equal of our Founding Fathers. What an irrationality, and yet that is what the record shows.

Also every single household in Managua, if you visit the inner city of Managua and you go into the barrios and the neighborhoods you will see sandbag shelters, you will see bulwarks of resistance and every household armed with a heavy-caliber gun. There is no reason, if the people wanted to, they could not rise and overcome the regime in Nicaragua. But the reason they are armed is they are fully expecting the North American invasion.

Now, why would they? I know that sounds kind of paranoic to some of us, but let us look at the history. We have invaded Nicaragua 11 times in its history; in this country alone 6 times. Nicaragua was the scene of the freebooter Walker who wanted to establish a government there that he would commandeer and would add her to the United States. The very name Sandino should tell us that it is evocative of the resistance of the Nicaraguan groups against the American invasion by the Marines in 1929.

I think we also ought to note that in neighboring countries such as Mexico the same fear still is prevalent. Now that is true. That is not the way we look at it. But I am speaking to you the way the real world out there looks at us, not the way we look at ourselves; the way they look at us given the experience of history and relationships and invasions on our part.

We have not hesitated one bit to impose the most atrocious, dictatorial, most tyrannical, most corrupt regimes as in Nicaragua. We are the ones, with the presence of the Marines there for 9 years, that is how long it took, before you isolated Sandino, who was the freedom fighter to their point of view and whose name is being evoked today. I think the significant thing is that we ought to point out that as in the case of "Black Jack" Pershing chasing after Pancho Villa and the Marines in the case of Sandino, in neither case did they catch them. That was in 1929. There was no such thing as sophisticated air power, no such thing as the means and methods available today militarily. But the difference is that in 1929 that world was a completely different world. In 1985 this is an absolutely new world. The world has shrunk. The masses that now outnumber us in total population, and I think this began to be true just about a decade and a half ago, but today they are about 50 percent greater in number than our total population for the first time. Those masses have been in the main downtrodden, exploited cruelly, coldly by their masters, that we have identified with. We are identified with these forces, simply because most of these people are the ones that will be doing business with our corporations. They are the ones that are trying to keep their power in place. They are the ones that do not hesitate 1 minute as they did all during the Alliance for Progress, taking and creaming off most of that aid money that President Kennedy, in good will—and the masses down there just sanctify him to this day—but it never got down to the masses because it went to the secret Swiss accounts of these corrupted leaders that could care less about their own masses. But those masses have awakened. They are like, we used to say during civil rights struggles in the sixties and before then before Martin Luther King some of us were in that struggle, and we used to say that the difference with our situation after the war as compared to before the war was like a little boy standing on the street corner with a little mess of kitties recently born, had them in a little box. The man came by and said, "Son, those are pretty little kittens. How much do you want for them?" He said, "They are 50 cents apiece."

The man walked on. The next day he came back and he said, "I have been thinking about that. I think I would like that brown mottled one there. How much is it? Is it 50 cents?" "No, it is $1." "You told me they were 50 cents yesterday." "Yes, I know that, but they have opened their eyes by now."

They have now opened their eyes. This is what has happened to these masses of people down there; they are no longer going to tolerate the injustices and oppressions that have been taken for granted for years. We ought to know. We ought to know that in 1932 there, you had the same kind of uprising as in the last 10 years. The difference was that the ruling 12 families of that day could conduct the massive, massive murdering of over 30,000 citizens and retain control of that regime. The CIA could go into the neighboring country, Guatemala, in 1954 and destabilize the so-called Colonel Arbenz's regime.

□ 1300

And we could use the money of United Fruit to hire the mercenary pilots through the CIA and pick Arbenz out by strafing the capital just one time. That was 1954.

The point I made last year was that in 1984, the CIA is abysmally wrong in thinking that what worked for them in Guatemala in 1954 was going to work for them in Nicaragua in 1984. It just is not about to happen.

The world has changed. We had better realize it, we had better find how just adhering to our own basic principles, we can gain victory. We do not have to do any more, any less than that.

That is the reason why I first spoke up on April 1, 1980. Now, President Reagan was not the President; it was Jimmy Carter, and I said the same thing then. I said: Mr. President, you have about 90 days in which you can still use that last remaining vestige of leverage for collective leadership in this new world. Do that. Do not go in unilaterally. Those days are gone. Gunboat diplomacy will not work any more. They are gone forever.

Let us use our brains, and with it out of this nettle of danger and disorder we can pluck this little flower of success, both peace and business even. There is no question why not, but for that we have to sacrifice ideology and the restraints of ideological zealotry, which is what is governing our leaders in our Government today.

And that is a state of mind. I have found all throughout my career you cannot argue against a state of mind. But we, the deliberative body, the House, should take note the President has followed a consistent course of abi-

valence and outright disregard for the wishes of the Congress, and particularly those expressed in the various resolutions passed by this House of Representatives.

This vote this week will be a critical one. I think that the least we can do is to point out to the President that since he has been in total disregard of the congressional mandate under the 1974 War Powers Limitation Act, and that when the President has, as he has in Beirut and others in other places, the end results have been detrimental to the well-being of our country; that our system is predicated on some congeniality, some collegiality they call it, between the branches of Government, that we cannot forget that, that as much as we know that the basic, fundamental premise of our Government is the separation of powers, the coequality of powers, the independence of each branch, that we must work together, at least on some basic, basic proposition.

At least if we disagree as to tactics, we can say that we will follow the same general road, the same general direction, and I have always said that, and have offered suggestions; I have made specific suggestions in every one of these instances, to President Jimmy Carter and now to President Reagan.

In the case of Jimmy Carter for whatever reason, there seemed to be an equal inaccessibility among those that were following whatever processes; I never could quite determine in the case of President Carter, there, and especially this President, and President Lyndon Johnson, especially the last 1½ years of his regime, exactly what the judgment-making valuation processes were.

Obviously, in the case of this President, we have a very serious situation, because we have a Chief Executive, who also under the Constitution is Commander in Chief, who will willfully ignore the unanimous advice of the most highly respected and professional of the military.

This is a very dangerous conjunction at this time in our Nation's history, and therefore calls upon the Congress like never before in an area in which we traditionally have deferred to Presidents and the executive branch, since the first Congresses, matters of foreign relations generally, in matters of diplomacy, naturally.

So both historically and constitutionally we set the precedent, but at this point, that is stressed also by the obtuseness of our leadership in its conduct of foreign relations in other parts of the world; not just in the Middle East where that is a total catastrophe. What is happening there now and for the first time really making it possible to have a heavy Russian presence in the deliberations in the Middle East.

Nobody speaks now about the Gemayal faction; in fact, Gemayal was almost murdered, like his brother Bashir before, and nobody speaks now of sending the Marines. Why? What has changed? The basic excuse given? Nothing, except the fact that sheer events in the course of these inexorble events and reality—the real world, have just shattered this bubble of illusion and delusion.

When I see the same thing in Middle Europe, and I see that in the matters of international finances we have consistently followed a course of disaster, equally well, and that it is just a matter of time before the consequences are generally felt.

In other words, just like during the Vietnam war, nobody much cared when in 1965 I rose right here on this floor and pointed our that 47 percent of those men who had and were continuing to face hostility; death, serious bodily harm, were draftees; 47 percent plus by August 1965.

Nobody gave a hoot. It was not until a few years later that the casualties came in, tragically, they reached the point of over 100 a week, then the military said well, you know, we have to have more. But if you have more, we have to have more backup, and then you start dipping into the middle class and then at that point, some corporation presidents said "Hey, Mr. President, what about this war, Let's look up."

In other words, when it began to hit the perception or level of us in our comfort, in all of our creature comforts, this is what I tried to say on Thursday, October, preceding the Sunday massacre, the 24th. The last words in the RECORD were my appeal to the President that evening, as the Members were taking off for the week. I said, when we go off, we have a good steak tonight. Mr. President, you will retire to the family quarters. Please think of those marines that are under the shadow of death this very moment.

I was looked upon—I had a couple of calls up to the office; critical and abusing, but I would give anything if what happened that following Sunday had not happened. If somebody had taken time to worry, just like in 1965 you did not have to be a prophet; you do not have to be a seer; you do not have to be an expert to know that if some of us are going to be asked and forced to fight undeclared wars, as we are preparing to do in Nicaragua, it will take 100,000 men to start off in Nicaragua. 100,000.

Well, what does that mean? Let us talk in terms of reality. Let us talk in terms of the guy that is going to have to go through those barrios and kill those families and face hostile fire, and on an equal basis.

Now we may have control of the air, maybe we will get challenged this time like we did not in Southeast Asia, but let us just look at it coldly and practically. It is undeclared war. All of the legal things that come into play when you have a declared state of war are absent, as they were during Vietnam.

So that some of the things that would be treason if there was a declared state of war, were not. Remember, unlike Britain that could in the case of the Falklands just feed out the information from the Minister of Information in London, we have the first amendment—until Grenada.

□ 1310

And for the first time President Reagan did what even Lincoln could not do during the Civil War, and he kept the press out. So that these are issues that maybe nobody heeds. We are worried about taxes and whether our taxes are going to go up or go down and whether somebody else is going to get gravy or not, and nobody is worried about those soldiers it is going to take to go in and knock out the Sandinistas. But, then, what is going to be their mission? Knock out what? The Sandinista government? Then who is going to govern? The Contras? Why, the Contras, mostly, at least 80 percent, are the ex-Somocistas, the ones who were hated and reviled and kicked out. So, then, unless we are prepared to think in terms of occupying the country, then that means we will not limit it to Nicaragua. It is going to set up that whole region in flames, as it is beginning to, and we will have for a long time what we like to call guerrilla warfare. We will call it terrorism, but they will call it guerrilla. And then we will not succeed in imposing a Somoza regime like we did in the 1930's; but I think we ought to start thinking about that. I think we ought to start thinking about what is our objective. Is Nicaragua a peril now to our national interest? The President says it is. In order for him to have imposed the embargo, under the law he had to say that Nicaragua is a present threat to the security and well-being of our country. Is that so? Then why do we not pull our Ambassador out of Nicaragua? We still have an ambassador. That means that, to the world, we proclaim that we recognize that regime.

These are the ambiguities, these are the questions that inevitably will arise. Whether I raise them or whether somebody else, it makes no difference. They are inevitable. But from a practical standpoint, if we deploy 100,000, then we have to pull in support. Where are we going to pull them in? From the 300,000 we have in Germany, at a time when Germany is in ferment, at a time when the President went a long way on his Bitburg visit to shore up the neo-Nazis that have the Russians climbing up the trees and, therefore, making it very attractive to revive the ancient rivalries, like the

mass requests in some of the provinces in Germany for the restoration of a couple of the provinces now technically in Poland that the West Germans say they ought to be restored? And then what is Minister Kohl saying? He is saying, "Well, hold up a little bit until we have a peace treaty."

Well, then, wait a while. Everybody is talking as if World War II is over with. But we have 300,000 of our military in Germany alone. Now, let us look at it realistically. The French live next door. How many do they have? The British, how many do they have? The British have about 7,000, mostly in the Ruhr, where they took over because of the steel production section. In other words, in the 1940's, after 1945, when Germany was split up, what the United States got was the hard part, all based on the fact that Russia would be a threat if it happened to come in over land. But the British got that which would protect their steel industries, and the French, of course, got their comparative share. But Germany is divided. And the whole basis of the cold war stems from that, German reunification.

General Eisenhower, as he was leaving office, was the last President and only President to address that. And if I were to quote General Eisenhower today, I would be criticized by the prodefense spokesmen in and out of the Congress as a pacifist. But who was speaking? Well, here was a warrior and a President, who was conscientious, who was as honest as the day is long, and who was telling or trying to tell the American people what the facts were. But those powers and those vested interests that he in effect was trying to expose to the American people to be aware of, by that time they had taken over, and today they have taken over completely.

And I rise only because I want to remind my colleagues that whether you vote for $14 million—$14 million, why, it took more than that to get Senator HELMS elected in North Carolina. So, you know that is not the issue. Or whether it is $40 million, $45 million or $100 million, that is not the issue. What you will be doing, depending on your vote, will be sanctioning, as in the case of Guatemala right now, a process that we do not have the manpower, the treasure and the national resources to win.

I believe in winning. This was the reason I asked the question of President Johnson, after he had a big briefing, with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and they were pointing out with their pointers Haiphong and should you mine or bomb Haiphong, and the admiral got up and he said:

Well, sure, we could do this, but there is a British ship in that harbor, there is a French ship in that harbor, there is a West German ship in that harbor, there are a couple of Russian cargo ships there, and we cannot guarantee that in the process one of them would not hit a mine or we would not bomb one of them inadvertently.

The President said:

See, that is the dilemma, that is the dilemma.

They had Gen. Lou Walt, fresh from I think they called it the fourth area, whatever it was, and talking about how the casualties were going up.

I was asked by one of the President's advisers, well, what did I think about it. And I said I think that I cannot figure it out. I heard Gen. Lou Walt say—and I have many, many constituents, most of them volunteers—I have the most volunteering constituency in the United States of America even now, so that I am sensitive, and also I am privy to many, many of my constituents who are serving in every single area of the world, whether it is Panama, El Salvador, Honduras, off the coast in Lebanon, Germany, Korea, name it, I have constituents, and they stay in touch with me. And I think I have an idea of what they face and what their questions are and what their worries are. They are good, loyal, patriotic, trained soldiers. They want to do their duty for their country. But they also want to know, as many asked me during Vietnam, "What is it all about?" Well, I will not mention this Presidential adviser, he is very prominent, but I said, "As I see it, General Walt just told us that these casualties are coming in, and that is because they are getting supplies over land by the Chinese, who are so able that they could put a railroad track under the surface of a creek or a river and protect it from bombing, our bombers." And they they had the cargo ships bringing in all kinds of goods. Remember, we did not have a friendly world opinion in our support in Vietnam. None of our European allies were outwardly supporting us or joining us, so they were doing what we call business with the enemy. And I said, "Well, if I had ordered any American out there and I knew he was going to get shot at and maybe killed and he was going to get shot at and killed from material coming in from Haiphong, or wherever, either I would do something about that or I would pull my man out, either one."

"Well, but do you want a war with Russia?"

I said, "Well, then, if that is what we are afraid of, then we should not be there at all, in my opinion."

What is the mission? What are you asking the military man to do? The military finally coined a phrase. They said, "The rules of engagement called for us to go here and there, and that's all, and over here, and that is all." In war you do not do it that way. You are not playing a football game.

This was what I tried to tell President Reagan. I said, "You are not the Gipper, you are the Commander in Chief, and you have got men who are going to die."

And this is what I am saying now. That whole area is in conflagration. Do not tell me about the problems that the Marxist-Leninists are posing for us in Nicaragua. We helped make those. In fact, we did more. And we have made the Communists, we have made Fidel Castro. We insist on giving them credit they are not entitled to.

□ 1320

We have made them; everybody will tell you that outside of our boundaries. We insist on giving the Communists credits that they are far from being entitled to. Our myopic policies; greedy policies because we are shaping some of them out of corporate offices instead of the State Department or here in the Halls of Congress. That is the reason; no other reason.

So when you vote, you are not voting just for money; you are voting for the expendable lives of a good chunk of our fighting men. So you better make sure you know what the purpose is. The Contras are a group dedicated to the destruction of a regime in Nicaragua. That is the long and the short of it. We intervene on behalf of a group like that; we are intervening in a civil war.

We do not have the consensus of opinion of support from those surrounding countries, either to the south or to the north. Neither one of our adjoining countries join us, whether it is Canada or the Republic of Mexico. Surely this is a good definition of a bankrupt policy, but now when you vote, you are not voting $35 million, you are also voting for no less than 20,000 to 25,000 dead American soldiers, at least.

If any of the professional soldiers who ought to know, are even half way right, that is what my information is. So make up your minds whether or not we face the frontal issue, and that is to hold the President accountable to the national policymaking body in the case of Presidential wars. This is our big question as we are on the verge of celebrating the 200th anniversary of our form of government. That will not come until 1989, because that is the bicentennial of the Constitution. At stake are the fundamental premises that the men who wrote the Constitution were most worried about. They were so worried about this office that they later called the Presidency, but which, during the Constitutional Convention debates they called it Chief Magistrate. They did not want that kind of office. In fact, the first 10 years of our national being, that is, two Continental Congresses, they did not bother. It was Congresses, Delegates, Representatives, because they wanted to make sure that they would not face what they had read about all

in history and what they themselves had faced in the form and shape of the European regimes.

My point is, we have come full circle. In the last 4 years, our country has emerged from a producing country to a consuming dumping ground of external goods and other materials. We are back to what I call the old merchantile system. This was one of the underlying causes of the American Revolution. No matter what products we raised here, wool, whatever, the manufactured good had to be bought from England, the mother country. We are back at that; we are back in that. We are back in the merchantile system.

For the first time since 1914, the United States is a debtor nation. In the meanwhile, as I have said, we keep ignoring that real world. What is the real world in Middle Europe for whose defense one-half of the $315 billion is what this Congress is approving.

But what is it that we are defending, and on what basis do we predicate it? Well, we predicate it on the premise that we have a situation of allies. But in the meanwhile, the reality is that Europe has grown into a unified position where they are now saying, as they pointed out to our Treasury and financial associates that went with President Reagan to Bonn last month in May, nobody in the United States read about the European Community having fleshed out through their six financial ministers the month before in April, in Palermo, Sicily, with the preliminary meeting before that in Basil, Switzerland, because now that group of six has more gold and more gold reserve than we have in the United States. So they are telling the United States. You read the headline where the French only held out on a trade agreement. But trade and international finance and such things as balance of payments are all one and part of a kit. What nobody wishes to discuss is that the Europeans have finally put together what they call the ECU, the European currency unit, and the supporting framework of reference known as EMS; the European monetary system.

Now, I have been speaking on this since 1979, but I find that it is the only voice so doing in the whole Congress, either on this side or over in the Senate. I have seen nothing in the RECORD to even mention the European currency unit. Yet, it is a fundamental, it is of mortal significance to us, because we are now in the most monstrous position internationally, trade wise. We have a trade deficit as of December 31, 1984, of $140 billion. For every 10 of those 140, America has lost 250,000 permanently.

This is why, I do not know if any of my colleagues saw in the newspapers just 2 weeks ago, finally it comes out and says, America has lost x number of millions of jobs in the last few years, and then nothing after that. But still there is no discussion about the reality of that world. What is that real world over in Europe? The President's mindset, and judging from the discussions and debates on this floor, the mindset of the overwhelming preponderant Members of my colleagues, is a Europe of 1947. That is gone. You have on the threshold of power in Germany alone a brandnew generation that does not remember World War II.

Kohl, the minister in West Germany, was 15 years old. Gorbachev, his Russian counterpart in Russia was 15 years old in World War II. So my friends, I say that my advice to the privileged orders is that we must, if nothing else, for the sake of our well-being look at this in a wider concept and context. Keep it in line with our own revolutionary traditions.

We are a revolutionary country. If we remain basically loyal to our basic principles. Let us not abandon those because those are the principles that gave for the first time in the annals of written human history a true democratic expression. The world is not kind to democracy, and particularly at this juncture of the 20th century.

The vote may seem inconsequential as to money, but let me assure you that the hidden, real cost of that bill will be one that will cause us all to hang our heads in shame. We are here on the scene at this moment and juncture in our history; we must rise to the occasion. Yes, politically, it may be expendable, but as I have said time and time again, my friends, arise, arise ye downtrodden Congressmen, we have nothing to lose but our seat.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of clarification, I would like to include the following article titled:

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1985]

A DEFECTING NICARAGUAN CONTRA'S TALE—FORMER FIELD COMMANDER CHARGES WIDESPREAD ABUSES

(By Robert J. McCartney)

MEXICO CITY, MAY 7.—Ever since 1980, when he was among the first Nicaraguans to join the anti-Sandinista resistance, Jose Efren Martinez Mondragon had appeared to follow the typical career of the dedicated contra, or counterrevolutionary, guerrilla leader.

Formerly a sergeant in the National Guard of deposed dictator Anastasio Somoza, Martinez Mondragon worked his way up in the resistance movement from commander of a guerrilla training unit in Honduras, to become a task force commander who regularly led missions inside Nicaragua. Just six months ago, he was commanding 180 contras on a patrol in Esteli province, deep inside territory normally controlled by the Sandinistas.

Today, however, Martinez Mondragon did something that no contra commander ever had done before: he flew home to Managua to be welcomed by his former foes as a defector. He will take advantage of a Nicaraguan amnesty law approved earlier this year that provides for a pardon for rebels who lay down their arms. Eight weeks ago, Martinez Mondragon and nine other persons, including two other guerrillas, sought political asylum in the Mexican Embassy in Tegucigalpa, Honduras. Initially the Honduran government refused to let him leave the country, although the others were permitted to depart for Nicaragua almost immediately, and his fate was uncertain until a week ago when the Honduran authorities finally let him fly to Mexico City.

The defection ended what Martinez Mondragon described as a prolonged personal ordeal of several years as he grappled with his own doubts about the guerrillas' cause and, even more, about their behavior in the field. In a four-hour interview here last night, he said he left the contras in disgust with what he said were their routine practices of murder, kidnaping and rape of Nicaraguan civilians.

"They are kidnaping and killing people who just want to work," the 26-year-old defector said. "This wasn't a struggle. It was banditry."

While there have been news reports of individual incidents of alleged killings and abductions by the contras of Nicaraguan civilians who were, or were believed to be, Sandinista sympathizers, Reagan administration officials in the past have denied the validity of claims that such practices were routine and characterized the claims as propaganda.

In another assertion that was likely to be controversial, Martinez Mondragon said that the Honduran, Salvadoran and Guatemalan armies have supplied the contras with the bulk of their ammunition and other military supplies since the CIA stopped funding them a year ago.

Spokesmen in Miami and Honduras for the rebel group Martinez Mondragon belonged to were unavailable today for comment on his specific allegations.

Because of the severity of his charges and the unprecedented nature of his defection, Martinez Mondragon's change of heart could contribute to the political debate that extends from Managua to the U.S. Congress. The guerrillas previously have drawn criticism for human rights abuses from some unofficial U.S. monitoring groups. This has become a factor in the U.S. debate over whether Washington should resume financial backing for them.

Several former Sandinista leaders, such as Arthuro Cruz and Eden Pastora, and many sympathizers of the Sandinistas have broken with Managua's government and are allied with the rebels. Martinez Mondragon, a middle-level contra field commander, is the first to go the other way.

The defection already has triggered a flurry of activity by several of the players involved, either to control the damage or maximize it.

The Nicaraguan Democratic Force, the largest of the rebel groups and the one to which Martinez Mondragon belonged, already has suggested that the defector had lost some of his mental faculties because of a motor vehicle accident. The force, known by its Spanish initials FDN, also has charged that Martinez Mondragon's lover was a Sandinista spy who may have encouraged the defection.

For its part, the Nicaraguan government wasted no time making the defector available to the media, presenting him both at the interview last night and at a news conference upon his arrival in Managua this morning.

In the interview, Martinez Mondragon alleged that the contras have regularly killed Nicaraguans who refused to join the rebel

cause after crossing the border into Honduras or after being abducted and brought there by the guerrillas. He said that there were several clandestine cemeteries for such victims along the Nicaraguan-Honduran border, including one near a hamlet called San Judas in Honduras' Choluteca province, and another at La Lodoza in El Paraiso province.

"If you won't fight, then they think you are a [Sandinista] infiltrator and kill you," he said.

He said the armed forces of Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala currently are providing the FDN with the bulk of its ammunition, uniforms and boots. He said he has seen Honduran military trucks and helicopters deliver ammunition and other supplies to contra camps, and that he had learned from friends who handled the rebels' supplies that these three countries' armies were the principal source of materiel.

The FDN's base camps are inside Honduras just across the border from Nicaragua, and the defector said that Honduran army officers control all deliveries of military supplies to the contras.

Since Congress stopped the CIA from funding the guerrillas a year ago, the source of the rebel's military supplies has been something of a mystery. The rebels say they have continued their fight with the aid of private donations, but several reports have surfaced that the Honduran, Salvadoran and Guatemalan governments were playing an important role.

Martinez Mondragon said that other contra commanders had told him that "the CIA advisers arranged for the Salvadoran, Guatemalan and Honduran armies to provide materiel" to the FDN. He did not say when the CIA supposedly had done this, however.

He said guerrillas fequently had raped civilian women in Nicaragua and abducted them for sexual use.

During a patrol in Nicaragua's Jinotega province last August, the defector said, he came across a group of 40 families near Wina who said that they had been abducted by another patrol from the San Jacinto regional command. This patrol had abducted and raped eight young women from the group, and had killed eight young men who refused to join the rebels, he said.

At that time, Martinez Mondragon said, he radioed FDN military leader Enrique Bermudez to complain about the treatment of the civilians. Bermudez told him "to stop interfering in business that doesn't affect you," the defector said. This was only one of several times that Martinez Mondragon complained to FDN leaders about abuses by the rebels and received unsatisfactory responses, he said.

The interview was conducted in a sitting room at the Nicaraguan ambassador's residence in Mexico City, but the defector said that he had not been pressured to grant the interview and had not been briefed beforehand by Sandinista officials. Nicaraguan Embassy officers wandered through the room from time to time during the talk, but their presence did not seem to affect Martinez Mondragon.

The defector acknowledged that he was seriously hurt in the vehicle accident, when he struck his head hard and was unconscious for a week. He spoke slowly, occasionally lost his train of thought and said that his head still hurt "deep inside" from time to time.

While the FDN has suggested that he cannot be trusted because of brain damage, the FDN did entrust him to command several missions inside Nicaragua after the accident has taken place.

Martinez Mondragon expressed fears that the FDN would take reprisals against his friends or family. He said he believed the FDN's leadership was responsible for the deaths of his brother and two of his cousins.

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. FRANK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PICKLE, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, today.
Mr. GAYDOS, for 30 minutes, June 11.
Mr. GAYDOS, for 30 minutes, June 12.
Mr. WILLIAMS, for 60 minutes, June 19.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOLBE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCKINNEY.
Mr. GRADISON.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. FRENZEL in three instances.
Mr. PETRI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BARNES.
Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.
Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.
Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.
Mr. BONER of Tennessee in five instances.
Mr. DONNELLY.
Mr. WISE.
Mr. NATCHER in three instances.
Mr. HUBBARD.
Mr. BENNETT.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 11, 1985, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Report of a House committee concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the first quarter of calendar year 1985 in connection with foreign travel pursuant to Public Law 95-384 is as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 30, 1985

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Joseph Addabbo	1/7	1/9	Italy		166.00						166.00
	1/9	1/11	Israel		200.00						200.00
	1/11	1/14	Italy		225.00		4,379.00				4,604.00
Hon. Daniel Akaka	2/9	2/13	Brazil		495.00						495.00
	2/13	2/17	Argentina		432.00						432.00
	2/17	2/19	Puerto Rico		150.00						150.00
Military transportation							4,068.16				4,068.16
Hon. Les AuCoin	1/4	1/7	Portugal		324.00				72.92		396.92
	1/7	1/9	Belgium		216.00						216.00
	1/9	1/12	Israel		399.00				207.72		606.72
	1/12	1/13	Denmark		111.00				15.48		126.48
	1/13	1/17	Soviet Union		635.00						635.00
	1/17	1/19	Austria		230.00						230.00
Military transportation							5,556.94				5,556.94
Hon. Lindy Boggs	1/5	1/8	Israel		399.00				566.28		965.28
	1/8	1/11	Egypt		246.00				304.81		550.81
	1/11	1/15	Greece		540.00				80.66		620.66
	1/15	1/18	Spain		327.00				197.51		524.51
Military transportation							8,817.30				8,817.30

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 30, 1985—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Richard Durbin	2/7	2/8	Mexico		162.56						162.56
	2/8	2/10	Nicaragua		271.00						271.00
	2/10	2/12	Costa Rica		150.00						150.00
	2/12	2/13	El Salvador		75.00						75.00
	2/13		United States		70.40		1,093.78				1,164.18
Hon. Bernard J. Dwyer	1/22	1/23	Portugal		150.00						150.00
	1/23	1/26	Germany		150.00						150.00
	1/29	1/31	Great Britain		267.00		4,226.00				4,493.00
	2/8	2/11	France		252.00						252.00
	2/11	2/13	Sudan		168.00						168.00
	2/13	2/16	South Africa		225.00						225.00
	2/16	2/17	Zaire		134.00						134.00
	2/17	2/19	Senegal		150.00						150.00
Military transportation							7,472.34				7,472.34
Hon. William Lehman	2/8	2/11	France		252.00						252.00
	2/11	2/13	Ivory Coast		156.00						156.00
	2/14	2/14	Congo		104.00						104.00
	2/15	2/17	Zaire		402.00						402.00
	2/17	2/19	Senegal		150.00						150.00
Military transportation							3,786.44				3,786.44
Commercial transportation							1,902.70				1,902.70
Hon. John Myers	2/8	2/11	France		252.00						252.00
	2/11	2/13	Sudan		168.00						168.00
	2/13	2/16	South Africa		225.00						225.00
	2/16	2/17	Zaire		134.00						134.00
	2/17	2/19	Senegal		150.00						150:00
Military transportation							7,472.34				7,472.34
Hon. Neal Smith	2/8	2/11	France		252.00						252.00
	2/11	2/13	Sudan		168.00						168.00
	2/13	2/16	South Africa		225.00						225.00
	2/16	2/17	Zaire		134.00						134.00
	2/17	2/19	Senegal		150.00						150.00
Military transportation							7,472.34				7,472.34
Terry Bevels	1/22	1/23	Portugal		150.00						150.00
	1/23	1/26	Germany		150.00						150.00
	1/26	1/29	Belgium		150.00						150.00
	1/29	1/31	Great Britain		178.00		4,154.00				4,332.00
Delacroix Davis	2/10	2/11	France		84.00						84.00
	2/11	2/13	Ivory Coast		156.00						156.00
	2/14	2/14	Congo		104.00						104.00
	2/15	2/17	Zaire		402.00						402.00
	2/17	2/19	Senegal		150.00						150.00
Military transportation							2,516.10				2,516.10
Commercial transportation							3,252.00				3,252.00
Jimmy R. Fairchild	2/8	2/11	France		252.00						252.00
	2/11	2/13	Sudan		168.00						168.00
	2/13	2/16	South Africa		225.00						225.00
	2/16	2/17	Zaire		134.00						134.00
	2/17	2/19	Senegal		150.00						150.00
Military transportation							7,472.34				7,472.34
John G. Osthaus	1/4	1/6	United States		112.50						112.50
	1/6	1/8	Costa Rica		140.00						140.00
	1/8	1/10	Guatamala		170.00		844.60				1,014.60
	2/8	2/11	France		252.00						252.00
	2/11	2/13	Sudan		168.00						168.00
	2/13	2/16	South Africa		225.00						225.00
	2/16	2/17	Zaire		134.00						134.00
	2/17	2/19	Senegal		150.00						150.00
Military transportation							7,472.34				7,472.34
Donald E. Richbourg	1/7	1/9	Italy		166.00						166.00
	1/9	1/11	Israel		200.00						200.00
	1/11	1/14	Italy		225.00		4,248.00				4,473.00
Committee total					14,637.46		86,206.72		1,445.38		102,289.56
Appropriations, surveys and investigations staff, expended between Jan. 1 and Mar. 31, 1985:											
R. Douglas Dunkle	2/2	2/8	Japan		549.75		2,041.00		32.80		2,623.55
Edwin C. Eads	1/28	2/10	Germany		993.75		1,986.93		6.72		2,987.40
	2/10	2/13	Belgium		243.75						243.75
	2/13	2/15	England		166.00				8.22		174.22
William P. Haynes	1/28	2/10	Germany		993.75		1,986.93		12.72		2,993.40
	2/10	2/13	Belgium		243.75						243.75
	2/13	2/15	England		166.00				8.22		174.22
Joseph D. Powell	2/2	2/8	Japan		549.75		2,041.00		32.80		2,623.55
Richard E. Sheffield	1/30	2/3	Korea		350.00		2,141.70				2,491.70
	2/3	2/7	Japan		352.75				29.00		381.75
	2/18	2/20	England		186.75		2,024.00		48.70		2,259.45
	2/20	2/23	Germany		206.25				5.00		211.25
	2/23	2/27	Spain		323.00						323.00
Carlton A. Weiss	1/30	2/3	Korea		350.00		2,141.70		38.00		2,529.70
	2/3	2/7	Japan		352.75				9.00		361.75
	2/18	2/20	England		186.75		2,024.00		29.70		2,240.45
	2/20	2/23	Germany		206.25						206.25
	2/23	2/27	Spain		323.00				11.00		334.00
Committee total					6,744.00		16,387.26		271.88		23,403.14

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Chairman, Apr. 30, 1985.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1427. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 99-77); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1428. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the quarterly report on HUD-owned multifamily project negotiated sales, as required by the Senate committee report on the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for 1983; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1429. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2482 of title 10, to allow a commissary store of the Department of Defense to donate unmarketable (unsaleable), but edible, food which would otherwise be destroyed to authorized food banks (nonprofit) sanctioned by either the Department of Defense or the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1430. A letter from the First Vice President and Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting information on a proposed transaction of more than $100,000,000 with respect to U.S. exports to Colombia, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1945, chapter 341, section 2(b)(3)(i) (88 Stat. 2335; 91 Stat. 1210; 92 Stat. 3724); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

1431. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled: "Revenue Report for March 1985," pursuant to Public Law 93-198, section 455(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1432. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the Community Services Block Grant Act and the Community Economic Development Act of 1981, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1433. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notice of intent to issue commercial export license for sale of certain major defense equipment to Israel in the amount of $50 million, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1434. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed letter of offer to the Federal Republic of Germany for defense articles and services estimated to cost $372 million, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1435. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1436. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Trading with the Enemy Act in order to terminate the Office of Alien Property; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1437. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, transmitting notice of intent to issue commercial export license for sale of certain major defense equipment or services to Belgium, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1438. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 1984 report on the status of Federal agencies support of the National Decade of Disabled Persons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1439. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a report on the activities of the inspector general, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1440. A letter from the Assistant Vice President, Farm Credit Banks of Baltimore, transmitting the annual actuarial and financial report for the farm credit district of Baltimore retirement plan for the year ending December 31, 1984, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1441. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the inspector general's semiannual report, October 1, 1984 to March 31, 1985, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (96 Stat. 750); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1442. A letter from the Secretary, Postal Rate Commission, transmitting an evaluation of compliance with the laws relating to open meetings of agencies of the Government (Government in the Sunshine Act), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1443. A letter from the Secretary, the U.S. Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1444. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's 10th annual report, pursuant to Public Law 92-225, section 311(a)(9) (93 Stat. 1354, 1362); to the Committee on House Administration.

1445. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to the act of August 7, 1953, chapter 345, section 10(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1446. A letter from the Trustees of the Pribilof Islands Trust, transmitting a copy of the audited financial statement of the St. George Island Trust and progress report, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1166(g) (Public Law 89-702, section 206(g) (97 Stat. 842); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1447. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to repeal those portions that relate to vessels or shoreside facilities used in the fisheries trade or industry; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1448. A letter from the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting proposed rules and comments to implement the provisions of the Motor Carrier Safety Act concerning foreign motor carriers; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1449. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a report on the modifications needed in the comprehensive ocean thermal energy conversion research, development and demonstration management plan, pursuant to Public Law 96-310, section 3(d); to the Committee on Science and Technology.

1450. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the commercialization and operation of a civil land remote sensing satellite system by the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

1451. A letter from the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the annual compilation of personal financial disclosure statements filed by Members of the House of Representatives and legislative personnel for the period January 1, 1984 to December 31, 1984, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 703(a) (H. Doc. No. 99-76); to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and ordered to be printed.

1452. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance recruitment and retention by the Veterans' Administration of graduate and student nurses; to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs.

1453. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report of the nondisclosure of safeguards information, pursuant to AEA, section 147e. (94 Stat. 788); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 1533. A bill with an amendment (Rept. No. 99-165). 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. BREAUX (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LENT, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 2704. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 2705. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the Internal Revenue Service to make income tax refunds within 45 days after the tax return is filed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 2706. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish rational criteria for the imposition of the sentence of death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

51-059 O-86-23 (Pt. 11)

By Mr. FAUNTROY (for himself, Mrs. HOLT, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. BARNES, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. WOLF):

H.J. Res. 310. Joint resolution designating July 4, 1985, as "July 4th Family Celebration Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLORIO (for himself and Mr. LENT):

H. Res. 194. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should not sell advanced fighter aircraft, mobile antiaircraft missiles, or any other advanced arms to Jordan while Jordan continues to oppose the Camp David peace process; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

151. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to a space-based, nonnuclear defensive system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

152. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to the Vietnam war; to the Committee on House Administration.

153. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to youth suicide; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 43: Mr. DASCHLE and Mr. BOSCO.

H.R. 667: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. SAVAGE, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 712: Mr. FIELDS and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 753: Mr. CROCKETT.

H.R. 864: Mr. SYNAR, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mrs. HOLT.

H.R. 1029: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HARTNETT, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. LOEFFLER, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. STRANG, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. SWINDALL, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. RUDD.

H.R. 1099: Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 1622: Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. GRAY of Illinois, Mr. DYMALLY, and Mr. NIELSON of Utah.

H.R. 1660: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1715: Mr. PEPPER and Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1776: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 2038: Mr. SHAW, Mr. FASCELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ROSE, Mr. RAY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 2258: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2262: Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2337: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 2626: Mr. DIOGUARDI, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. EMERSON, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.J. Res. 105: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. PEASE, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. UDALL.

H.J. Res. 127: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.J. Res. 135: Mr. FLORIO, Mrs. JOHNSON, Mr. CARR, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DIXON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. DANIEL, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.J. Res. 156: Mr. WHEAT, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. TALLON, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.J. Res. 190: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. LELAND, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. STARK, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BARNES, Mr. FRANK, Mr. ROSE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 90: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H. Con. Res. 131: Mr. SCHUMER and Mr. ZSCHAU.

H. Res. 165: Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. BONER of Tennessee, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. CARR, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. REID, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. MOORE, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, and Mr. BROYHILL.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

120. By the SPEAKER: Petition of F. B. Jimenez, Manila, Philippines, relative to Philippine Scouts pay during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

121. Also, petition of the mayor of the city of Bowie, TX, relative to Federal Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

122. Also, petition of the city council of Tyler, TX, relative to an exemption from the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

123. Also, petition of the North Atlantic Assembly, Brussels, Belgium, relative to "Economic Interdependence and Alliance Security"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

124. Also, petition of the city council of Gothenburg, Sweden, relative to Central America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

125. Also, petition of the State of Maryland, Commission on Human Relations, Baltimore, relative to investments in South Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

126. Also, petition of the Board of supervisers, County of Los Angeles, relative to voting; to the Committee on House Administration.

127. Also, petition of John Christopher Garrison, San Diego, CA, relative to taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1555

By Mr. DURBIN:

—Page 61, beginning in line 14, strike out "Assistance under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to the economic support fund)" and insert in lieu thereof "(a) CONDITIONS.—Assistance described in subsections (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section".

—Page 61, line 18, strike out "amount of"; line 20, after "25 percent", insert "of the amount of economic assistance described in subsection (b)(1) and up to 25 percent of the aggregate amount of military assistance described in subsection (b)(2)"; and line 25, strike out "75 percent" and insert in lieu thereof "amount of assistance".

—Page 62, line 6, strike out "amount of"; line 8, after "50 percent", insert "of the amount of economic assistance described in subsection (b)(1) and up to 50 percent of the aggregate amount of military assistance described in subsection (b)(2)"; and line 15, strike out "50 percent" and insert in lieu thereof "amount of assistance".

—Page 62, after line 20, insert the following:

(b) ASSISTANCE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS.—The conditions established by this section apply with respect to—

(1) assistance provided under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to the economic support fund); and

(2) assistance provided under chapter 2 of part II of that Act (relating to grant military assistance), chapter 5 of part II of that Act (relating to international military education and training), and the Arms Export Control Act (relating to foreign military sales financing).

H.R. 1872

By Mr. BENNETT:

—At the end of Title II, add the following new section:

Section 207(a). That at the time of submission to the Congress of the requests by the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1987 expenditures for the Strategic Defense Initiative, said Department shall inform Congress as to:

(1) What probable responses can be expected from potential enemies should the Strategic Defense Initiatives be carried out to procurement and deployment, such as what increase may be anticipated in offensive enemy weapons in an enemy's attempt to penetrate the defensive shield by increasing the numbers or qualities of its offensive weapons;

(2) What can be expected from potential enemies in the deployment of weapons not endangered by the Strategic Defense Initiatives, such as cruise missiles and low trajectory submarine missiles;

(3) The degree of the dependency of success for the Strategic Defense Initiative

upon a potential enemy's not deploying anti-satellite weapons;

(4) Whether it would be in the best security interests of the United States to share our discoveries in the Strategic Defense Initiative studies with potential enemies as a way of discouraging their offensive weapons buildup, as has been suggested by the Administration; and

(5) The cost estimates for the proposed Strategic Defense Initiative, not only in research and development but in procurement and deployment,

(b) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to the authorizations in Section 201(a) for research, development, test and evaluation, the sum of $25,000,000 shall be available to the Department of Defense to complete the studies required for the information sought in Section 207(a).