HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, October 16, 1985*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Gracious God, we are appreciative of those people whose love has graced our lives and whose support has been our strength. We are thankful for family and friends who have encouraged us and whose concern has been with us in all the seasons of life. We remember their names in our hearts and pray Your special blessing upon them. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 103, answered "present" 7, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

YEAS—242

Ackerman
Akaka
Andrews
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Atkins
Barnard
Barnes
Bateman
Bates
Beilenson
Bennett
Berman
Biaggi
Bliley
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Borski
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (CA)
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Carper
Carr
Chapman
Chappell
Clinger
Coats
Coelho
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Cooper
Courter
Coyne
Crockett
Daniel
Darden
Daschle
Davis
de la Garza
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dowdy
Downey
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Edwards (CA)
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foley
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frost
Fuqua
Garcia
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hawkins
Hayes
Hefner
Heftel
Henry
Hertel
Holt
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Jeffords
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Kanjorski
Kastenmeier
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Kolter
LaFalce
Lantos
Latta
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Leland
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lipinski
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lundine
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDade
McHugh
McKinney
McMillan
Mica
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (WA)
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moore
Morrison (CT)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Ortiz
Owens
Panetta
Pease
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Rinaldo
Robinson
Roe
Rostenkowski
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Roybal
Rudd
Russo
Savage
Scheuer
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sharp
Shumway
Sisisky
Skelton
Slattery
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Denny (OR)
Spratt
Stallings
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stratton
Studds
Swift
Synar
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walgren
Weiss
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whitten
Wirth
Wise
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Wylie
Yatron

NAYS—103

Armey
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Boehlert
Brown (CO)
Burton (IN)
Carney
Chandler
Clay
Cobey
Coleman (MO)
Conte
Craig
Crane
Dannemeyer
Daub
DeLay
DeWine
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
Evans (IA)
Fawell
Fiedler
Fields
Frenzel
Gallo
Gekas
Gregg
Grotberg
Gunderson
Hendon
Hiler
Hopkins
Hunter
Ireland
Jacobs
Kindness
Kolbe
Kramer
Lagomarsino
Leach (IA)
Lent
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Lott
Lungren
Mack
Madigan
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
McCandless
McEwen
McGrath
McKernan
Meyers
Michel
Miller (OH)
Molinari
Monson
Moorhead
Morrison (WA)
Packard
Parris
Penny
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Roth
Roukema
Saxton
Schaefer
Schuette
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shelby
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stangeland
Strang
Stump
Sundquist
Swindall
Thomas (CA)
Weber
Wolf
Zschau

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7

Anderson
Dymally
Gordon
Hatcher
Sabo
Schroeder
Snyder

NOT VOTING—82

Addabbo
Alexander
Aspin
AuCoin
Badham
Bedell
Bevill
Boggs
Boland
Bonker
Bosco
Boucher
Boulter
Bustamante
Chappie
Cheney
Coble
Collins
Conyers
Coughlin
Dickinson
Dixon
English
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank
Franklin
Gingrich
Goodling
Hartnett
Hillis
Horton
Jenkins
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kostmayer
Lehman (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lujan
MacKay
McCain
McCollum
McCurdy
Mineta
Mitchell
Moody
Nelson
O'Brien
Oxley
Pashayan
Pursell
Ritter
Rodino
Rogers
Rose
Schneider
Solarz
St Germain
Staggers
Sweeney
Tallon
Tauke
Torricelli
Traxler
Udall
Vento
Vucanovich
Walker
Watkins
Waxman
Weaver
Whittaker
Williams
Wilson
Wright
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (MO)

□ 1225

Mr. RICHARDSON changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 2174. An act to provide for the transfer to the Colville Business Council of any undistributed portion of amounts appropriated in satisfaction of certain judgments awarded the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation before the Indian Claims Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amend-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ments to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 372) "Joint resolution increasing the statutory limit on the public debt," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. ROTH, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DANFORTH, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. LONG, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. CHILES, and Mr. LEVIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution correcting the enrollment of H.R. 2409.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

COMPETITION IN PAY TELEVISION

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to alert the House to a new American invasion—the invasion of the encryptors. Although this warning may seem a bit amusing, it is a most serious one.

Encryption or scrambling of satellite television signals is being tested now and is planned for full-time use early next year by most major producers of satellite television programming. In other words, Americans who have paid for, and installed home satellite reception systems will soon face a situation where more and more of the programming they now receive will be scrambled, and, thus, denied to them without the benefit of a decoding or descrambling device.

Pay television programmers, like HBO, Cinemax, Showtime, the Disney channel and others, are planning to scramble to protect their right to compensation. That is well and good—provided. Provided that home satellite systems have a fair right to pay for, receive, and descramble those signals.

Last year this House voted to deregulate a relatively new industry—cable television. And we did so because we expected cable TV to operate in a competitive environment. But if cable TV is ever granted the legal or practical exclusive right to distribute America's pay television programming, we will have been responsible for deregulating a virtual monopoly.

H.R. 1840, the Satellite Viewing Rights Act of 1985 seeks to guarantee a competitive environment—ensuring that your constituents and mine will have a real choice between cable and home satellite systems.

I urge you to consider cosponsoring H.R. 1840 before the invasion of the encryptors is upon us.

CONGRESS ADDRESSES PROBLEM OF INTERSERVICE RIVALRY

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, at long last, Congress is finally addressing the problem of interservice rivalry in our Armed Forces. Wonderful. It is about time we are doing something about the Pentagon and the infighting that goes on there. The rivalry among the branches of our services, the Navy, Army, Air Force, Marines, is legendary, as anyone who has served in the Armed Forces can tell you. Most Americans believe that one branch of our Armed Forces would rather win a fight with another branch than win a battle with one of our Nation's adversaries.

Also, because of the sharp separation among our Armed Forces, there are endless duplications and unconscionable added costs. This is one of the reasons our defense budget is so high. The effectiveness of our military is also impaired because of the lack of communication and coordination among the different branches in our Armed Forces. Yes, it is about time that the overweight Pentagon gets down into fighting trim and that we are not caught flatfooted in an increasingly dangerous world.

THE DOD AUTHORIZATION CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

(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, the delayed floor action on the DOD authorization conference agreement is resulting in serious repercussions for our enlisted personnel.

An example is the 3-percent military pay raise which was to be effective October 1, 1985. Another example involves the National Guard and Reserve bonus programs. Authority to pay enlistment and reenlistment bonuses expired on September 30, 1985. Once reestablished, the authority cannot be used retroactively.

It is not right that we continue to delay accepting the military conference agreement. It's not the big weapons systems that are affected by this delay—they will eventually come on line. It is the people, those in uniform and those waiting to wear the uniform, who are being hurt.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to bring this military conference agreement to the floor. Let's get with it.

THE COMMUNIST SANDINISTAS

(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, not long ago, many in this body asked: Are the Sandinistas really Communists? Are they really dedicated to making Nicaragua a totalitarian police state, modeled after Cuba?

Well, no longer should there be any doubt. Last night Sandinista Commandante Daniel Ortega suspended human and civil rights in that nation, including the right to free speech, free expression, public assembly, the right to strike, and freedom of the press. Justice Minister Rodrigo Reyes says news censorship "will be total." All sections of the media will now be required to submit their material to the Interior ministry prior to publication or broadcast.

Ortega said,

In response to the terrorist politics of the United States * * * internal pawns of imperialism supported by some political parties, news media outlets, and religious institutions have redoubled their actions to sabotage the defense forces of our homeland.

Cardinal Obando y Bravo a "saboteur"? la prensa a "saboteur" and "pawn of imperialism"? come on, Commandante!

The people of Nicaragua deserve better than this, Mr. Speaker. They wish to live free from totalitarianism, from repression and suppression and, yes, free from communism. The actions, again, on the part of the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, are testament to their own war being waged against freedom here in our own hemisphere. Once again, the Communist Sandinistas are showing the world their true colors.

A MORAL OUTRAGE

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

Mr. SILJANDER. I just recently came back, Mr. Speaker, from the dedication of the new Holocaust Museum. The speakers there were moving, asking us to remember, remember prejudice, remember hatred, remember racism. So it is fitting to continue this desire we have with the Soviet Jews, the starvation in Ethiopia, the suffering blacks in South Africa, as we have in Romania, with

religious and ethnic persecution, and so many other countries, to continue our moral outrage at racist comments such as those made by Reverend Farrakhan regarding the Jewish religion.

I have introduced a resolution condemning Mr. Farrakhan and his association with the Ku Klux Klan and his incredibly wild statements such as quoting Hitler as "a very great man." He said that Israel is "structured on injustice, theory, lying and deceit, using God's name to shield your dirty religion."

While some have said this resolution would only help promote Mr. Farrakhan, he has had rallies with thousands and thousands, recently almost 20,000 in New York, cheering him on. Our moral outrage must stand up and speak out somewhere along the line. How far can we allow Mr. Farrakhan to go before this Congress should speak up and exercise its freedom of speech and condemn Mr. Farrakhan and ask him to please cease and desist in his racist comments toward the Jewish faith.

TERRORISM

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I, too, had the honor this morning of being at the groundbreaking ceremony for the Holocaust Memorial. Mr. Eli Weisel, as the distinguished preceding speaker said, is truly the chronicler and conscience of the Holocaust. This morning, Mr. Weisel involved the memory of an American whose mortal remains are at this moment slowly making their way back to his homeland, the U.S.A. The bullet-punctured remains of Leon Klinghoffer bear cruel testimony to the horror of terrorism in our world today. No one is safe. Not children. Not senior citizens in wheelchairs. As Eli Weisel said at the ceremony this morning, this murder of Mr. Klinghoffer was so vicious, so ugly, so absurd, the shooting of an American in his wheelchair, in the 70th year of his life—organized crime hiding behind political rhetoric. But Leon did not disappear beneath the waves. William Shakespeare said it well in his play, "Hamlet," that "murder, though it has no tongue, will speak with most miraculous organ * * *."

Leon Klinghoffer in death has given the lie to the absurd remarks of terrorist Mr. Abbas and those apologists of terror around the world who have said that Mr. Klinghoffer probably died of a heart attack. Yes, a Mafia heart attack—that's a bullet in the brain.

I address you, President Mubarak. There are many of us in this House who are glad that you are the President of Egypt, but we implore you, before a stronger message is sent to you from the Congress of the United States, a financial message, please knock off this embarrassing rhetoric and stop responding to terrorism in a weak way. It is so unlike all the rest of your career. You're a fighter pilot; act like one. You sat next to President Sadat, your friend and mentor, as his blood was splattered on you by terrorist bullets. You survived by God's will alone. You took care of those killers permanently and avenged your President. Why so weak now? Stop widening this gap between our two countries. Let us stay together again in friendship, furthering peace in the Mideast. Do not let this terrorist hijacking of a pleasure ship succeed by damaging our good relations. Get real, Mr. President. Remember October 6, 1981.

EL SALVADORAN REFUGEES

(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, as a parent, my heart ached as I watched El Salvador's President Duarte send his children thousands of miles away to our country for protection. President Duarte and the people of his country have endured so much that this seems blatantly unfair.

As a Congresswoman, I am also angry that the same administration that would receive President Duarte's children for protection would continue to press criminal charges against American church people engaged in the sanctuary movement who are trying to protect other El Salvadoran refugees.

I hope, with all my heart, that this administration rethinks its position and stops prosecuting American citizens who are trying to aid refugees from El Salvador. When we admit the children of the President of that country, saying they cannot be protected, how can we possibly say that regular citizens can be safe? I also hope that this House moves as rapidly as it can on the Moakley bill, because that will help solve the problem.

□ 1240

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL POLICY

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently, I was pleased to have attended an excellent dinner-seminar held by the House Wednesday Group which I currently chair. The event was titled "The Role of Government in Economic and Social Policy" and proved to be a superb opportunity to have an informal exchange of ideas between Members of Congress and members of the business and academic communities.

The evening was highlighted by remarks from our colleague BILL GRADISON, Brad Butler, chairman of Procter & Gamble, and David Saxon, president of MIT. Following short informal presentations, we also heard from Paul Volcker, Martin Feldstein, Charles Schultze, Paul McCracken, and a variety of other outstanding individuals.

Not surprisingly, although we sought to explain specific policy questions in education, civil rights, and a range of other important topics, the bulk of our discussion kept coming back to the Federal budget deficit, its macro and micro effects, and the inability of our national political institutions to deal effectively with it.

We learned from our guests, Mr. Speaker, that the budget deficit is the fundamental problem behind our trade deficit and unbalanced economic recovery. We cannot continue to avoid the tough choices that come with running a government. At the same time, our guests learned from us that while government never quite moves fast enough to address all our problems, our approach to the deficit has changed substantially in recent years. We may not have done enough but at least we are moving in the right direction.

SUPPORT URGED FOR THE JCS REORGANIZATION ACT

(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, since 1982, the House Armed Services Investigation Subcommittee has looked long and hard into ways to improve the workings of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Gen. David Jones, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. Shy Meyer, the Army Chief of Staff, triggered this effort in 1982. Both generals in articles described the poor advice and even poorer staff procedures on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

After a series of very thorough hearings, the House passed JCS bills in 1982 and again in 1983 with broad, bipartisan support. On both occasions, the Senate was unable to draft its own Joint Chiefs of Staff bill. This year, the House Armed Services Investigation Subcommittee has again put together another JCS bill. This session, however, the chances are very good that the Senate will address this important matter.

Over the past 2 weeks, two highly respected Members of the other body have given a series of speeches about the very serious problems in the orga-

nization of our national defense establishment. I commend them for their efforts. Having worked on this issue since 1982, I am pleased about the bright prospect of the Joint Chiefs of Staff reform becoming a reality. I hope that the Members here will support the JCS Reorganization Act of 1985 that was recently adopted by the House Armed Services Investigation Subcommittee.

HIGH TECHNOLOGY MONTH

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

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the technology that is developed in this country is one of our most important national assets and affects nearly every facet of our lives.

Our homes are filled with the wonders of high technology making our lives richer and more comfortable.

The technological advances in the medical profession have increased the length and quality of our lives.

Space and ground communication systems have drawn the world community closer together thereby changing, for the better, our concepts of the world.

Technology has produced an unparalleled national defense capability and is a major factor in providing the proper climate for resumption of arms control talks.

Our developing high technologies also provide for our significant international competitive edge, producing both jobs and products.

The high return on our national investments in research and technology continues to be one of the best bargains available and I ask my colleagues to join with me this month, National High Technology Month, in recognizing and saluting the Nation's aspirations and achievements in the various and far-reaching fields of high technology.

CUT OFF AID TO EGYPT

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

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, Egypt's freeing of the hijackers of the *Achille Lauro*—who killed an American passenger—and its condemnation of our entirely justifiable operation to bring those outlaws to justice, should prompt reassessment of our aid program to Cairo.

When Anwar Sadat made peace with Israel under the Camp David accords, the United States swiftly rewarded Egypt. Economic and military aid was only $21 million in 1974—today it totals almost $2½ billion.

Now, President Mubarak, after giving misleading statements about the location of these hijackers, insinuates that our interception of the criminals, whom he allowed to escape, is an act of piracy. And he has the gall to demand an apology from us.

We supported President Sadat for an act of peace by greatly increasing assistance to Egypt. President Mubarak's tolerance of terrorism warrants an inverse response—a cutoff of that aid.

THE PEOPLE WANT ACTION ON THE DEFICIT NOW

(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, the people of my district want action on the deficit—and they want that action now.

While I was at home this last weekend, I stopped at a service station in Sunsites—the rural part of my district—to fix a leaky radiator hose. While the mechanic struggled under the hood of our car, he took the chance to tell me what he thought about our spending habits back here: "If you guys don't do something about that deficit, and stop all that spending," he told me, poking a greasy finger in my chest, "I'm not going to have this service station or any job * * * and you'll darn well be out of a job, too!"

You know, Mr. Speaker, he's right. And you know something else? The people of America have caught on to what we are doing back here. They've figured out that we can't have it both ways: voting for so-called "tough" budget resolutions to cut spending, and then voting for spending bills that waive the budget resolution.

Who are we kidding? Not the American people.

We need the Gramm-Rudman amendment to impose some discipline on us and on this budget process. Not next year. Not next month. We need it now.

RETAIN THE FULL DEDUCTIBILITY OF STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

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

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, tax reform will be successful only if it increases fairness and reduces the tax burden for middle America. This should be the test for any tax reform proposal. A major component of President Reagan's tax plan falls far short of meeting this test. That, of course, is the President's proposal to eliminate the deductibility of State and local taxes.

The State and local deduction has been a part of the Federal Tax Code since its creation in 1913. It is designed to prevent double taxation and to preserve the historic right of local governments to raise revenues.

A majority of middle-income taxpayers deduct their State and local taxes. In New York, the administration's proposal to end deductibility would add more than $1,600 to the tax bill of the average middle-income taxpayer.

Furthermore, ending deductibility would have a devastating effect on the ability of State and local governments to provide basic services. Education, police and fire, aid to the poor and elderly, health programs, all would suffer.

This proposal is even worse because it comes at a time when State governments are being forced to bear a greater responsibility for public services.

Finally, eliminating the State and local deduction would erode property values and dramatically increase the cost of home ownership.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to make certain tax reform fair and equitable, the full deductibility of State and local taxes must be maintained.

FAVORABLE CONSIDERATION URGED FOR BUY AMERICAN PROVISIONS IN H.R. 2959

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

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to weigh several factors when they consider funding for the Bonneville Power Administration. Last month, Westinghouse announced it will no longer make large power circuit breakers. If access to foreign markets were consistent with access to U.S. markets, Westinghouse would still be making circuit breakers.

They will now be made abroad; another example of exporting not products but jobs. Twelve hundred jobs. The 1979 trade agreements did not incorporate Government procurement of heavy electrical equipment and our trading partners have taken advantage of this by selling here while U.S. manufacturers have been excluded over there.

In the last 5 years, foreign penetration in the U.S. market has gone from 15 to 95 percent. There is no reciprocity. Yet in the last 4 years, over 80 percent of the items purchased by Bonneville Power Administration and funded in large part by American taxpayers have been for foreign-made equipment. Why? These are American taxpayers' dollars. We, the Congress, are the trustees for that money. In good conscience, we must make certain

American taxpayers' money is spent to insure American jobs.

Please consider favorably the buy American provisions in H.R. 2959.

□ 1250

NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS SUPPORT STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the city of Washington, DC, is generally regarded as the news capital of the world, but, surprisingly, with respect to a very historic event that took place yesterday in the city of San Francisco, I have not seen that event reported anywhere since it took place. That event was a convening of the North Atlantic Assembly made up of parliamentary representatives from the 16 NATO countries who, after a 3-day discussion of the issue and after listening to outstanding and very informative speeches by Secretary Shultz and Ambassador Nitze, voted overwhelmingly to support the Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan.

In fact, that voting margin was 4 to 1 when the votes were counted by our NATO allies, and I think that is an outstanding and surprising success for the SDI.

This remarkable result, Mr. Speaker, was made possible by the tireless efforts of the leaders of our North Atlantic Assembly House delegation, the gentlemen from Texas, Mr. BROOKS, a former President of the Assembly, and the chairman of the House delegation, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. FASCELL, the chairman of the great House committee on Foreign Affairs. Both of these leaders worked tirelessly with the delegations from Europe and Canada to convince them of the wisdom of the SDI.

I might also point out that both of these leaders who made this important victory possible for the Reagan administration were both Democrats. In that great legislative body, there was no partisanship; we worked as a team.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3520

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3520.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO SIT DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1985

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit at 10 a.m. on Thursday, October 17, 1985, for the purpose of holding a hearing on H.R. 277—a bill to amend the laws on limitation of a shipowner's liability—and on chapter 311 of H.R. 3156 pertaining to limitation of liability.

The ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LENT] and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] have been apprised of the hearing date and time and are in accord with this request.

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

There was no objection.

LET'S ADD A LOTTERY TO THE DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 weeks, the House and Senate have passed separate plans with one common goal—to eliminate the Federal deficit by 1991. Both plans would do this mostly through spending cuts with no new sources of revenue.

That does not have to be the only way. I have a modest proposal for the House-Senate conferees that would make the final deficit reduction plan less painful. Simply provide authority to conduct a national lottery in any of the 6 years of the plan. What a painless but potentially powerful source of new revenues.

States have a successful track record with lotteries. In 1983, revenues from 18 State lotteries exceeded $5.2 billion. Consider that in New York, in the week before the $40 million lottery award, tickets were selling at a rate of 20,000 a minute. Consider that our Nation's newest lottery in California saw 30 million tickets sold in just the first 2 days of operation.

Conservative estimates show a national lottery could raise between $12 and $18 billion a year depending on participation. The goal of the deficit reduction plan is $36 billion in savings a year. This means a national lottery could represent between one-third and one-half of these savings.

As the author of a national lottery bill, I urge it be given consideration. Its time has come.

SANDINISTA REPRESSION AGAINST THE NICARAGUAN PEOPLE INCREASES

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, from the inception of their regime, the Sandinistas have made no pretense of being anything other than committed Marxist-Leninists. Since coming to power in 1979, they have not deviated from establishing a totalitarian society against the wishes of the Nicaraguan people. We see increasing evidence of this repression in reports from Managua.

Now the ruling-junta has suspended civil liberties for 1 year, reducing the already restricted freedoms of the Nicaraguan people. And, in true Communist fashion, they shut down the Catholic Church newspaper, Iglesia, and intimidated its employees.

The Sandinistas claim this action was in response to the U.S. threat against Nicaragua. But this is the same excuse we've heard since they marched into Managua.

These recent measures aren't a result of U.S. actions; rather they're just part of the standard methods of Communist consolidation.

The threat, Mr. Speaker, to Nicaragua is not from the United States, but from the Nicaraguan Government. It is they who are oppressing their people. These latest Sandinista actions should be seen for what they really are—proof that the Communist in Managua are becoming more desperate, and their policies bankrupt.

ELIMINATING STATE AND LOCAL TAX REDUCTION IS BOTH UNPOPULAR AND UNFAIR

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

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the proposal to eliminate the deduction for State and local taxes.

Eliminating this deduction would constitute double taxation for millions of hard-working middle-income taxpayers.

Must the middle class be asked to take on an even greater share of the financial burden of this country? Of my constituents responding to a recent survey I conducted, 82.4 percent say no.

Across the Nation an estimated 70 to 80 percent of all taxpayers, again, say no. This figure includes over 60 percent of those from low-tax States, as well as nonitemizers. Eliminating the State and local tax deduction is not only unpopular, it is unfair.

I urge my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee to preserve the State and local tax deductions. Let us not add to the existing tax burden of the middle class who is more than contributing its fair share.

DEFICIT REDUCTION ISSUE NEEDS MORE ACTION, LESS TALK

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

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Speaker, a weekend visit to my district does not go by without hearing the question: "When are you going to do something about the deficit?"

Given the rhetoric that we hear almost daily in these Chambers, one would get the impression that that action is imminent, but last Friday, when given an opportunity to do something specific about reducing our national deficit, we passed the issue off again and sent it to conference so we could talk about it some more. That is somewhat consistent with the action we traditionally take of waiving budget resolution requirements and of voting to increase spending on appropriation bills.

The facts are that we are not dealing with this issue. The people of America want it dealt with, and they want it dealt with now. We have an opportunity to do it through a specific proposal that sets targets and gives discipline to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will quit talking and get on with the action that is necessary.

AMERICA'S ALLIES OFFER SCANT SUPPORT OF ANTITERRORISM EFFORTS

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

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, as the *Achille Lauro* drama continues to unfold, we are basking in the glory of finally having done something against terrorists.

But unfortunately, relations with some of our allies have hit rock bottom over this incident. President Mubarak of Egypt lied to the press and personally lied to the American Government. Italy allowed a known terrorist and murderer to quietly leave their country after United States warrants had been issued for his arrest.

These actions are a damning indictment of the commitment of our allies to support us and stand firm in the face of terrorism. It also questions the very substance of our relationships with these nations and the continued wisdom of pouring billions of U.S. aid dollars from American taxpayers into foreign coffers.

Mr. Speaker, one daring intercept does not an antiterrorist policy make. Clearly these events have shown us that a coordinated, formal policy of combating terrorism must be formulated and ratified by the United States and its allies.

We must learn to work together and depend on each other to lick this international menace.

A WRONG APPROACH TO SOLVING THE DEFICIT PROBLEM

(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, let us be clear about the deficit problem and what is being done. First of all, it is obvious to all of us and to all Americans that we have a serious problem with this Federal deficit.

□ 1300

We are now in conference with the Senate to try to resolve it. Two things ought to come from that, in my judgment. No. 1, we ought to require this President, who continually talks about balanced budgets, to send balanced budgets to Congress; and No. 2, we ought to require Congress to balance the Federal budget.

Now there were two things wrong that came from this missive that came from the other body. First, they say, "Let's do all of these things, but we want to wait until after the next election to get it done."

I say that is baloney. Let us roll up our sleeves and get it done. You want to do it, let us do it now. Let us not wait until after the next election.

And second, they say, "We want a little escape hatch here for this fiscal year leading up to the election. We might want to spend $20 billion more in this fiscal year."

So let us be clear about what is going on. We want to solve this deficit problem. I want this President to be required to submit balanced budgets to Congress, and I want this Congress to be required to balance the Federal budget at some point in the future.

But what came from the other body does not make sense at all for those two reasons. First, it does not take effect until after the next election; and second, in my judgment, it is not the right kind of medicine to solve this kind of problem and it would allow for more spending in the first fiscal year.

A WIDE RANGE OF CIVIL RIGHTS SUSPENDED IN NICARAGUA

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

Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, as other Members have already mentioned, President Daniel Ortega of Nicaragua suspended yesterday a wide range of civil rights in his country. These rights include the right to public meetings, the right to strike, the right to freedom of expression, the right to move about freely within the country, and the right to organize into labor groups.

To make sure everybody understood he was serious, he sent people in, security agents of his Government, to the offices of the Roman Catholic Church's printing press to prevent the publication of a new magazine.

So maybe we ought to pay attention to his words and his actions and understand what he is doing. He is doing what many of us have warned about for some period of time. He is making sure that they entrench their Marxist-Leninist government in Nicaragua.

Just before the so-called elections in Nicaragua last year, he suspended the suspension of these civil rights for a short time in a showing of good faith; that is to try to dupe us into believing that those were free elections.

The folks who were down there, the folks who were elements of the other parties, refused to participate in the elections because they said they were not given an opportunity to freely participate. And some in this country suggested that those people were being less than forthcoming and, in fact, those elections were fairly free.

Let us just look at the record now. I think it is fairly clear what Daniel Ortega and his compatriots are doing down there. They are making sure that they are entrenched. They are violating civil liberties, and now they are doing it openly and efficiently. Let us take them at their word and take them at their actions.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS EXAMINATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1985

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

Mr. CARPER. Mr. Speaker, in 1985, almost 1,000 American banks are being maintained on a list of troubled institutions. Approximately 100 banks will fail this year in our country. Despite a return of profitability by a number of savings institutions, the situation in the savings industry is even more ominous, posing a threat to the vitality of the FSLIC which insures deposits in savings and loan institutions. Today, there are fewer than 4,000 remaining S&L's in America, as 1,000 of them have been liquidated and merged in the past 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I am introducing, along with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNDINE], legislation that will represent a major step forward in our attempt to ensure the safety and soundness of our financial institutions—banks, thrifts, and credit unions. I am pleased to be able to tell you that the bill is being introduced with over half of the members of the House Banking Committee as original cosponsors.

As our financial institutions have become more complex in their products and services, State and Federal examiners are being overwhelmed by their ever-growing responsibility for supervising these institutions. Low pay for examiners has led to high turnover rates and the loss of experience on the job. Without an experienced pool of expert examiners, early detection of risk in financial institutions is difficult. There is no question that identifying problems sooner is one of the keys to lowering the number of bank and thrift failures.

This legislation grew out of hearings conducted by the Banking Committee over the past year and meetings Congressman LUNDINE and I have held with representatives from the financial industry and the regulatory agencies. Many suggestions have evolved from these discussions, ranging from risk-based premiums and risk-based capital to market-based accounting. However, there was no consensus on any of these proposals. During this lengthy process, many witnesses did testify to the importance of improving the compensation and training of examiners as a fundamental first step, regardless of what other changes may be made.

Briefly, my bill would authorize the development of a reasonable system of compensation for all Federal examiners. Additionally, the bill provides for better training of these examiners, and it authorizes a graduate degree program in financial management analysis. Finally, the legislation would require the establishment of a uniform procedure for reviewing, with the consent of the States, State examinations of institutions which are also subject to examinations by Federal agencies.

I hope that these steps will help provide Federal and State examiners of financial institutions with the expertise to identify problem institutions sooner—restoring confidence in our banks, thrifts, and credit unions. It is a logical first step toward enhancing the safety and soundness of our financial system.

COSPONSORS INVITED FOR LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE QUALITY OF BANK EXAMINATION

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

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Delaware, for this cooperative effort with respect to improving the quality of bank examinations and I take pride in being a cosponsor of that legislation.

I am also today introducing legislation requiring the President to call an international conference to reform the monetary exchange system in this country and in relation to other currencies around the world.

We all know that the overvalued, inflated dollar, is a major aspect of our international trade problem. Various economists have tried to quantify it, some saying that it is as much as 70 percent of our trade deficit problem.

Now, what can we do about the overvalued dollar? Last week I joined our colleague in the other body, the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. BRADLEY, in cosponsoring a strategic capital reserve designed to intervene on a strategic basis in capital markets to bring the value of the dollar into line.

Today I am introducing a long-term program to bring monetary reform to international exchange and I invite the attention of the House and the cosponsorship of my colleagues for this legislation.

BLACK CAUCUS BUDGET WOULD HAVE REDUCED DEFICIT

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a moment to comment on this issue of the budget deficit. There has been a great deal of discussion with respect to the need for Members of the House of Representatives to in effect bite the bullet or make the difficult decisions to govern this country and simultaneously bring down the budget deficit.

I would like to submit, Mr. Speaker, that the 20 Members of the House who make up the Congressional Black Caucus did just that. We submitted a national budget for all of America and in so doing we brought down the budget deficit over the out years more efficiently and more effectively and more drastically than any other budget submitted to the Congress of the United States and we did so for 5 consecutive years.

In effect, we did bite the bullet. We did make the difficult political decision that we were prepared to defend politically, intellectually, ethically, as well as morally.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that embracing the Gramm-Rudman formula that would bring down the deficit by 1991 is really a flight into fantasy. It really does not require the Members of the House to bite the bullet. As a matter of fact, it takes us off the hook. We tend to cling tenaciously to the magic carpet ride or a new formula that would not require that we make difficult decisions.

We embraced the nuclear freeze. We did not have to make decisions about bringing down the incredibly dangerous levels of nuclear weapons.

We had an across-the-board freeze cut so that we would not have to make difficult decisions that we would have to stand up and defend intellectually, politically, as well as morally.

Now we have a new formula, the Gramm-Rudman formula, which does not require us to make difficult decisions. We just hurt people across the board. I think it is inappropriate, Mr. Speaker.

AVOIDING RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. LOWRY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] for the statement he just made. I am proud of the fact that for 5 years I voted for the Black Caucus budget, which did make the tough choices.

Nothing is better to show what a political sham the missioe that came over from the other side is than the fact that the day after they voted, 75 to 25, for the Gramm-Rudman, they voted overwhelmingly against cutting the defense budget, voted overwhelmingly against cutting Social Security, voted overwhelmingly against raising taxes. They voted overwhelmingly against the only really tough things which will do something about this budget deficit.

It is obvious that Gramm-Rudman is a way by which to get 33 Senators past the next election and avoid the tough votes. It is a political sham. We ought to throw it aside and come up with a real deficit reduction plan.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF RADIATION CONTROL FOR HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT—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 Energy and Commerce.

(For message, see proceedings of the Senate of today, Wednesday, October 16, 1985.)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 196 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1409.

□ 1310

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1409) to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, with Mr. GLICKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the first reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, today the Committee on Armed Services, the Subcommittee on Military Facilities and Military Installations, brings to the floor of this body H.R. 1409, as amended, the fiscal year 1986 military construction authorization bill.

In presenting this legislation, Mr. Chairman, I want to express my deep appreciation to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER], the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, for his leadership and assistance during extensive hearings on the bill before the body today.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would hasten to indicate that I would like very much to thank all the other members of the subcommittee for their extraordinary diligence on this bill, particularly at a time when we face severe budgetary constraints and difficult choices.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, the committee believes that H.R. 1409, as amended, is a good bill. It represents a balanced effort that sought to meet both the fiscal constraints that face us and to respond to the most pressing construction requirements of the military services.

For the benefit of the Members, Mr. Chairman, I would briefly review the development of this legislation. The purpose of the bill is to provide new military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military department, defense agencies, Guard and Reserve forces. Its enactment is necessary before appropriations can be provided to finance these activities.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense originally requested new authorization in the amount of $10.3 billion for fiscal year 1986. On May 14, by vote of 43 to 1, the Committee on Armed Services approved the bill before us, H.R. 1409, as amended, providing for $9.55 billion in authorization for the new fiscal year. This amount is $759 million below the administration's budget request.

The full committee action on H.R. 1409, as amended, followed extensive hearings and review by the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities. In order to be consistent with the expected final form of the first concurrent budget resolution, the committee adopted certain procedures as outlined in the committee report for reducing the budget request. These procedures resulted in a number of reductions being made and some projects being deferred that may otherwise be considered valid requirements.

In the interest of time, Mr. Chairman, I would not detail some of the individual actions taken by the committee. For your convenience, however, I have included in my statement a summary of those actions which are more fully explained in the committee report.

[In thousands of dollars]

Military department	Fiscal year 1986 budget request	Committee changes	Total approved by committee
Army	$3,649,674	−$250,263	$3,399,441
Navy	2,886,249	−284,015	2,602,234
Air Force	2,917,048	−107,487	2,809,561
Defense agencies	329,900	−124,140	205,760
NATO	98,000	−43,000	55,000
Guard and Reserves	428,600	+49,963	478,563
Totals	10,309,471	−758,942	9,550,529

But just to review, the fiscal year 1986 budget request from the administration was a figure of $10.3 billion. The committee then cut $758.9 million, for a total authority of $9.55 billion.

Mr. Chairman, I want to fully explain to my colleagues that the military construction authorization bill, although coming to the floor as a separate piece of legislation—and I would just add parenthetically that I think perhaps the only reason why the military construction budget comes to the floor as a separate item is simply because of the enormous number of individual contracts that are involved in the bill; and second, perhaps simply out of convenience and out of tradition; but this gentleman who chairs the subcommittee is seriously considering next year bringing the military construction budget as part of the total military authorization bill so that my colleagues will not become confused with respect to the notion that in some way the military construction budget indeed stands separate and apart from the total military authorization bill. Nothing can be further from the truth.

□ 1315

So that if we brought the bill in total, it would simply be another title of the military authorization bill, and the Chair thinks that next year that it probably would be more appropriate to do so, so that our colleagues can look at our military requirements in their aggregate, in effect embracing the Gestalt, rather than dealing with this particular bill as a separate item.

But to go further, as will be recalled, Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the first concurrent resolution on the budget, in the wisdom of this body they decided that the military budget for fiscal year 1986 would be frozen at last year's authorization levels. We agreed to that in the budget resolution. So we meant that the ceiling for the military budget of fiscal year 1986 would be $292 billion.

As a result of that budget debate and that budget decision that took place on the floor of this House, that was communicated to the Committee on Armed Services: That although the President of the United States had asked in the aggregate for a military budget approximately $322 billion in total, that the House of Representatives had given the Committee on Armed Services a maximum figure of $292 billion, which represented the authorization of last year so that we, in effect, froze it at 1985 levels.

The leadership of the House Committee on Armed Services, both Democrat and Republican, sat down and said, "We now are faced with a $292 billion figure. How do we then shift the priorities within that $292 billion figure?"

My colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services decided that if they had to cut down to a freeze level, $292 billion, that they wanted the heaviest cuts to come from procurement and research and development; that those two areas that over the last several years made a rather dramatic increase, that those two categories of the military budget should take the largest cuts, therefore providing that the No. 1 constructive priority would be in readiness and in quality of life.

Mr. Chairman, as most of my colleagues know, readiness and quality of life over the years has not been the highest of priorities. In this body we tended to be more preoccupied with the technology, with sophisticated weapons systems, but with not as much consideration for the human dimension of the military, where people work, how they live, how they function.

There are 2.1 million men and women serving in the U.S. military. So in the wisdom of my colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services, attempting to respond favorably to the first concurrent resolution on the budget, dealing with the budget for fiscal year 1986, decided that within that $292 billion figure that the Subcommittee on Military Facilities and Installations that this gentleman chairs, responsible for bringing a military construction budget to the floor, that we would take a lower cut, so they allocated cuts across the board to each subcommittee, and that those cuts would in the aggregate total $292 billion and not exceed it.

In that formula, this subcommittee was given a figure of $718 million to cut, and they said:

You guys deal with the issues of quality of life, family housing, et cetera. So you will take a cut of a minimum of $718 million.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the subcommittee took that responsibility very diligently and, as a matter of fact, not only did we reach the $718 million figure, we exceeded it. So we went to $759 million. So the President's request was at $10.3 billion. We then, given our allocation within the $292 billion, $718 million to stay within the freeze figure, exceeded that by a few million dollars, to $759 million.

I go into this elaborate explanation because there are some of my colleagues who have an unfortunate and misguided view, and that is that the military construction budget is indeed a separate piece of legislation because it tends to come to the floor separately, but it is not. The leadership of the Committee on Armed Services, carrying out its responsibilities beautifully, attempted to establish priorities and they said for the first time that quality of life will be a high priority issue.

So that means we came to the floor with a figure of $9.55 billion. Last year's authorization was at $9.1 billion. If one did not know, one would say, "Well, is this $450 million over and above last year's authorization? Does that take us beyond the freeze?"

The answer to that is no; that the figure that we brought to the floor of $9.55 billion is within the $292 billion freeze figure, simply allocated based upon priorities.

The Chair would like to point out one further thing with respect to these numbers. At some point one of our colleagues, or some of our colleagues, will offer an amendment to freeze back at appropriation levels. There are arguments that I will raise at that time, but I want to notify my colleagues that at the appropriate point we will offer a substitute amendment that would bring the authorization, notwithstanding any action we take on the floor of this body, that we would not authorize beyond $9.2 billion.

Let me explain where we get the $9.2 billion; $9.55 billion was within the $292 billion freeze level. As my colleagues know, we went to conference with the Senate and my colleagues decided that they would acquiesce to the Senate's figure of $302 billion. This was a decision that this gentleman did not agree with, and on the record opposed that decision. But the majority will was there and we came back from conference with a figure of $302 billion.

One would assume logically that if we came back with a larger figure, $10 billion over the freeze level, that the military construction budget would then have a higher figure. The interesting thing is that once the smoke settled and we realized all the deals that were made in the conference, the figure that was assumed in the $302 billion conference report actually was lower. It brought us down to $9.2 billion. The practical effect is that our budget was, in effect, cut prior to the time that we bring the authorization bill.

So the chairman believes that in carrying out the dutiful responsibilities of this subcommittee that we then have a responsibility to make this authorization bill conform to the conference report, even though it means a lower figure. So we will now be reducing, at the appropriate point in the proceeding this afternoon, from $9.55 billion and whatever add-ons we accept on the floor, back down to $9.2 billion maximum authorization, bringing us not only in compliance with the conference report, but several hundred million dollars under what was our responsibility under the $292 billion.

So the Chair would like to, in explaining this in some detail, Mr. Chairman, point out that this committee is clearly hundreds of millions of dollars within the freeze figure.

I might just add one other note parenthetically, Mr. Chairman. The figure that this body authorized for military construction last year was at $9.1 billion, I believe, so the $9.2 billion is only a few dollars over and above the authorization level. If we then go to conference at $9.2 billion, the Chair believes without fear of contradiction that this committee will more than likely come back probably with a figure even lower than the $9.2 billion, but that remains to be seen, given the comity between this body and the other body as we go to conference.

So I took that time to explain this in some detail. Just further and briefly, Mr. Chairman, because of the decision of establishing quality of life as the high priority of military construction, we were able to bring to the floor today a military construction bill with over 5,500 units of family housing, barracks, maintenance facilities to improve the living and working conditions of our men and women in uniform.

I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that some of us traveled to different military installations in this country and overseas as well. What we have come to realize is that the American military is rapidly becoming a married military, Mr. Chairman. A very high percentage of our military personnel are married people. That, then, means that we have to engage in certain kinds of policy decisions. How will these people live? We make a number of policies on the floor of this body that affect human beings in the military in very profound and dramatic ways. We have decided to have thousands of troops stationed in Europe. This gentleman has gotten up on the floor on numerous occasions and argued against that deployment, but the majority of my colleagues have seen fit to deploy. So if we deploy, we go overseas and ask these young people who are living on the economy, "How are you surviving?" We suddenly find out that many of them are subsidizing their service in the military, that their housing allowance is not adequate, that many of them live far away from the military base. They have to put a phone in and it comes out of their pocket. They have to purchase an automobile that they cannot afford. They are married. They have one, two, or three children.

□ 1325

I talked to young American military personnel in Germany who said, "I am not being given any dignity, Mr. Chairman, I am not living in dignity. If I were living in the United States, I would live better than this."

We talked to troops in the United States who cannot quite make it on their allowances, and so we have to address the human reality. We have to address the problems that are all too real among the people.

I might just point out the very dramatic case that took place at Fort Ord when a young child, a member of a military family, chose to take his life, to commit suicide because he felt that if his family did not have him to feed, one less mouth to feed, that that family could survive.

Consider the enormous and frightening and painful implications of having people in the military and we do not take care of the quality of their lives adequately.

I would argue that we ought to be dealing with the human misery of all people in this country, all people. I happen in this particular instance to have come to the floor dealing with the problems of young men and young women who serve in the military. So we tried to take this responsibility, Mr. Chairman, very seriously. And we expanded family housing. We tried to

bring in child care facilities, community service facilities, other kinds of facilities that are very real.

We talked to military commanders who said there was a time in my military career when I only had to deal with the tactical and strategic issues, but now I have to deal with the problems of marriage, the psychological problems, the problems of taking care of children, because I know that if a military person serving somewhere away from home is worrying about their children, worrying about their spouse back home, that 100 percent of their emotional, and intellectual, and psychological resources are not where they are because they are back home worrying. So our military commanders now realize that child care centers are not some frivolous addition, that family housing is not a frivolous addition, that community centers that serve people and serve married personnel in the military are not frivolous issues.

I would say to my colleagues, you have to put up or shut up. If you make the decision to deploy these troops, you have to deal with them in dignity.

People say, "Gee, is this RON DELLUMS, the progressive from Berkeley, making these kinds of statements? This is the guy that comes to the floor that challenges the military budget." But my response to that is we are not knee-jerk people, we are not saying, and we do not come here to say, that we are antimilitary.

What we are challenging are the specific roles we have the military playing, specific missions and policies that we have them carrying out, that one can intellectually debate, politically differ with, and we also oppose certain weapons that we place in the military's hands that we believe ultimately will bring devastation and destruction to the world.

So this notion are you promilitary or antimilitary, that is really a non sequitur. What we have to do is address the realities we are confronted with, and military construction is dragged by other kinds of decisions.

If you choose to build that B-1, you are going to have to construct landing pads. If you choose to build the MX, you are going to have to engage in construction around it. If you choose to deploy the Euromissile, you have to build support facilities. If you choose to forwardly deploy American troops in different places around the world, you have to take care of where they work, and where they live, and provide them with some dignity, some respect, and some sense of integrity.

So you have to look at the totality of the decisions that are made.

So this gentleman finds himself in a position of saying we must enhance the quality of life. I would like to see us do it for all people. In this instance, we are talking about the military, and we have to do it that way.

My colleagues on the Armed Services Committee with whom I often disagree strongly, we agree on enhancing the quality of life.

I pointed out earlier, and will go into it, on a vote of 43 to 1, the bill passed out. This gentleman was the one opposing vote. So they said how can you bring a bill to the floor and oppose it.

It is not that we did not do good work, and I commend everybody on the committee for doing extraordinary work in making the issue of quality of life a much more magnificent effort on our part. And so that is a good piece of this bill. But we cannot vote on that separate, it is a total bill.

My opposition was not a slap in the face of the work of my colleagues, because they worked diligently, and with honesty, and with integrity. What my opposition was is to simply say that this budget reflects the general bill. The decisions that are made in the big bill drag along this bill.

So where we had discretion; that is, quality of life, we exercised it. Where we did not have discretion, this bill conforms to the larger military authorization bill for fiscal year 1986.

So those persons, Mr. Chairman, who supported the military authorization bill, they can support this bill and there are probably reasons why they can be even more enthusiastic because there are a number of benign, quality-of-life projects that do not kill anyone, but do enhance the dignity of the human condition. Those persons who opposed the bill on policy and on principle, you still can oppose the bill, not because there are not good items in this legislation, but it embraces policies that are consistent with the other bill. I will go into that later.

Let me just in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, give a few highlights of what the committee did in terms of some of the dollar items. Briefly I will highlight some of the major adjustments made by the committee, and then reserve time.

A $22.7 million reduction in the Ground-Launched Cruise Missile Program. The decrease reflects the committee's action to defer $22.7 million for supporting facilities in the Netherlands until the country-to-country agreement has been finalized.

A $19.2 million reduction for construction in Spain. Renewal of the base rights agreement is in question due to the Spanish Government's recent restated desire to reduce U.S. forces in Spain.

A $39 million reduction for a binary component production facility. The cost estimate is questionable because it is based on zero design.

A $19.5 million reduction for controlled humidity warehouses in Korea. The committee questioned the scope and the cost and directed the Army to consider less expensive construction methods.

A $148 million reduction for a water reclamation and flood control project at Camp Pendleton, CA. For the second time, the committee deferred the Navy's share of the proposed $270 million project until the scope is resolved and independent action is taken by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

A $20.5 million reduction for airfield improvements in Keflavik, Iceland. The deferral of this project reflects committee concern that Iceland should share the cost since improvements would mostly benefit the new civilian air terminal under construction.

A $21.5 million reduction for a fleet operational control center in Japan. The committee deferred the project and directed the Navy to reevaluate the scope and the cost.

Mr. Chairman, then $43 million reduction in NATO infrastructure funds to reflect the U.S. dollar's strength against other NATO currencies.

Finally, in the general provisions, the committee approved the following major items:

Provisions that would increase the number of affordable housing units available for service personnel both in the United States and overseas, and I have alluded to that.

A provision authorizing the services to use funds appropriated for planning and design purposes to assist communities in planning for a major military growth impact.

Three fair-market-value land exchanges and three land conveyances were authorized.

Mr. Chairman, the committee believes that this is a balanced bill, a bill that on the one hand reflects the consensus of this body with respect to the policies established in the larger bill. It reflects from a monetary perspective the commitment to freeze at last year's level that this body adopted. And finally, it also is a bill that attempted to expand the quality of life and enhance the living and working conditions of our young men and women who happen to serve in the military.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I would be very pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I just wanted to commend the gentleman from California for his activities in this bill. As I have already told him, I had the privilege during the recess period to visit Germany in the so-called quick-look arrangement that the Secretary of the Army favors. We visited in the course of 3 days most of the headquarters of American units in Germany, and we were particularly impressed with the

construction that is going on with the 3d Armored Division in Friedberg.

The thing that was most remarkable was that in place of the old German kasernes, where many of our troops are still housed, in place of that, they are building new structures that were dramatically much more attractive, much more comfortable, more spacious for our enlisted personnel. I asked the commanding general, are these new modern structures not something that the Congress has directed, that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has innovated to improve the quality of life? Yes indeed, the general said these are the designs that Congressman DELLUMS insisted on to provide more space and more light.

As we walked through these buildings—they are not yet complete but they are pretty well completed—you could see the pleasure on the faces of the young men and women that were serving there and they were looking forward to the day when they could move into these modern facilities.

So when the gentleman talks about the quality of life, "you ain't just whistling Dixie." You have really put these ideas into reality over there. I am sure the enlisted personnel will certainly give their congratulations to you for what you have done. I think that is what the gentleman was talking about in this bill about improving the quality of life and I think it is a very remarkable achievement.

I hope that the House will approve this legislation overwhelmingly.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank my colleague, and I was very pleased to yield to him. I would simply say that I appreciate the personal references. They are always obviously gratifying.

But I would hasten to add that all of my colleagues on the subcommittee agree with respect to making this a major priority. And whatever accolades are given out, I would like to share them with all of my colleagues, because that is an area where we have all come together. We have our political differences. That is very obvious in the 15 years I have been here. But the rewarding thing is on these matters we have managed to close ranks and we have come together to enhance the quality of life.

I thank my colleague and, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself so much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 1986 military construction authorization bill that is before us this afternoon.

In that process, let me commend the members of the subcommittee and our staff for doing what I consider to be an excellent job. Let me especially commend the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], not only for his fair leadership, but also because of his, I think, farsightedness. I think he is far too modest in terms of his own role increating a new emphasis within the committee on quality-of-life issues.

Obviously the committee has for a long time been concerned that our military personnel around the world are well-housed and well cared for as an important ingredient in morale. But I think under his subcommittee chairmanship, more has been done quickly than certainly at any time that I have been privileged to be a member of this committee, and I think this body owes him a great debt of thanks for his efforts in this regard.

□ 1340

As the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] explained, this legislation represents an effort by the Committee on Armed Services to respond to the military services' most pressing construction needs and at the same time to do it within the fiscal constraints that face us.

Earlier, some of the major adjustments to this bill were explained, and I will not take the time of the Members of this body to reintroduce those subjects at this juncture.

Suffice it to say that the Department of Defense requested approximately $10.3 billion for fiscal year 1986 military construction. This represented some significant growth over the amount authorized by Congress for the 1985 fiscal year military construction program, and after a careful review of that request, this committee was able to reduce that number by $759 million; well within our overall objective of no real growth in the defense function.

The bottom line, I think, is as the gentleman aptly pointed out and must be remembered, is that this bill at its present funding level of $9.55 billion actually represents a figure that is $32 million below a freeze level compared to 1985 expenditures and authorizations.

I believe we were able to do this without damaging our defense readiness, without postponing badly needed projects to improve the facilities where our personnel live and work.

Even with the changes made by our committee, this bill provides a level of authorization that maintains the committee's propriety for quality of life projects. This means that besides providing facilities for new weapons systems, many substandard structures built during World War II can be replaced; modern barracks and working spaces will be provided for our forces at home and overseas, and programs to comply with environmental laws and for conserving energy will continue at an uninterrupted pace.

Although the committee has brought to the House a bill that entails a smaller total program than that requested by the administration, it preserves our defense readiness and in many instances improves our fighting capabilities.

I think this is a bill that the House can pass upon favorably, proudly, and I urge that this bill be passed by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER] has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] who is the ranking Democrat on the committee and a very diligent worker.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1409, the fiscal year 1986 military construction authorization bill. As the ranking majority member on the Subcommittee on Installations and Facilities, I would like to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DELLUMS, on the fine work he has accomplished in bringing this bill to the floor. With the cooperation of the ranking minority member, Mr. KRAMER, and the other members of the subcommittee and staff members most helpful, we were able to draft a bill which represents fiscal responsibility and, at the same time, provides the authorization levels required to fund the essential projects needed by our Active and Reserve Forces.

The total $9.6 billion figure in this bill reflects a reduction of some $700 million in the $10.3 billion amount requested by the administration. After extensive hearings and deliberations, the members of the Armed Service Committee considered the projects in the administration's request as well as requests for additional projects and made some very conscious decisions. However, I am particularly pleased to point out the emphasis placed on Guard and Reserve facilities, family housing, and other quality-of-life projects.

In arriving at its decisions, the committee felt that it was time to address the needs which have become so critical; needs such as family housing, antiquated barracks, and inadequate training and work areas. We cannot continue year after year to fund facilities for expensive weapons systems and let the needs of the men and women in uniform go unanswered.

Guard and Reserve military construction requirements also received particular attention by the committee. Mr. Chairman, as we all know, Congress has placed increasing emphasis on the Nation's Guard and Reserve Forces. This emphasis reflects, not only a desire to provide a first line of defense under the total force concept,

but also a desire to reduce defense expenditures. Reliance on our Reserve Forces has proven to be an effective means of achieving overall budget reductions.

Increased reliance, however, also requires increased support of these forces. The area of facilities is no exception. When the administration submitted its military construction request, I was dismayed to see that only 4.1 percent, or some $429 million, was intended to fund Reserve requirements. This was particularly alarming in light of the testimony we had heard indicating a backlog of more than $3 billion in Guard and Reserve construction projects.

I am pleased that this bill reflects action taken by the Armed Services Committee to help correct this Reserve and National Guard situation and make a dent in this backlog. I would hope that next year's request will reflect a more responsible evaluation on the part of the administration of Guard and Reserve requirements.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides authorization for the essential military construction projects and also represents a responsible approach to resolving some very critical problems. I, therefore, ask my colleagues for their support.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill pending here, on the military construction for this year, and I would like to join with my colleagues from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER] in paying tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], for his diligence, his hard work, his fairness and accommodation anytime I have had to deal with him, and as far as I know any other member of the committee.

We have a good subcommittee; a very good subcommittee. We approach it with dedication; we approach it with the interest of the American taxpayer in mind, and I think that we—even patting myself on the back as a member of that subcommittee—I think we do a darn good job.

We scrubbed the figures that were given to us; we reduced them; and then when the Budget Committee gave us a figure, to the full committee; the senior members got together and they said, "Well, all right, this is the size of the pie that we have, how do we divide it up? Do we take a pro rata part and have everybody take a certain percent, or what do we do?"

It was a joint decision of the full Committee on Armed Services that one thing that we wanted to protect was the quality of life of our enlisted men as well as our officers, and the things that make it worthwhile to serve on the Committee on Armed Services.

So because of this, it was the agreement of the Research and Development Subcommittee, the Procurement Subcommittee, the Seapower Subcommittee, all the other subcommittees that whatever retrenchments that were made in the spending levels that we wanted to make sure that our servicemen at home and overseas had a dignity to their military existence; themselves, their families, that their quality of life was not minimized by the cuts that we might be faced with here on the floor.

We did this, and so as was pointed out by the chairman of the subcommittee, when we had to take the cuts, we took them in other areas, but this is a part of the total bill. So when the total bill is, as we will mandate it by our Budget Committee on the House side at least, we were given $292 billion as the total bill. Then we went to conference with the Senate, and we came up with $302 billion. We have yet to come back to the floor and get the conference report approved, but then the Appropriations Committee gets into the process.

□ 1350

It is my understanding now that they have reported out again a reduction back to $292 billion. Well, that is all right. Whatever works out between the House and the Senate.

But what we must do is to see that our equipment is under canopies, in storage. It is going to ruin if it stands out in the rain or in the weather. We have to see that our people are living in dignified conditions, and this is not the case universally. It is especially not the case in Europe. It has not been the case historically. We have been working very diligently on the committee to increase and to enhance the quality of life because, you see, it is very pennywise and pound foolish not to spend what is needed and to lose that man that we have had 4 years of training invested in, plus his transportation, or even 8 years. When he says, "Hey, I don't like it here any more, my family is not being adequately cared for, my children are not proud to be in the military, we are living in substandard conditions," then we lose him because we have not provided for him.

I am the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, and I am here to tell you that some of the exotic, far out research and development programs that we have tightened our belt and made substantial reductions in research and development. But when it gets to a question of buying new weapons, of getting into the SDI star wars, and all these "big buck" programs, and you compare that to getting the troops out of the rain, putting them in decent housing conditions, I really do not think there is any comparison. So we have tried to protect, in the total budget, what we need for our people in uniform. We have not been extravagant.

We have come up with a figure less than what was asked for by the administration. I think any amendment that might be offered to decrease what we have done will really be short-sighted because I think we can justify everything that is within this bill, and I would certainly urge the Members, so far as the military construction part of the total military bill, I would urge all the Members to support this. If they are unhappy with the total spending on the military, if they do not want to buy weapon systems, if they do not want to do research and development, fine, attack those when they come in another section of the bill. But not out of the military construction part of it.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to another very diligent and hard-working member of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia

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

Mr. Chairman, most of the information that I was going to provide to the committee was already talked about.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the Military Installations and Facilities Subcommittee, chaired by the very able gentleman from California, held 2 weeks of hearings on this legislation. Our task was not an easy one, for we had to find ways to reduce the budget request and yet provide sufficient funds to field various new weapons, replace deteriorated World War II facilities at many bases, and provide better facilities where our military personnel live and work. I believe this bill accomplishes that goal.

We reduced the request by a net amount of $759 million by taking the following actions:

First, projects were disapproved when no clear requirement existed or because they failed to meet established construction design thresholds;

Second, project estimates were lowered wherever possible to reflect the currently favorable construction bidding climate, reduced inflation rates and favorable overseas dollar exchange rates; and

Third, available unobligated balances of prior-year authorization of appropriations were carried forward and applied wherever possible.

As a result of these actions, the committee was able to reduce the $10.3 billion request by $1 billion. At the same time, additional projects totaling approximately $250 million were included because of their relative priority in terms of contributing to

military readiness, morale, and operational capability.

We on the committee believe this is a good bill and deserves the support of the House. I urge its passage.

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

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1409, and I salute the members of the committee who have already spoken concerning the importance of this piece of legislation. But in particular, I would like to embrace the comments made by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

As a matter of fact, he so accurately described the importance and the scenario of how we got here that it leaves very little to be said. As a matter of fact, I would like to say that, for anyone, a Member of this body, who was here and listened to what our chairman had to say, it would be beyond me how they could oppose this piece of legislation.

When we started back in February of this year to address how we were going to spend our military construction dollars, we were working up to a budget figure that was, for the whole committee, $30 billion below what the President requested for all DOD spending.

This gentleman, quite frankly, did not agree with those figures, but that is what we had to live with. When the chairman and the ranking members of all the committees got together, they parceled up and responsibly made a decision as to how they wanted to spend those dollars.

Under any scheme of things, whether you go with the figures that came out of our conference or whether you go with the figures that came out of this body, we are below any freeze figure as for as Milcon is concerned. The only people that could oppose this bill under that set of circumstances are people who do not understand what we are trying to do here.

Just to put things in perspective, that cut, that $30 billion reduction from what the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, requested, and of itself, is three times as big as the entire expenditure for military construction in this bill.

This total expenditure for military construction, for the quality of life for our troops, for their readiness, for the defense of this country amounts to just a little over 3 percent of the Department of Defense authorization bill.

If you have problems with defense expenditures, wait until that bill, the defense authorization bill, comes along. In the meantime, I think every Member ought to take into consideration what we are trying to do here is allocate some $9.2 billion, less than 3 percent of the total DOD budget, and I think we have acted very responsibly.

I would like to say to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California, and for the benefit of the other Members, that I have served on this committee now for 3 years. When we started marking up and having hearings early this year, it was quite a challenge for us, notwithstanding the fact that some of the bigger cuts have been allocated to other subcommittees. We had to look at situations where we have people living in uninhabitable premises and deny them improvements. Yet they are supposed to proudly wear the uniform of the U.S. Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or the Marine Corps. When we had to make some pretty tough decisions and cut more and more, we did the right thing; we did it within the framework of the mark the subcommittee was given. When people come back and suggest that we were not responsible and did not allocate appropriately, I would suggest to them that if they have a problem with the size of the overall defense budget, wait until the other bill comes along. If you want to do something responsible, debate this bill and show us where we went wrong. The fact of the matter is, the chairman, the gentleman from California, has done an outstanding job. In all the time I have served in Government, I want to say that I have yet to serve with anyone who has been as fair, or more reasonable, and open to the Members when they wanted to come and plead their case.

So I say to the people who do not want to think about it but instead are a little concerned about the perception of what we are doing here in Washington, I would suggest you have missed an opportunity in the past to come before our subcommittee and find out where it is at. And I would suggest that if you had problems with the way we do our business, I know this chairman would welcome you to come before our subcommittee in the future and state specifically where you think we ought to beat up on the men and women in uniform in this country or upon the readiness of the defense of the United States of America.

So I salute the chairman for all the outstanding work he has done this year and in prior years, and, believe me, it is a privilege to serve on that subcommittee.

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from California and the members of his subcommittee for the excellent work they have done in providing the military construction authorization in support of the missions of our active duty and reserve forces.

The needs and demands for construction projects far exceed the available funds. Thus, it required a careful review by Mr. DELLUMS and his subcommittee of the Department of Defense's budget submission to Congress and the concerns of individual Members before a final decision could be made as to which projects would be authorized.

Besides providing the construction required to support the weapon systems Congress has approved, the committee gave careful consideration to quality of life programs for our service men and women, and their dependents.

Further, the subcommittee was very supportive of projects that will improve our military readiness through the enhancement of our in-house maintenance and repair capabilities.

My own district, the Fourth Congressional District of California, is home to two major Air Force facilities: McClellan AFB and Travis AFB, and in the surrounding areas we have Mather AFB, Sacramento Army Depot, and Mare Island Naval Shipyard. Chairman DELLUMS and his subcommittee have been very supportive of these bases both this year and in years past.

In this bill, the following projects have been approved: McClellan AFB receives $16.9 million for an aircraft accessory maintenance complex, $3.5 million for an ammunition storage complex, $13.1 million for a depot electronic warfare communication facility, $10.3 million for a logistics systems operations center, $12.8 million for a medical and occupational health clinic, and $700,000 for sound suppressor support.

Additionally, $5.8 million is approved to hook up McClellan's wastewater disposal system to the Sacramento regional system.

The Sacramento Army Depot will receive $1.9 million to construct a communication repair facility, and $4.5 million to construct an optical facility.

Mather Air Force Base will receive $1.5 million to construct an accounting-finance facility and $1.2 million to construct a central life support equipment facility.

Travis Air Force Base will receive $78 million for phase III of the David Grant Memorial Hospital and medical complex. This 298-bed facility will include outpatient clinics, a 52-room dental clinic, an aeromedical staging facility, and a hyperbasic chamber. It will serve over 70,000 people.

Other projects approved by the committee for Travis include a $2 million addition to the flight simulator train-

ing facility, a $2.1 million facility for hazardous storage, and $6.2 million for a weapons systems maintenance support facility. Total funding for Travis construction projects amount $81.1 million.

Mare Island will receive $815,000 for security lighting and $5.1 million for a sewage treatment program.

Again, I applaud the gentleman from California and his subcommittee for their outstanding work and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the job of managing the military construction bill is one that embraces all of our military facilities. I want to say publicly that the gentleman from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, is always open to listen to the literally thousands of requests that are made of him concerning the military installations in our country and around the world. And I want to say that the chairman has done an outstanding job.

I appreciate the time, the effort, the energy, and the intellect that the chairman has given to the subject over which he presides.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

For the purposes of entering into a colloquy, I yield at this time to the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK].

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. DELLUMS] if he could take a minute to discuss the very difficult Navy housing situation facing us in the San Francisco Bay area.

Currently, for Navy families in the bay area, we need about 1,000 units of housing beyond what is now available. Within a couple of years, the battleship *Missouri* and its escorts will be stationed in the bay, increasing the need for family housing to a total of 3,700 units by 1989.

Yet as you well know, the bay area is one of the most congested, expensive housing areas in the Nation. I think I can catch our colleagues' attention when I say it is even more expensive than housing in the Washington, DC, area!

There are very few open spaces suitable for masses of housing, but there is a large amount of housing that is suitable for rehabilitation and repair near some of the large naval facilities. Does the gentleman have any thoughts on how we can best meet the current shortfall in housing and prepare for the arrival of the *Missouri* personnel?

Mr. DELLUMS. There are severe Navy housing problems in the bay area and we must begin as soon as possible to solve those problems. But it is going to take the cooperation of all the parties involved—the Navy, the local government officials, and the community—if a solution is to be found to reduce the housing shortage.

I would hope we could provide housing near the bases, because in addition to housing shortages, the traffic congestion bottlenecks in the bay area are crippling. We don't need a lot of new long distance commuters.

I believe the city of Alameda is doing some work on ways to produce new rental units through the substantial rehabilitation of existing housing and mixed-use structures. I think we should look more deeply into this approach and if it is workable for the military, see if other bay area cities would be interested in similar approaches.

As you know, I have made the issue of improving the quality-of-life of our service members a top priority of this subcommittee. We are certainly open to exploring any proposals that appear to provide a solution to reducing this deficit. It is clear that no one approach alone will solve the military family housing problem.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. The Alameda-type proposal is the kind of mixed housing project that I like. It can help shore up older communities and keep those cities vibrant.

The Navy has expressed some interest in buying—for somewhere between $7 and $20 million—some vacant land on a ridge between San Leandro and Castro Valley, to place hundreds of units of Navy housing. There is some earthquake danger in the area, there is a lack of local support services, and none of the surrounding communities want this open land turned into a housing project. I hope the subcommittee chairman could ask the Navy to avoid this kind of expensive, compound-type housing in the bay area and to explore scatter-site and rehab housing as by far the best choice.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I agree that large compounds of military housing apart from a military base have caused problems in other parts of the country. I can assure the gentleman that the subcommittee will look into this situation and that the concerns you raised will be brought to the attention of the Navy, as we attempt to provide additional military family housing in the bay area.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership in providing good housing for our Nation's Service personnel.

□ 1405

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank my colleague for his comments, and I am very pleased to work with him.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to another one of my colleagues from California [Mr. COELHO], for the purposes of entering into a brief colloquy.

Mr. COELHO. I would like to join in the remarks made by my colleague from California about the role of the gentleman from California as chairman of this subcommittee and what he is doing for the Armed Services personnel throughout the world. We appreciate that leadership that he has provided.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and would first of all like to commend him and the members of his subcommittee for the time and attention they have devoted to programs to improve the quality of life of our men and women in uniform.

The tragic suicide of a 13-year-old boy at Fort Ord last year, brought into sharp focus the widespread shortage of affordable housing for military families. Therefore, I applaud the subcommittee for increasing the authorization for construction, operation and maintenance, and leasing of military family housing by more than $460 million over the appropriation for fiscal year 1985.

I am particularly interested in the build-lease program. A 1984 Air Force housing survey disclosed that there was insufficient housing available for Air Force families in the communities adjacent to Castle Air Force Base, which is located in my district. In April of this year, Castle was notified that it was 1 of 4 bases selected by SAC Headquarters to receive build-lease housing. Anticipating that in fiscal year 1986 the Congress would expand the test program authorized under Public Law 98-115, Castle was told to solicit community support for building 200 additional units of family housing.

I can understand the committee's reluctance to approve any further build-lease projects until the two demonstration projects are completed, and the results analyzed. At the same time, I want to emphasize that there is already an urgent need for more family housing at Castle Air Force Base, and I would hope that the committee will be prepared to authorize construction of additional family housing either under build-lease or some other program in the not too distant future. Can the chairman shed some light on the committee's timetable on this?

Mr. DELLUMS. Yes. I think the gentleman raises a good question. For the record, I would like to make the following response:

As my colleague is aware, this subcommittee has given very special attention to the needs of the military

for additional affordable family housing. The test program the gentleman has mentioned is but one of the avenues we are following to increase the family housing inventory around our military bases.

Earlier this year, this gentleman, along with others and staff, toured several military bases in California to look specifically into the issue of family housing. I can assure my colleague that as a result of those visits I became increasingly aware that renewed efforts must be made both within the Department of Defense as well as by the local communities to find solutions to increasing housing availability for our military families.

I might add, parenthetically, that this is becoming a problem where military and civilian people both are competing for the shrinking inventory of affordable housing. So this is becoming an issue of crisis proportions that we have to address, and I think this subcommittee certainly is moving down that road.

Mr. COELHO. I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, it is particularly acute with the trainees that are coming into Castle, and so forth, to be able to afford some type of housing.

Mr. DELLUMS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I might just add that, however, this issue cannot be viewed in isolation, as I said, from the shortages of housing in the civilian population, since housing is a problem both outside as well as inside the military. It seems to me that we must find a way to work together. Although I cannot give the gentleman a specific timetable, I feel that I can speak for all of my colleagues on the committee when I say that we will not only continue to fund traditional family housing construction but also explore other approaches that may provide housing as quickly and as economically as possible at such bases as Castle Air Force Base that my colleague is very concerned about and understands the issues in a very intimate and profound way.

Mr. COELHO. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, sometime earlier this year there was widely circulated a scare list of possible base closures. This list struck fear into the hearts of the very communities in which these bases were located, because many times we would find that such a facility is the very core of the economic activity of a particular region. On that scare list appeared the base located in New Cumberland in central Pennsylvania. We know, firsthand, of the adverse consequences felt just by the publication of that scare list. Since that time, because of the diligent work of this subcommittee and by the considered ear of the gentleman from California who listened to the concerns expressed as to the scare list, the cloud has been removed. This has adverse consequences, the publication of such a list, in 2 different fashions: Not only does it hurt the people whose jobs and whose economy and whose situations in life are surrounding a particular facility, but also it throws a monkey wrench into the very program of national defense which we are so carefully trying to construct.

If indeed in the middle of construction projects, in the middle of new facilities geared for the modernization of our national security, there comes a scare list of possible base closures, this can do serious harm to the steady, proper, progressive planning for the maintenance of our national security. It is, therefore, with deep gratitude that I, who have observed this phenomenon, say to the gentleman from California that his inclusion in the committee report of an end of speculation as to this national list of base closures and of possible realignment of missions does a service not only to the people affected but also to our Nation in its plans for modernization and continuance of national security.

I thank the gentleman. I can report back to the people in New Cumberland: Your mission is safe, your mission must go on, your mission is to contribute to the national security of the United States of America.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], another very diligent member of the committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation, H.R. 1409—the Military Construction Authorization Act for 1986 and compliment our chairman, Mr. DELLUMS, on his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today. I find it a privilege and a pleasure to work with such a hard-working committee and staff that are truly professional. I recognize the great responsibility that this committee has, not only to this distinguished House, but to our people and this great Nation.

Many times in the past, funding for the living and working conditions of our men and women in uniform have been deferred, out of necessity, to the operational requirements of our force modernization programs. This has been accomplished in order that the peace we strive for may be maintained through our military preparedness and strength. Thus, we can demonstrate to our adversaries the military readiness and deterrence from war that our Nation possesses. This is as it should be. However, there comes a time when the quality of life for the men and women in uniform must not take a back seat to the driving forces of upgrading our weapons and support equipment required to enhance, should the need arise, a smooth transition from peace to a full wartime footing. I believe this bill, H.R. 1409, does just that.

A high priority has been placed on the quality of life for our men and women in uniform, their families, and their various needs, especially the construction of new housing units here in the United States and overseas. I fully realize that the military construction authorization does not exist in a vacuum. It should be considered in the full context of the Department of Defense Authorization Act for 1986. It is with this understanding that this bill provides funding for the beddown of weapons systems. These systems include the MX missile, B-1B bomber, ground-launched cruise missiles, F-15 fighter aircraft, the C-5B cargo plane, and the space defense initiatives, as well as first year funding to support construction of two new homeport sites for the Navy. This proposed bill is within the overall House approved Defense authorization and budget guidelines.

As was stated by the Honorable John O. Marsh, Jr., Secretary of the Army, and Gen. John A. Wickham, Jr., Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, in hearings before our subcommittee and the House Armed Services Committee, "our most important mission is to maintain the readiness of the Army in order to protect this great Nation. Readiness is inextricably tied to solders' morale and discipline, and to sustaining their families' strength." As the pool of potential enlistees decline, we need to provide those tangible benefits that let our service personnel and their families know that we support them and that we will provide for their welfare. Truly, this bill provides those living facilities and support systems so necessary to promote the quality of life and facilities that will maintain our force of excellence.

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

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1409, the military construction authorization bill under consideration today by this body. I particularly want to express support for authorized projects at Vance AFB and Tinker AFB, both of which are in Oklahoma.

Vance AFB, a pilot training base, is part of the Air Training Command [ATC]. As we all know, ATC bases are

where Air Force pilot trainees learn to fly before going on to advanced training and regular flying duty for the Air Force. It is training such as that offered at Vance that enables pilots to develop the flying skills later applied in the operation of advanced fighters, bombers, and support aircraft. H.R. 1409 contains two authorized projects for Vance, a central life support equipment facility authorized at $660,000 and a mission support facility authorized at $3,550,000. These two projects are desperately needed.

The central life support equipment facility will provide a safe and environmentally secure structure for aircrew life support systems; items such as parachutes and oxgen masks. Current facilities at Vance are woefully inadequate for the storage and maintenance of these vital systems.

The mission support facility at Vance AFB will provide a centrally located facility designed to house 15 missions support functions, including those for administration and base personnel. These closely related offices are currently located in widely dispersed, inefficient, World War II-vintage buildings. In addition, it is estimated that the modern, centralized facility will result in annual operation and maintenance cost savings of more than $474,000 and a 55-percent reduction in energy usage that saves and addditional $15,000 annually. The mission support facility is urgently needed now.

Tinker AFB, a vital cog in our Nation's Air Logistics Command, has several authorized projects totaling $33.1 million. Authorized are funds for: First, a transient munitions facility and land acquisitions; second, and E-3A maintenance hanger; third, alterations for Tinker's petroleum operations storage complex and base unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing; and fourth, additions and alternations for the heating plant and recreation center.

While it would require to much time to detail the need for each of these authorized projects, I would like to briefly address the authorizations for the transient munitions facility authorized at $6,900,000 and the E-3A maintenance hangar authorized at $6,800,000.

The transient munitions facility is a safety and security improvement. It will provide the air depot at Tinker with the capability to respond to crises throughout the world in a safe and expeditious manner. The handling and transshipment of the munitions is a hazardous business. This facility will provide an extra measure of safety for those who work in this area.

The E-3A, or AWAC's, has become an indispensible tool of the Air Force. Tinker AFB is the home of AWAC's. The AWAC's and its crew, must be prepared to deploy at a moments notice to any part of the globe. This requirement makes an up-to-date maintenance facility vital to the mission of this aircraft. That is why the E-3A maintenance hangar authorized in H.R. 1409 is so very important.

And so, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I urge the adoption of H.R. 1409, the military construction authorization bill.

□ 1420

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my words of compliment for the gentleman from California to those that have been expressed by so many other Members on the floor in the course of this general debate.

Indeed, as I listened to the comments coming from so many varied philosophical sources on this floor, I am almost awestruck. It seems to me that the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has taken the admonition of our former distinguished President, Lyndon Johnson, who said: "Come let us reason together," and has managed to have people from all shades of opinion in the armed services community come and reason together and to find him to be a most reasonable and sensitive chairman of that important subcommittee.

Given the view that I have of the job that the gentleman has done and the commendation that he justifiably received, I would therefore rise with some sense of trepidation under normal circumstances in opposing the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1986. In doing so. however, I know the gentleman from California knows that not only is there no criticism of him intended, but that he and I share the very sentiments that he expressed when he cast his vote against the very bill that he reported out of committee in which he so eloquently set forth the reasons and concerns he had for voting against that bill.

Among my reasons and his reasons for opposing this bill is the inclusion of money for the home ports that the Navy is proposing to build in a number of locations, including one in New York Harbor. The Home Port Fleet, which is a surface action group, in New York would consist of the battleship *Iowa* and six support vessels which would be equipped to carry nuclear weapons.

A total of $86.2 million in first-year funding is authorized in this bill for land acquisition, housing, site improvement, and berthing pier/bulkhead construction. This bill contains initial funding for two of the five new homeports the Navy seeks to build in an effort to disperse its fleet.

Now, the dispersal is supposed to be a strategic dispersal, according to the Secretary of the Navy. However, there have been some questions raised both in the gentleman's committee as well as in the equivalent committee over in the other body as to whether in fact this is a strategic dispersal for military purposes or political purposes. I think in any event there are going to be studies undertaken in both Houses to determine the real purpose of this dispersal and to determine the dangers they may represent.

I strongly object to this funding—an increase of more than $65 million over the amount requested by the Defense Department—because the Navy has failed to satisfy the concerns of my constituents and thousands of other area residents about the risks associated with stationing nuclear weapons in their backyard.

The importance of the Navy's failure to communicate with New York residents—and their elected representatives—cannot be overstated. Only recently we learned that the Defense Department failed to inform State officials in New Jersey about the extent of radioactive contamination resulting from a Bomarc missile explosion and fire at McGuire Air Force Base that occurred in 1960. New Jersey environmental officials only learned the details by accident—25 years later.

We still do not fully know whether population areas were exposed, but we do know that the true magnitude of the radioactive release was kept from the public and Government agencies. In a 1981 report, the Defense Department asserted that the radioactive contamination was restricted "to an area immediately beneath the weapon and an adjacent elongated area approximately 100 feet long." However, it was recently revealed that about 400,000 square feet, or nearly 10 acres of the base property, had been sealed in concrete to contain the contamination.

Moreover, the Defense Department is reportedly still not cooperating with State officials attempting to identify the risk and eliminate the hazard.

New Jersey residents have every right to demand more responsible conduct from the Air Force. And they, along with New Yorkers, have every right to insist that the Navy respond to their health and safety concerns before a single nuclear weapon is brought into our harbor.

Unfortunately, the Navy's response to date has been silence. The environmental impact statement prepared by the Navy looked at the impact of the Staten Island home port on air quality and harbor dredging; it even studied its effect on traffic. Yet there is no mention of the single aspect which could pose more of a threat to the health and welfare of the area's resi-

dents, and of all life in the area, than any other conceivable impact: a nuclear weapons accident.

This constitutes a clear violation of the National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA]. Federal agencies, according to NEPA, must conduct a thorough environmental impact analysis of all aspects of a proposed action that affect the environment in any way.

The Navy has been equally deficient in its attitude toward emergency preparedness planning. The general lack of communication to date between the Defense Department, and State, and local enforcement and health officials in this area is truly disturbing. In the absence of a workable, highly coordinated area emergency response and evacuation plan, the home port plan should simply not go forward.

The EIS, in claiming substantial economic benefit to the New York area without providing convincing evidence, is faulty in a second, serious respect. The Navy reached its economic conclusions without waiting for a fiscal impact analysis currently underway by the Pentagon, a study prompted by concerns in the Defense Department itself, that the home ports economic benefits were overstated. An accurate assessment, I believe, would show the home port to be a costly cousin to alternative investment at Staten Island.

Two recent developments underscore the inadvisability of providing funding for the home port.

First, a coalition of individuals and groups filed suit against the Navy this past April, charging gross violations of NEPA. The coalition includes Friends of the Earth, Physicians for Social Responsibility, New York PIRG and seven members of the New York City Council.

The suit, which is pending, argues that the EIS prepared by the Navy was deficient because it fails to: First, discuss the risks or potential environmental impacts of a nuclear weapons accident; second, consider less populous alternatives sites for the proposed home port; and, third, adequately discuss the adverse economic impacts of the home port on the Metropolitan New York area.

The plaintiffs are seeking an injunction prohibiting the Navy from advancing its New York plans until it prepares a new EIS that complies with NEPA.

In another recent development, the Navy recently announced that it will prepare a supplemental EIS to address a number of changes in its Staten Island proposal. Primarily, the Navy reports that it seriously underestimated the supply of adequate, affordable housing available to the 2,200 families it will move to the New York area. The draft supplemental will not be released until December.

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

Mr. WEISS. I only have limited time. The gentleman from Colorado has a great deal of time left.

In addition to that, a referendum is now on the ballot for the November 5 election to allow the people of the city of New York to state for themselves whether they want a floating nuclear silo in the midst of the most densely populated area in the country.

□ 1430

I concur with the views of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities of the Committee on Armed Services. The Navy's homeporting policy should be examined more closely before we commit millions of dollars to building new naval facilities and locate nuclear weapons in New York and in the ports of some of our other more densely populated cities.

The funding authorized in this bill would permit the Navy to proceed rapidly in building its base on Staten Island without having addressed a number of highly controversial issues.

While my main concern is with the authorization of the ill-considered home port on Staten Island, I am also opposed to a number of expenditures envisioned, expenditures for the MX missiles, for the Trident II or D-5 missile, and for a number of other destabilizing first-strike weapons.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding the time to me, and for all the reasons I set forth, I oppose this bill.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WHITEHURST].

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Chairman, I listened carefully to the words of my colleague, the gentleman from New York, and I would just say this: I expect to vote for the bill, but if the bill should lose, I would just like to say for the record that we in the Second District of Virginia, the great Port of Hampton Roads, and the Navy capital of the world, the city of Norfolk, would love to have those ships, nuclear weapons notwithstanding. We would take every one we can get, and we would welcome those Navy families to our bosom.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say on behalf of the great city of New York that we are not going to give up the ships so easily to anyplace else. I appreciate this feeling about it, but I could not let this opportunity go by, Mr. Chairman, and fail to respond to the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

As we listen to his arguments opposing the home port, he starts off talking about it being a safety issue, but then he goes from safety, to ship dispersal, to economic benefits. The fact is that I think the objection of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] is because it is a military project.

I would like to respond point by point, if I may. What do we get by ship dispersal? If we look today at the number of ships that we have at some of our ports, I think we will have an idea or we should have an idea as to how vulnerable we are. At Charleston, there are 70-some-odd ships based there today; at Norfolk, 120-plus ships; and at San Diego, 120-plus ships.

Now, I am deeply concerned that over 50 percent of our naval fleet is homeported at three centers. It only makes sense, I think, that if we are going to be building more ships and retrofitting others, we do not put them all in three locations. Have we not learned any lessons from Pearl Harbor?

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] talks about the support of some members of the city council for his position. What he did not say was that this project for New York City has been heavily endorsed by Governor Cuomo of New York, by Governor Kean of New Jersey, by both Senators from New York, Mr. D'AMATO and Mr. MOYNIHAN, and by both Senators from New Jersey, Mr. LAUTENBERG and Mr. BRADLEY, and as a matter of fact, it was endosed by every Member of Congress from New York and every Member of Congress from New York City, with the exception of the gentleman who just spoke, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

So I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS], you stand all by yourself or you have stood all by yourself as a member of the congressional delegation opposing the project from its inception.

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

Mr. MOLINARI. No; I will not yield. I will give the gentleman the same courtesy he gave me.

Mr. Chairman, let us talk about the safety items. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] was not satisfied with the safety issues. He was not satisfied because he did not get the decision his way, so he went to the General Accounting Office and requested a study. It took 18 bloody months to get the General Accounting Office to release the study that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] requested, and when it came out, it was certainly not supportive of his position.

So what did he do? He accused the General Accounting Office and said they did a terrible job. I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr.

WEISS], you cannot have it both ways. What the General Accounting Office said was that in this surface action group, one of the ships would be capable of carrying nuclear-tipped missiles, the Tomahawk missile, and GAO said that it was the safest nuclear missile in the entire missile fleet.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to express my support for the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI]. As he well knows, the decision to seek a naval surface action group was supported by a large majority of the New York congressional delegation.

Over the past weekend, I had the privilege of attending the deliberation of the North Atlantic assembly, at its meeting which was held in San Francisco. At our luncheon I happened to sit next to Mayor Feinstein, who mentioned to me that in San Francisco some months ago, there had been the same kind of irrational fear of the homeporting of the battleship *Missouri* in San Francisco. Mayor Feinstein told me that in spite of the opposition that was building up, as it has been doing in New York City as well, she appealed to the business community of that great naval city, San Francisco, and they came up with overwhelming support for welcoming a great historic battleship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI] has expired.

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

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, the mayor of the city of New York our former colleague, Ed Koch, doing the same thing, because, as the gentleman in the well knows, and other members of the delegation know, bringing that naval action force into New York City is going to generate some $500 million every year. So certainly that economic benefit cannot be ignored.

I feel certain that perhaps if Mayor Koch were to consult with Mayor Feinstein, she might be able to give him some other hints as to how to overcome this very irrational antinuclear opposition to bringing back naval ships into New York City, which over the years has always been a great naval town, a major part of the U.S. fleet on the east coast so that we can protect ourselves from those enemies that maybe around us.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

When this project was first announced, there were two main objections that were raised by the gentleman from New York and others. The first, and the one that put fear into everybody's heart, was the thought of an accidental explosion of a nuclear device, and, of course, everybody should be concerned about that.

It is interesting, though, after we started getting information from the Navy and others, I understand that the position of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS], today is that even he acknowledges the fact that the possibility of accidental explosion is so remote, just like the General Accounting Office said, that it does not exist.

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

Mr. MOLINARI. I yield to the gentleman from New York—yes.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished friend for yielding.

I have said from the very beginning that the problem was the release of radioactive material. It does not have to be an explosion; it can be fire, it can be an accident, it can be damage, it can be sabotage. In any one of those ways, radioactive material can be released into New York Harbor.

Mr. MOLINARI. If I understand the gentleman now—and this is important because we do have a referendum coming up, and we do have other issues coming up in debates—he does recognize in fact and he concedes, as I understand it, that there is no possibility and he is not concerned about an accidental nuclear explosion? Is that correct?

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. WEISS. I have said from the very beginning that the possibility of explosion as such is extremely remote, very unlikely.

Mr. MOLINARI. All right. The issue of plutonium, then, is the only other safety issue that has been raised in the floor debate. As far as the information from the Navy is concerned—and I think the gentleman from New York is absolutely incorrect in terms of sharing information—the Navy has been extremely forthright in giving us requested information. There has been an exchange of correspondence from the Department of Energy, from the Navy, from the Defense Department, and from Mr. Weinberger back and forth to the mayor, to every elected official, and to others.

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

Mr. MOLINARI. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. Would the gentleman please share with his colleagues his information as to what planning has been done for emergency action in case of an accident? Will the gentleman tell us what the Navy has told him about that?

□ 1440

Mr. MOLINARI. The Navy has not planned any emergency action. I do not think it is the province of the Navy to do that. I think that is the province of your local government. That is the position they have taken throughout the country.

Now, they will work with local government in planning. They have said that. They will work with you to implement the plan.

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

Mr. MOLINARI. Yes, I will yield further.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman know whether in fact the Navy has shared information with the local governments as to whether and what kind of accidents the localities ought to be preparing for?

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, let me respond this way perhaps. I took advantage of something that every Member of Congress has, and that is the opportunity to get a classified briefing at the Pentagon. I do not know if the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] did so, but I did.

Mr. WEISS. I did.

Mr. MOLINARI. I came away after 3 hours fully satisfied and had no apprehensions or fears whatsoever. I stand in the well here and I can say to my constituents back home, please accept it without any fear or trepidation whatsoever. There are 30 years of record that the Navy has had with nuclear weapons, a superb record, without one single nuclear accident.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MOLINARI. I would be happy to yield even though the gentleman did not want to yield to me.

Mr. WEISS. I had no time. The gentleman has all kinds of time.

The gentleman is not suggesting to this body, or to his constituents, or my constituents that in private briefings the gentleman was given information as to existing information which the Navy has shared with localities as to how they could prepare for emergencies; the gentleman is not saying that, is the gentleman?

Mr. MOLINARI. No, I am not.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, because I was given no such information.

Mr. MOLINARI. The issue of economic benefits I think we should dispense with very quickly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI].

Mr. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding these 2 additional minutes.

On the issue of economic benefits, I think there has been a great deal of debate in the New York City area about economic benefits. There is no question that there are substantial economic benefits. We may debate as to how much, but I do not think there is any question remaining that the benefits are indeed substantial.

I would like to close, however, by referring to something that the chairman mentioned before. I think it is very important, and this is related to the home port issue; that is the aspect of the funding level in the bill dealing with the quality of life.

I do not know how many Members of this body have taken the time out to go to military bases and see how our military people are living. It is shocking. It is absolutely shocking if you visit the areas where I live and see how our military people are living. If they were ordinary citizens and not in the military, I think they would be asking for public assistance from local governments.

How we, as Members of Congress, can permit that is something that is deeply disturbing to me.

So I commend the gentleman from California, the chairman, and the other members of the committee for what they have done here and I hope that we support the chairman in his efforts here today.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to rise on behalf of San Diego and the Navy families in San Diego and thank the committee and the chairman and the ranking member for the work and the consideration that they gave us in regard to the housing that will be built, some 200 units for Navy housing.

I would like to thank the chairman especially for the time that he spent and the trip that he took to San Diego examining the situation very closely.

I just would like to say one last thing, and that is that in California our big problem generally with regard to military construction and housing is the land prices. I very much like the ideas that have been floated several times during the debate and during the discussion concerning the possibility of leasing land, having contractors come on and build units and then pay over a period of time based on the capability of our enlisted people to pay for their Navy housing or Army housing allowance, to pay for those units; in other words, the idea of not having in the future perhaps to spend up front appropriation money for the military construction itself.

I commend the committee for taking a look at that and I hope we can do that in the next several years.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

I just want to make one point on the home port issue.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI], a gentleman I also served with in the State legislature in New York, is a very thoughtful person and someone who has worked very hard ferreting out all the answers to the questions that were brought up concerning home ports.

We would all certainly agree that it is ludicrous at best to home port half our naval fleet in three ports; so once the decision was made, which as I say makes eminent good sense, the competition was on as to where these ships would be home ported.

In the State of New York and city of New York, the State and Federal legislators worked very hard convincing the Navy that this was the most appropriate cost-efficient place to home port this battle group.

I want to point out that there is no doubt in anybody's mind that as far as the vast majority of the elected officials and opinion leaders in the State of New York, they want very much to have that battle group in New York Harbor.

I salute the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOLINARI]. I salute the Governor. I salute the mayor. I salute both U.S. Senators from New York and from New Jersey, and the vast majority of the delegation from New York headed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] who support home porting.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the military construction authorization of funds for New York City homeporting for the *Iowa*. The homeporting is being sold to New Yorkers as safe and economically beneficial. Unfortunately, both the safety and economic aspects have not been explored sufficiently to allow New Yorkers to know with any degree of certainty whether or not they will benefit from the homeporting.

Advocates of homeporting argue that it will bring jobs to New York and help the economy. After the initial building is over, it is unclear that the naval base will bring any jobs to New Yorkers. Yes, it will bring another payroll to New York but there is no certainty that it will bring jobs which will be filled by the local residents who must contend with the hardships and risks related to the base. The naval jobs will be filled with men and women from all over the country. Base-related jobs are usually reserved for the families of service members who are assigned to that base. From the beginning the economic facts of this situation have not been stated honestly.

On the safety issue, some Members of Congress have been reassured that there is no safety problem. I am one of those who has not been so reassured. In the end this is an important judgment call. It would appear that safety, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder and I cannot believe that the various nuclear mishaps which have happened here in the States and in Europe were intentional so I must conclude that serious accidents can happen. To accept, as an article of faith, that there will be no accidents in densely populated New York is to gamble needlessly with the lives of human beings. The New York Port represents one of the most densely populated areas in the world. When nuclear accident risk possibilities are being weighed, special allowances should be made for New York City.

The homeporting issue is on the ballot in New York. The people will have the opportunity to express their will directly. It is only reasonable for Members who represent New York City to wait upon this expression of support or lack of support. No commitment should be made prior to the results of the referendum on this issue. This is an important judgment call which all interested citizens should be given an opportunity to make.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today and address the subjects of military housing and the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1986. I would first like to address the issue of military housing.

Those of my distinguished colleagues who have heard me speak on the issue of military housing in the past know that this is a very important issue to me and it is one about which I feel deeply. Not just because I, too, experienced the military family life, and not just because a young boy hanged himself at a military installation in my district last year because the hardships imposed on his family by shortages in military family housing and moving expenses; but because I am convinced that our Nation's defense is only as strong as the men and women who serve as the cogs of our great defensive wheel.

In the past, my comments on the issue of military family housing have been tinged with sadness, and filled with determination. Today, however, I am glad to report to this distinguished body that I am optimistic that we are on our way to meeting the challenges faced by our military personnel and their families; not just in my district on the Monterey Peninsula, but all over the country, and the world.

I am optimistic because the House has approved a Department of Defense authorization that contains numerous provisions that seek to address the challenges, financial and emotional challenges, facing our military personnel and their families. I am

pleased to have introduced the first legislative package to address these challenges, and I am hopeful that relief for our men and women in uniform and their dependents may soon be on the way.

I am also pleased today to lend my support to the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1986. This bill calls for $9.5 billion in military construction during the next fiscal year. That might seem like a small sum compared to the rest of entire Department of Defense authorization recommendation of $302.6 billion, and indeed it is—the military construction request is only 3 percent of the total budget recommended by the House Armed Services Committee. But, ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you what a mere 3 percent can do.

This money will provide for the construction of 600 units of housing at Ford Ord, CA, and the upgrading of almost 600 more units that have been found by the Army to be substandard. Think of that, ladies and gentlemen, some of our military personnel live in substandard housing—but not for long. This money will also provide for 70 mobile home spaces at Ford Ord—a post where 2,500 families are currently on waiting lists for on-post housing.

Plans also call for the construction of barracks for enlisted personnel that will house nearly 1,000 individuals, at a cost of $23 million. I speak of Fort Ord because I happen to represent that area, because I once served at Ford Ord, and because that is where 13-year-old Danny Holley hanged himself. The average wait for on-post housing at that facility is 5 to 7 months. Fort Ord has recently awarded a contract to a local construction firm that will provide more than 200 mobile home spaces for military personnel. Where the housing situation has been critical, there is now hope.

These construction plans will mean a great deal to an estimated 2,500 military families at Fort Ord alone. And yet the total price tag is $84 million—only three-tenths of 1 percent of the total Department of Defense authorization for fiscal year 1986. And that is at Fort Ord alone.

Military housing construction plans call for 50 mobile home spaces at Fort Riley, KS; 50 more at Fort Bragg, NC; and 282 housing units at the Marine Corps Air Station in El Toro, CA. The military housing plans reach across the seas to the Netherlands and West Germany, as well. And we can do all this, and virtually change the lives of an estimated 5,570 persons with only 3 percent of the total Defense authorization recommended by the House Armed Services Committee.

While family housing is certainly the most visible component of the Military Construction Act, it is not the only issue that I would like to address today, because military construction can take many forms, other than military housing. I am talking about the construction plans for military facilities such as Fort Hunter Liggett, the Presidio of Monterey, and the Naval Postgraduate School, as well as Fort Ord—facilities which have been able to contribute so much to our national security and defensive capabilities. But facilities which are also in desperate need of expansion, or upgrading, in order to continue to perform these valuable functions to their full potential.

Fort Hunter Liggett, for example, has asked for $11.1 million for the construction of a multipurpose range complex and a technical documentation facility. The House Armed Services Committee, recognizing the value of these projects, has recommended full funding of the administration's request. For the Presidio of Monterey, the Department of Defense has set aside $2.65 million for the construction of a military personnel administration center. This center is required to provide a consolidated Army/USAF center together with administration headquarters for Army/Navy/Air Force/Marine Corps contingents at the Defense Language Institute. The Department of Defense concluded in a recent study that the failure to provide this center would result in a growing inefficiency in operation at the Presidio. Again, the House Committee on Armed Services has recommended full funding.

The Navy has requested $13 million for an ocean science academic building which would greatly increase the oceanographic study capabilities at Monterey, an area that has long been recognized as the center for oceanographic study, research, and fleet communications. This building would complement an already impressive array of marine and oceanographic feacilities on the Monterey Bay, including the Monterey Bay Aquarium funded by Hewlett-Packard, the Moss Landing Marine Lab, the Naval Environmental Prediction Research Facility, and the Fleet Numerical Oceanography Center.

The Army has asked for $3 million to be spent on the energy monitoring and control system, a medical supply warehouse, and an operations building at Fort Ord. The operations building is needed to provide an operational facility for the Criminal Investigation District Headquarters at Fort Ord. Current investigations are conducted out of a substandard and deteriorating temporary facility that was constructed in 1941. The Department of Defense has determined that the building is not suitable for modification, and the House Armed Services Committee has recommended full funding for construction of a new facility.

Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about a major weapons system. I am not talking about changing the nature of our warfighting machine. I am not even talking about charges of waste and fraud in our Defense Department. In other words, I am not addressing a controversial or partisan issue. I am talking about the welfare of our men and women in uniform and their dependent families.

Why is it, after all, that in the strongest and richest nation on Earth some of our military personnel are forced to live in substandard housing unit that was built as a temporary facility prior to World War II? Why is it that military families are forced to separate, or squeeze a family of 5 into a camping trailer in a campground along with 30 other families that has only one hot shower? There is no reason for this situation. But there is a solution. And that solution will cost less than the price of two F-14A Tomcat aircraft—and Navy has requested 18 of these aircraft for the next fiscal year alone.

In examining the important issue of our national defense, I believe it essential that we not overlook that element of our military that is most vulnerable and most in need of our assistance—the human element. We can, after all, talk until we are blue in the face about weapons systems and strategic superiority or inferiority, but it does not mean a thing unless we address needs of our military personnel in housing and facilities.

After extensive hearings and testimonies, the House Armed Services Committee has forwarded a balanced proposal that would meet the immediate needs of housing and military construction at a reasonable cost. I urge this body to accept that proposal.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for the $12.8 million authorization for the proposed construction of the Air Force Institute of Technology [AFIT] at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

The Institute is a U.S. Air Force organization which is responsible for providing and coordinating advanced degree programs, professional continuing education, and support for basic and applied research. Many of its courses are unique and are offered only by AFIT. These educational programs are designed to meet the highly specialized needs of the Department of Defense. Because of its special location at Wright-Patterson, which is the largest center for defense research and development, AFIT offers rare opportunities for engineering and logistics instruction.

The student load at this center is increasing substantially. Moreover, the AFIT has greater demands for computer space. There is currently a total space deficiency of 256,000 square feet based upon existing needs. This project is designed to enhance the existing facility at Wright-Patterson which is in dire need of a new building to alleviate the problem of overcrowding. The proposed facility improvements will provide a better learning environment for those persons enrolled at this science and research center.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this authorization. It will enhance AFIT's ability to serve the Air Force and our national security interests by providing first-rate instruction to Air Force officers and airmen.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1409, the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1986. This bill authorizes all funds for military construction and military family housing in the United States and overseas.

This bill authorizes $4.2 million for the construction of a navigation equipment laboratory at the Naval Air Development Center [NADC] in Warminster, PA, which is located in my district. I want to thank my colleague from Wisconsin, Representative LES ASPIN, the distinguished chairman

of the House Armed Services Committee, for his support of this important project. I also want to again thank the distinguished chairman for visiting NADC with me on April 19, 1985.

The NADC is vitally important to the Department of the Navy since it is the leading naval air research laboratory in the United States. It is responsible for research in such critical areas as air warfare analysis, air combat systems engineering, aircraft navigation, surface ship navigation, submarine navigation, and air command and control systems. No other naval research facility performs the functions assigned to the NADC, particularly in both land-based and carrier-based antisubmarine warfare. The NADC also recently developed the reconnaissance module for the FA-18 aircraft.

The NADC is also very important to my constituents in the Eighth District as it is the second largest employer in my district. It is a modern and expanding facility that employs 2,633 people, including 2,385 civilians. The growing role of the NADC is highlighted by the fact that this year there have been 300 vacant engineering and technical positions at the Center, positions which the Navy has been filling.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the continued vitality of one of the most important facilities in my district. Beyond that, however, I am convinced based on the visits I have made to the Center that the NADC is fulfilling its vital national security mission for the Navy. It is in the best interest of the country that the NADC continue its important operations in Warminster. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the military construction bill which includes the authorization for this new laboratory.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1409, the military construction authorizations for fiscal year 1986. This legislation authorizes the transfer of the Army's Arlington Hall Station to the jurisdiction of the U.S. State Department through the General Services Administration for location of the Foreign Service Institute.

My constituents, Defense Department officials and the administration agree that development of the FSI at Arlington Hall would be an asset for the Arlington community. I think it is fair to say that it is unusual when a Member of Congress supports the closing of a military installation in his or her congressional district. However, the relocation of Arlington Hall's current tenant, the Intelligence and Security Command to Fort Belvoir, VA, is a positive move for the military and for the intelligence community. This is also an efficient use of Federal property and presents a rare opportunity for the people of northern Virgnia to be a part of plans to locate the facility where the prestigious corps of foreign service officials and diplomats will be trained.

The necessary first step for this proposed transfer is congressional funding of $30 million for a new headquarters for the Intelligence Command and Control Facility at Fort. Belvoir. The Senate has included this amount as part of its military construction legislation and it is my hope that a joint House-Senate conference on this bill can resolve this difference in spending priorities.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1409, the military construction authorization for next fiscal year, but more importantly, I rise to commend the committee and the bill's manager, Chairman DELLUMS, for not being stampeded into slashing away at the military construction authorization based on a list of possible bases to be closed that surfaced in response to a request from the other body and which was never fully explained. That list became known as a hit list inspite of the fact that the Defense Department attached disclaimers to it and indicated that it was only illustrative. Those of us who represent areas of the country where those based are located knew all too well that a decision this year to halt needed work on those bases could turn illustrative into fait accompli. I personally am deeply indebted to the Armed Services Committee for the rational manner in which it put its bill together and its insistence on substantiation and explanation of that list which, without the good work of the committee, could very well have taken on a life of its own.

The House of Representatives has been well served by its committee, and I want the record to show that I, for one, am most appreciative.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we have no more requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, we are now concluding with the general debate on the military construction bill for fiscal year 1986. I think my colleagues and I have done an adequate job in presenting to this body what we have done, how we did it and where we are at this particular moment.

I would just like for a brief moment to comment on the last debate that took place between and among my colleagues from New York. Without in any way commenting to the merits of the case, simply to say that this debate only underscores the desire of the Chair to bring the military construction budget within the umbrella of the total authorization bill, because these are policy matters that cut across the entire length and breadth of the military budget.

The debate to some extent becomes relatively distorted, Mr. Chairman, when it gets debated at the military construction level with these policies that were made far before we get to this particular level; so my hope is that next year when we look at the total military budget that my colleagues can see the implications of their policies all the way from the tactical and strategic implications all the way to their quality of life and community implications.

So I would simply say that it only underscores the need for an indepth policy, oriented, rational, and intelligent debate, devoid of rancor, devoid of name calling, devoid of posturing at a rather superficial level, so that we can meaningfully come to grips with what is an appropriate military policy within the framework of an enlightened and intelligent foreign policy.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the reported bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and each title shall be considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986".

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO], be permitted to offer an amendment out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. HUTTO

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, because I have a committee to chair, I appreciate very much the willingness of the gentleman from California to allow me to offer three noncontroversial amendments that have been agreed to. Actually, one of these will be presented by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] since we both have an interest in that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman have one amendment he wishes to offer at this time?

Mr. HUTTO. I have two, Mr. Chairman, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has one. They are tied together.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent that all three amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the three amendments be considered out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. And en bloc?

Mr. HUTTO. And en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman amend his unanimous consent request to state that the amendments be considered en bloc, for purposes of saving some time?

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have no problem with that.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Florida has two amendments.

Mr. HUTTO. Two amendments, Mr. Chairman, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has one.

The CHAIRMAN. And the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] has one; but the gentleman asks unanimous consent that his two amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments, Nos. 1 and 3, be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. HUTTO: Insert the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. TERMINATION DATE FOR CERTAIN AUTHORITY.

Section 808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1983, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) The authority of the Secretary to carry out this section shall terminate in October 1, 1990.".

Add the following new section at the end of the title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA.

(a) TRANSFER.—The Secretary of the Navy shall transfer, without reimbursement, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs approximately 15.31 acres of real property, including improvements thereon, at the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida.

(b) USE OF LAND.—The real property transferred pursuant to subsection (a) shall become part of the Barrancas National Cemetery and shall be administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under chapter 24 of title 38, United States Code.

(c) CONDITION.—If the real property transferred pursuant to subsection (a) is not used for the purpose described in subsection (b), the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall transfer such property, without reimbursement, to the Secretary of the Navy.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and location of the land and improvements described in subsection (a) shall be determined in a survey approved by the Secretary.

Mr. HUTTO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, just briefly, on the first amendment, this merely adds a sunset date of September 30, 1990, to the authority granted to the Secretary of the Air Force by section 808, Land Conveyances, Eglin Air Force Base, FL.

The second amendment relates to a parcel of land that would be shifted from the Navy to the Veterans' Administration for extension to the Barrancas National Cemetery. They were to build a brig on that, but we prevailed upon them to allow the cemetery to be extended so that we could carry through.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding and for his explanation.

The Chairman would like to indicate that these two amendments were offered after the subcommittee met and the full committee met, but we have subsequently come together as a committee, we have reviewed the two amendments offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida, and the committee is in support of the amendments on this side of the aisle and accepts the two amendments offered en bloc by the gentleman from Florida.

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

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

Mr HUTTO. I yield to the ranking minority member.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we have had an opportunity to consider the amendments on this side and we have no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] be permitted the opportunity to offer an amendment out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROBINSON

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON: Add the following new section to the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. AVIGATION RIGHTS ON SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLORIDA.

The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all right, title, and interest in the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1229), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5. The prohibition contained in subdivision d. of the first section against the erection of any structure or obstacle on the land conveyed under this Act in excess of seventy-free feet above mean low-water level shall be deemed to be a prohibition against the erection of a structure or obstacle in excess of two hundred feet above mean low-water level in the case of that portion of such land on Santa Rosa Island which is east of the Destin East Pass and known as Holiday Isle.".

Mr. ROBINSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. Chairman, I will simply say in order to save time and get right to the bottom line, this amendment simply amends the avigation rights on Santa Rosa Island, FL. There was a prohibition in the law that restricted building buildings higher than 75 feet. This allows that law to be amended to allow buildings in excess of 200 feet.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO] if he has any comment about this.

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

This merely agrees with the Air Force that buildings in this area can be extended upward of 200 feet, instead of the original 75 feet, which was out of date.

It is my understanding that no one objects to it. It has all been worked out.

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

Mr. ROBINSON. I yield to the distinguished Chairman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that was fashioned after the subcommittee and the full committe had worked its will on the fiscal year 1986 authorization bill. The subcommittee subsequently met, reviewed all these amendments, including the one before the body at this time, and the subcommittee agrees to accept the gentleman's amendment, without objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] be permitted the opportunity to offer an amendment out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS: Page 67, beginning on line 13, strike out section 816 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 816. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER CERTAIN EXCESS PROPERTY WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT.

(a) TRANSFERS UNDER EXCESS PROPERTY PROVISIONS AUTHORIZED.—In accordance with the provisions of section 202 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 483) governing transfers of excess property—

(1) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer the real property described in subsection (b) of this section without reimbursement, if such property is transferred to the Secretary of the Army; and

(2) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer the real property described in subsection (c) of this section without reimbursement, if such property is transferred to the Secretary of State.

(b) REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT FORT MCNAIR.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1), the property described in this subsection is a tract of land of approximately 10.5 acres, together with improvements thereon, adjacent to Fort McNair in the District of Columbia.

(c) REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT ARLINGTON HALL STATION.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the property decribed in this subsection is a tract of land of approximately 72 acres, together with improvements thereon, known as Arlington Hall Station in Arlington County, Virginia.

Mr. BROOKS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today deals with two proposed transfers of property that are included as section 816 of H.R. 1409. As reported by the Committee on Armed Services, section 816(a) provideds for the Administrator of General Services to transfer, without reimbursement, to the Secretary of the Army, an 18.5-acre tract of land adjacent to Fort McNair in the District of Columbia. This land was declared excess by the Army in 1982 and control passed to GSA. Although around 8 acres of property are the subject of a legally binding sale agreement and are not available for disposition, some 10 acres remain as excess property and would be available to be returned to the Army for its needs.

Section 816(b) of the bill as reported provides for the Secretary of the Army to transfer approximately 72 acres of the Arlington Hall station property in Arlington County, VA, to the Secretary of State to be used as a center for training in foreign affairs and for other purposes. This transfer likewise would be without reimbursement.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I am sympathetic to the underlying purposes of these transfers. In the case of Fort McNair, it makes sense that this property should be returned to fill the needs of the agency that held it until just 3 years ago. And, in the case of the Arlington Hall station property, I appreciate the desirability of relocating the State Department's Foreign Service Institute to a permanent location, and the Arlington Hall station would be extremely suitable for this purpose. In addition, relocating FSI out of leased space and into a Government-owned facility would be a sensible and cost-effective step.

At the same time, I am deeply concerned that the integrity of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, which sets out a government-wide system for the utilization of federally owned property, be maintained. In order to achieve the goals of the original provisions of the bill in a manner which is consistent with current law and regulations, I am offering this amendment today. It provides authorization for the Administrator of General Services to transfer the Fort McNair property, without reimbursement, if such property is transferred to the Secretary of the Army, and for the nonreimbursable transfer of the Arlington Hall station property by the Administrator, if such property is transferred to the Secretary of State.

The current Federal property management regulations provide that, in cases where the Congress specifically authorizes a nonreimbursable transfer, the interagency transfer of excess property shall be without reimbursement. The amendment I am offering today constitutes such a specific congressional authorization.

I urge support for this amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

□ 1455

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to point out to the body that this amendment is technical in nature and is offered to bring section 816 into conformance with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. It is offered to satisfy jurisdictional concerns of the Committee on Government Operations.

The amendment changes no substantive provision and the committee is prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] also be provided with the opportunity to offer an amendment out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: Page 71, after line 9, insert the following:

SEC. 819. LAND CONVEYANCE, DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, TUCSON, ARIZONA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of the Air Force (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the city of Tucson, Arizona (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "city") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 61 acres of real property adjacent to Golf Links/Craycroft Intersection, Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—(1) In consideration for the conveyance, the city shall extend the existing lease with the Air Force covering 4,348.81 acres of real property owned by the city at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base for an additional fifty years commencing in 2002 at the existing rental rate of $773 per year.

(2) The total value of the consideration received by the United States shall be at least equal to the fair market value of the real property conveyed under subsection (a), as determined by the Secretary.

(c) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and legal descriptions of the real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys that are satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of such surveys shall be borne by the city.

(d) CONDITION.—(1) The conveyance to the city under this section shall be subject to the condition that the real property to be conveyed shall be used for public park purposes or other purposes agreed upon by the Secretary and the city which are consistent with the primary mission of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base.

(2) If the real property is used for any purpose other than a purpose described in paragraph (1), title to the real property shall revert to the United States.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions with respect to the conveyance made under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. UDALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would convey 61 acres of land at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base to the city of Tucson for use as a public park and refuse transfer station. In exchange the city of Tucson would extend a 50-year lease to the Air

51-059 O-86-18 (Pt. 20)

Force for 4,348 acres on the Poorman Gunnery Range.

The land to be conveyed to the city of Tucson was recently severed from the main portion of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base by extension of a major public thoroughfare across the northern boundary of the base. This land is no longer needed by the Air Force for base operations and the uses of the land by the city of Tucson are consistent with the overall objectives and mission of the base.

In fact, the park facilities and refuse transfer station would serve base personnel and the Air Force has fully endorsed this land conveyance.

The extension of an additional 50-year lease on the Poorman Gunnery Range is essential to the continued operations at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base. The city of Tucson would lease the land to the U.S. Government for $773 a year. The value of the lease far exceeds the fair market value of the land to be conveyed to the city of Tucson.

This is an amendment which is in the best interests of the U.S. Government and the city of Tucson. I hope my colleagues will support this amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona insert the following:

SEC. 819. LAND CONVEYANCE, DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, TUCSON, ARIZONA.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the highest and best use of the lands described or identified in subsection (b) is public park and recreational use or public health use;

(2) the city of Tucson, Arizona, has indicated a willingness to extend the existing lease to the United States Air Force of the lands described in subsection (c) for an additional fifty years commencing in 2002 at the existing rental rate of $773 per year;

(3) therefore, the Administrator of General Services should—

(A) assign to the Secretary of the Interior lands described in subsection (b)(1) for use as a park or recreational area; and

(B) assign to the Secretary of Health and Human Services lands identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2) for public health use;

(4) the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretaries of the Interior and Health and Human Services, as the case may be, should simultaneously with the acceptance of the extension of the lease for the lands described in subsection (c), convey to the city of Tuscon, Arizona—

(A) the property described in subsection (b)(1) for use as a park or recreational area through a public benefit discount conveyance under section 203(k)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(2)), and

(B) such land as is identified in subsection (b)(2) for public health use through a public benefit discount conveyance under section 203(k)(1)(B) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(1)(B)).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND SUITABLE FOR PARK OR RECREATIONAL USE AND FOR PUBLIC HEALTH USE.—(1) The property described in this paragraph is 61 acres of real property adjacent to Golf Links/Craycroft Intersection, Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona.

(2) The property identified in this paragraph is such portion (not exceeding eight acres) of the land described in paragraph (1) as the Secretary of Health and Human Services, with the concurrence of the Secretaries of the Interior and Defense, determines to be suitable for conveyance for public health use.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY SUBJECT TO LEASE. —The property described in this subsection is 4,348.81 acres of real property owned by the city of Tucson, Arizona, at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base.

(d) SURVEYS OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal descriptions of the real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys that are satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretaries of the Interior and Health and Human Services, as the case may be. The cost of such surveys shall be borne by the city of Tucson, Arizona.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering regarding the conveyance of land at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Tucson, AZ, would allow this transfer to go forward in a manner consistent with the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act's provisions on public benefit discount conveyance of excess Federal property. The amendment would establish a congressional finding that the highest and best use of specified property at Davis-Monthan is for park and recreation use or public health use, and that the city of Tucson has indicated a willingness to extend an existing lease of 4,348.81 acres of property to the Air Force for an additional 50 years at $773 per year. The amendment states that the Administrator of General Services therefore should assign the property to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Health and Human Services for park and public health uses, respectively, and that the Secretaries, simultaneously with the acceptance of the lease extension from the city, should convey the property to the city through a public benefit discount conveyance under the Federal Property Act.

Mr. Chairman, this conveyance appears to serve both the interests of the Federal Government and the city of Tucson. My amendment would allow the transaction to take place in conformity with the Federal Property Act. I urge its acceptance.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is exactly correct that we have reviewed this amendment. The people in Arizona and the military have come together, and there is no objection to the amendment. This side has no objection to the amendment.

The full subcommittee has reviewed the amendment and the Chair knows of no objection, and we certainly would be willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, we are now going back to regular order, title I.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

TITLE I—ARMY

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, $57,580,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, $32,530,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, $55,450,000.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, $610,000.
Fort Drum, New York, $2,990,000.
Fort Greely, Alaska, $2,500,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, $80,000,000.
Fort Hunter-Liggett, California, $11,100,000.
Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania, $5,300,000.
Fort Irwin, California, $30,050,000.
Fort Lewis, Washington, $110,880,000.
Fort McCoy, Wisconsin, $940,000.
Fort Meade, Maryland, $18,930,000.
Fort Ord, California, $25,820,000.
Fort Polk, Louisiana, $27,230,000.
Fort Richardson, Alaska, $3,600,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, $49,290,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas, $1,440,000.
Fort Sheridan, Illinois, $3,500,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia, $29,600,000.
Fort Wainwright, Alaska, $14,000,000.
Presidio of Monterey, California, $2,650,000.
Yakima Firing Center, Washington, $16,430,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

Fort Shafter, Hawaii, $6,300,000.
Pohakuloa Training Area, Hawaii, $2,150,000.
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, $32,460,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia, $6,450,000.
Fort Belvoir, Virginia, $7,100,000.
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, $5,300,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, $39,650,000.
Fort Bliss, Texas, $31,760,000.
Fort Dix, New Jersey, $6,100,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, $46,040,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, $20,770,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, $6,900,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, $15,471,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, $12,350,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, $39,350,000.
Fort Pickett, Virginia, $420,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, $9,695,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, $52,000,000.
Fort Story, Virginia, $1,950,000.

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort Myer, Virginia, $8,300,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, $4,670,000.
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, $8,960,000.
Army Materiel and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts, $770,000.
Corpus Christi Army Depot, Texas, $4,400,000.
Detroit Arsenal, Michigan, $320,000.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, $8,650,000.
Fort Wingate, New Mexico, $490,000.
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, Missouri, $19,000,000.
McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, Oklahoma, $2,300,000.
Navajo Depot Activity, Arizona, $240,000.
New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania, $88,000,000.
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, $1,000,000.
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, $19,000,000.
Pueblo Depot Activity, Colorado, $200,000.
Red River Army Depot, Texas, $820,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, $25,750,000.
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, $29,000,000.
Sacramento Army Depot, California, $6,450,000.
Savanna Army Depot, Illinois, $510,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, $1,410,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, $2,600,000.
Tooele Army Depot, Utah, $11,490,000.
Umatilla Depot Activity, Oregon, $260,000.
Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, $240,000.

AMMUNITION FACILITIES

Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Tennessee, $320,000.
Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Indiana, $210,000.
Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, Iowa, $810,000.
Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, Kansas, $570,000.
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, Missouri, $930,000.
Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant, Louisiana, $640,000.
Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia, $2,910,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, $2,050,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, New York, $23,700,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

Fort Detrick, Maryland, $7,600,000.
Tripler Army Medical Center, Hawaii, $970,000.
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia, $1,150,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND

Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey, $3,200,000.
Oakland Army Base, California, $330,000.
Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal, North Carolina, $1,200,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Humphreys Engineer Center, Supt. Activity, Virginia, $11,000,000.

ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Various, United States, $3,000,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

UNITED STATES ARMY, JAPAN

Japan, $1,050,000.

EIGHTH UNITED STATES ARMY

Camp Carroll, Korea, $25,380,000.
Camp Casey, Korea, $12,920,000.
Camp Castle, Korea, $1,100,000.
Camp Colbern, Korea, $550,000.
Camp Edwards, Korea, $1,090,000.
Camp Gary Owen, Korea, $580,000.
Camp Giant, Korea, $1,050,000.
Camp Greaves, Korea, $420,000.
Camp Hovey, Korea, $8,300,000.
Camp Howze, Korea, $1,980,000.
Camp Humphreys, Korea, $9,750,000.
Camp Kittyhawk, Korea, $1,600,000.
Camp Kyle, Korea, $3,580,000.
Camp Liberty Bell, Korea, $800,000.
Camp Market, Korea, $710,000.
Camp Page, Korea, $32,650,000.
Camp Pelham, Korea, $2,400,000.
Camp Red Cloud, Korea, $1,730,000.
Camp Stanley, Korea, $5,500,000.
K-16 Army Airfield, Korea, $2,350,000.
Location 177, Korea, $2,290,000.
Yongin, Korea, $2,550,000.
Yongson, Korea, $9,800,000.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Kwajalein, $14,600,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND OVERSEAS

Panama, $5,480,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE AND SEVENTH ARMY

Amberg, Germany, $850,000.
Ansbach, Germany, $14,390,000.
Bad Kreuznach, Germany, $1,100,000.
Bad Toelz, Germany, $1,850,000.
Bamberg, Germany, $6,490,000.
Baumholder, Germany, $900,000.
Darmstadt, Germany, $29,200,000.
Frankfurt, Germany, $18,680,000.
Friedberg, Germany, $9,150,000.
Fulda, Germany, $7,200,000.
Giessen, Germany, $1,700,000.
Goeppingen, Germany, $10,250,000.
Grafenwoehr, Germany, $2,450,000.
Haingruen, Germany, $680,000.
Hanau, Germany, $48,140,000.
Heidelberg, Germany, $8,800,000.
Heilbronn, Germany, $2,200,000.
Hohenfels, Germany, $6,300,000.
Kaiserslautern, Germany, $3,450,000.
Karlsruhe, Germany, $4,020,000.
Mainz, Germany, $820,000.
Neu Ulm, Germany, $1,000,000.
Nuremberg, Germany, $9,360,000.
Pirmasens, Germany, $14,000,000.
Schoeninger, Germany, $700,000.
Schweinfurt, Germany, $17,840,000.
Stuttgart, Germany, $4,500,000.
Vilseck, Germany, $10,290,000.
Wiesbaden, Germany, $2,900,000.
Wildflecken, Germany, $20,000,000.
Wuerzburg, Germany, $48,070,000.
Various Locations, Greece, $1,440,000.
Various Locations, Italy, $1,850,000.
Various Locations, Turkey, $7,440,000.

SEC. 102. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of the Army may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Fort Ord, California, six hundred units and seventy manufactured home spaces, $50,640,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, fifty manufactured home spaces, $712,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia, twenty manufactured home spaces, $253,000.
Bamberg, Germany, one hundred and six units, $7,209,000.
Grafenwoehr, Germany, one hundred and thirty-eight units, $6,120,000.
Vilsek, Germany, three hundred and seventy units, $26,830,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, fifty manufactured home spaces, $700,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, fifty manufactured home spaces, $689,000.
Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts, one unit, $154,000.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, twenty manufactured home spaces, $317,000.
Fort Drum, New York, eight hundred units, $67,500,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, two units by reconfiguration and fifty manufactured home spaces, $637,000.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, one hundred and four units and twenty-four manufactured home spaces, $8,674,000.
Fort Myer, Virginia, six units, $596,000.

SEC. 103. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $167,521,000, of which $10,950,000 is available only for energy conservation projects.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia, one unit, $99,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, one hundred and sixty-four units, $4,712,000.
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, eighty-one units, $2,762,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DICKINSON

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DICKINSON: Page 3, line 26, strike out "$9,695,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,950,000".

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which adds a little less than $2½ million for the purpose of building an Army aviation museum to house the historic artifacts, memorabilia, and so forth, of the Army Air Corps, which as everyone knows was the predecessor of the Air Force.

We have $75 million worth of aircraft.

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

Mr. DICKINSON. I would be very pleased to yield to my chairman, the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that arrived before the subcommittee after we had met our time constraints with respect to markup, but the subcommittee has subsequently met.

All of the members reviewed the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, and there is no objection to the amendment on this side and, as far as the Chair knows, no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer three amendments to title I, and I ask unanimous consent that the three amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. DELLUMS: Page 8, strike out line 19.

Page 8, line 21, strike out "$9,360,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$8,500,000".

Page 9, after line 4, insert the following: Various Locations, Germany, $101,000,000.

Page 9, line 21, strike out "Grafenwoehr, Germany, one hundred and thirty-eight units" and insert in lieu thereof "Various locations, ninety-eight units".

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the acceptance of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Chairman, we have three amendments that we have offered en bloc. The first amendment is a technical amendment that simply corrects clerical and printing errors in the bill, and it changes no substantive provision in the bill.

The second amendment, Mr. Chairman, would provide authorization of $101 million for Army to construct a number of facilities necessary from their perspective to increase the security and safety of our Pershing missile deployment in various locations in Germany.

Mr. Chairman, the Pentagon, the Army, approached the subcommittee after the markup on a matter that they considered of grave significance, and that is the question of security and safety. We indicated that the process was over for such a relatively substantial amount of money in a serious area. We asked them why they had not come before the committee at the appropriate time. They said that the issue just manifested itself, and they were not able to get to us during the markup process.

They also indicated that because of the strength of the dollar and the savings that they have been able to realize as a result of the strong dollar in Europe that they can fund these safety and security facilities without any additional moneys being allocated. Therefore, this authority is to the tune of $101 million but it adds no additional money to the bill. It can be funded out of savings from prior funded programs.

There is no question that the problem exists. In fact, our distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY] was able to make an onsite visit to some of these facilities and underscored to my colleagues on the subcommittee that these problems of security and safety, do, in fact, exist. The subcommittee reviewed this request and agreed to accept it without objection.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the third part of the three amendments offered en bloc deals with the Divad appropriation. The third amendment would reduce the Army's minor construction request from $1.68 million by deleting two ammunition storage projects in Germany. These two projects are no longer required. They were intended for the so-called Sergeant York air defense gun, commonly known as Divad, which the Department of Defense has subsequently canceled.

Therefore, this amendment brings this bill into conformity with the decision made by the Office of the Secretary of Defense to cancel the weapon system and there is no need for this accompanying construction.

Mr. Chairman, with that explanation of a technical amendment, an amendment dealing with security on the deployment issue; and third, an amendment that would delete a certain amount of money from the bill to make it conform with the decision of the Department of Defense with respect to the Divad is what I present, and I hope that my colleagues will support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The amendments were agreed to.

□ 1505

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the Army will vacate Arlington Hall in the summer of 1988 and that the State Department must adhere to a very tight timetable to accomplish site planning, architectural design, and contract negotiations necessary to begin construction of the Foreign Service Institute as soon as the Army unit departs.

The existing language guarantees the site for the State Department, thereby allowing expenditure of substantial funds to implement the timetable. But the proposed amendment appears to be specific only as to the conditions of the transfer if the transfer is made to the State Department.

Would the proposed amendment that the gentleman offered allow this transfer to take place in an orderly manner?

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

Mr. WOLF. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, that is my question as well. As the gentleman knows, we passed an authorization and we would like to see this transfer take place in a time period that would be coordinated with the authorization, and that there be no unnecessary slowdown.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure both gentleman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] that it is not my intent to slow down this transfer. My amendment just authorized the nonreimbursable transfer to the Secretary of State consistent with the Federal Property Act. And given the Secretary of State's high-priority interest in the establishment of a training facility for the FSI, it should provide as much assistance as does the existing language that the State Department will receive this property. And anything I can do to expedite that, I will be glad and happy to do.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROSE

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROSE: Page 2, line 10, strike out "$57,580,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$68,390,000".

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to take advantage of an unusual opportunity which will greatly benefit the operations and training capability of the Fort Bragg military reservation.

Fort Bragg has recently completed a land-use requirements study which has shown a requirement for addition-

al land to train our increasingly mobile Army units to attack and defend on wider battlefronts than they did in World War II. The modernized weapon systems of the Army move faster and have longer ranges and thus require more training space. Increased reliance on our National Guard and Reserve Forces requires additional training which causes competition for the existing heavily used training areas.

We have recently learned the International Paper Co., is reducing its timber-harvesting operations and 12,760 acres of timberland will be available for sale. This land is immediately adjacent to the overcrowded, overused training area at Fort Bragg and shares 7.8 miles of the reservation's Little River boundary.

The opportunity to purchase a single, large parcel of land for the necessary expansion of one of our military installations is rare indeed. The price proposed in this amendment is a fair market value for the land. It behooves us to act quickly rather than wait 1 year for a routine project request and run the risk of having the land lost by sale to private developers.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Simply in the interest of time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the gentleman offered this amendment again after the committee met. The subcommittee subsequently met, reviewed all of the amendments, including the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. ROSE, and we have no objection to the amendment and urge that it be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II—NAVY

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, California, $530,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, $6,905,000.

Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center, Bridgeport, California, $1,470,000.

Marine Corps Camp Detachment, Camp Elmore, Norfolk, Virginia, $3,995,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, $24,140,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, $25,175,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Camp Pendleton, California, $14,310,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $36,450,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, $30,375,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, $17,420,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, $10,780,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, $3,610,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California, $17,970,000.

Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California, $22,670,000.

Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, $7,060,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, $14,700,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, $28,900,000.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE NAVY

Navy Finance Center, Cleveland, Ohio, $2,940,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, $1,880,000.

Naval Space Command, Dahlgren, Virginia, $4,700,000.

Navy Regional Data Automation Center, Jacksonville, Florida, $10,300,000.

Naval Space Surveillance Field Station, Lewisville, Arkansas, $675,000.

Navy Tactical Interoperability Support Activity, Mayport, Florida, $470,000.

Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, $13,000,000.

Navy Tactical Interoperability Support Activity, North Island, California, $585,000.

Navy Regional Data Automation Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $10,880,000.

Intelligence Center, Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $2,900,000.

Naval Space Surveillance Field Station, San Diego, California, $600,000.

Commandant Naval District, Washington, District of Columbia, $6,300,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, $3,040,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, $29,835,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $9,960,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, $5,800,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, $16,370,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, $10,820,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, $365,000.

Naval Station, New York, New York, $86,260,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $10,675,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $800,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, $16,940,000.

Naval Facility, Radio Island, North Carolina, $17,640,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

Naval Facility, Adak, Alaska, $2,650,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, $8,650,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Bangor, Washington, $5,200,000.

Amphibious Task Force, Camp Pendleton, California, $9,020,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, $16,150,000.

Naval Station, Everett, Washington, $17,640,000.

Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, $36,500,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, $2,300,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California, $17,230,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, $385,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, $18,593,000.

Commander, Oceanographic System, Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $1,180,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $2,900,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California, $16,197,000.

Naval Submarine Base, San Diego, California, $14,120,000.

Naval Station Mare Island, Vallejo, California, $735,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, $2,650,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Fleet and Mine Warfare Training Center, Charleston, South Carolina, $1,180,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Coronado, California, $9,330,000.

Surface Warfare Officers School Command Detachment, Coronado, California, $5,200,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, $4,360,000.

Fleet Combat Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, Virginia, $9,640,000.

Naval Explosive Ordnance Disposal School, Eglin, Florida, $13,700,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, $20,740,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, $2,460,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Little Creek, Virginia, $420,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, $11,695,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, $450,000.

Naval Submarine School, New London, Connecticut, $13,300,000.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, $19,580,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, $9,400,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, $225,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, $5,670,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Port Hueneme, California, $4,800,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, $7,850,000.

Fleet Combat Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, $305,000.

Fleet Training Center, San Diego, California, $4,750,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, $2,900,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, San Francisco, California, $1,570,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, $810,000.

NAVAL MILITARY PERSONNEL COMMAND

Navy Band, Washington, District of Columbia, $1,900,000.

NAVAL MEDICAL COMMAND

Naval Medical Clinic, Annapolis, Maryland, $12,540,000.

Naval Hospital, Groton, Connecticut, $8,720,000.

Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida, $18,600,000.

Naval Hospital, Long Beach, California, $6,300,000.

Naval Hospital, Oak Harbor, Washington, $13,900,000.

Naval Hospital, Pensacola, Florida, $7,250,000.

Naval Hospital, San Diego, California, $450,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIEL

Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, California, $24,980,000.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, $30,945,000.

Naval Supply Center, Bremerton, Washington, $1,520,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $4,070,000.

Polaris Missile Facility, Atlantic, Charleston, South Carolina, $1,620,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $17,620,000.

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, $9,315,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey, $3,720,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, $2,550,000.

Naval Ordance Station, Indian Head, Maryland, $1,570,000.

Naval Supply Center, Jacksonville, Florida, $1,555,000.

Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station, Keyport, Washington, $2,440,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, Georgia, $388,360,000.

Naval Air Engineering Center, Lakehurst, New Jersey, $600,000.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, $7,160,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Louisville, Kentucky, $16,950,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Norfolk, Virginia, $13,080,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $2,350,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, North Island, California, $9,465,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California, $7,890,000.

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $1,860,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $13,700,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pensacola, Florida, $8,430,000.

Pacific Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, $10,200,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, $23,650,000.

Naval Ship Weapon Systems Engineering Station, Port Hueneme, California, $10,780,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, Portsmouth, Virginia, $3,255,000.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, $6,690,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, San Diego, California, $27,450,000.

Naval Supply Center, San Diego, California, $7,100,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Activity, Saint Inigoes, Maryland, $15,550,000.

Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California, $5,915,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pennsylvania, $4,220,000.

Naval Mine Warfare Engineering Activity, Yorktown, Virginia, $4,120,000.

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY COMMAND

Naval Oceanography Command Facility, Jacksonville, Florida, $390,000.

Naval Western Oceanography Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $4,500,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Radio Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, $785,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Activity, Adak, Alaska, $980,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Northwest, Chesapeake, Virginia, $1,385,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island, California, $395,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, $3,280,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Air Station, Iwakuni, Japan, $1,775,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Futenma, Okinawa, Japan, $2,990,000.

Marine Corps Base Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, Japan, $2,250,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Facility, Argentia, Newfoundland, Canada, $700,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, $22,410,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, $1,270,000.

Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $7,100,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $14,700,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

Navy Support Facility, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $16,530,000.

Naval Air Facility, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $22,450,000.

Naval Magazine, Guam, $11,270,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, $6,550,000.

Naval Station, Guam, $10,200,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, $990,000.

Naval Magazine, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $250,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $13,270,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, UNITED STATES NAVAL FORCES EUROPE

Naval Activities, London, United Kingdom, $7,635,000.

Naval Support Activity, Naples, Italy, $7,750,000.

Naval Air Station, Sigonella, Italy, $5,930,000.

Personnel Support Activity, London, United Kingdom, $450,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIEL

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, $1,080,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Yokosuka, Japan, $4,400,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Communication Area Master Station, Western Pacific, Guam, $8,945,000.

Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth, Australia, $2,690,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Detachment, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $3,700,000.

HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

Various Locations, $980,000.

SEC. 202. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Navy may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Naval Air Station, Adak, Alaska, one hundred units, $15,500,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, two hundred and eighty-two units, $29,800,000.

Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California, one hundred units, $8,400,000.

Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, two hundred units, $15,200,000.

Fleet Training Group Pacific, Warner Springs, California, forty-four units, $4,400,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey, two hundred units, $15,400,000.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, one unit, $170,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, three hundred units, $24,180,000.

(b) NAVAL PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, SAN DIEGO.—The Secretary of the Navy may construct the two hundred housing units authorized by subsection (a) for the Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, at Telegraph Point or at any other suitable and appropriate site.

SEC. 203. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $34,020,000.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, three hundred seventy-two units, $17,610,000.

Naval air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, one unit, $56,500.

SEC. 204. TRANSIENT HOUSING UNITS, CHINHAE, KOREA

The Secretary of the Navy may convert the four existing transient housing units contained in Building 706 in Chinhae, Korea, to family housing units.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will designate title III.

The text of title III is as follows:

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Utah, $28,280,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, $41,699,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, California, $63,129,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, $7,350,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $33,100,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, $21,890,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, $2,500,000.
Edwards Air Force Base, California, $7,250,000.
Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, $14,560,000.
Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, $27,150,000.
Sunnyvale Air Force Station, California, $2,700,000.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Billy Mitchell Field, Wisconsin, $500,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Buckley Air National Guard Base, Colorado, $12,370,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, $1,730,000.
Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas, $29,950,000.
Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, $10,500,000.
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, $22,750,000.
Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, $1,900,000.
Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, $6,850,000.
Mather Air Force Base, California, $2,700,000.
Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, $3,200,000.
Reese Air Force Base, Texas, $3,250,000.
Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, $16,150,000.
Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $4,210,000.
Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, $660,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Station, Alabama, $6,000,000.
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, $12,000,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Attu Research Site, Alaska, $910,000.
Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, $44,950,000.
Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, $5,000,000.
King Salmon Airport, Alaska, $8,600,000.
Shemya Air Force Base, Alaska, $45,900,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $13,160,000.
Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, $10,120,000.
Base 24, Classified Location, $6,170,000.
Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, $250,000.
Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, $1,620,000.
Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, $3,090,000.
Eglin Auxiliary Field 9, Florida, $1,700,000.
Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, $60,330,000.
McChord Air Force Base, Washington, $2,240,000.
McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, $16,100,000.
Norton Air Force Base, California, $4,570,000.
Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, $440,000.
Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, $17,150,000.
Travis Air Force Base, California, $10,300,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, $480,000.
Wheeler Air Force Base, Hawaii, $5,050,000.

SPACE COMMAND

Cape Cod Air Force Station, Massachusetts, $600,000.
Cavalier Air Force Station, North Dakota, $950,000.
Clear Air Force Station, Alaska $4,500,000.
Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, $5,200,000.

SPECIAL PROJECT

Various Locations, $55,000,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, $1,400,000.
Base 34, Classified Location, $8,920,000.
Beale Air Force Base, California, $6,950,000.
Belle Fourche Air Force Station, South Dakota, $4,080,000.
Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, $4,260,000.
Carswell Air Force Base, Texas $3,150,000.
Castle Air Force Base, California $3,300,000.
Dyess Air Force Base, Texas, $16,950,000.
Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, $72,064,000.
Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, $12,500,000.
F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, $12,550,000.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, $62,730,000.
Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, $2,740,000.
Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, $1,700,000.
K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, $22,580,000.
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, $1,300,000.
March Air Force Base, California, $9,000,000.
McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, $71,490,000.
Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, $5,000,000.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, $4,740,000.
Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, $1,200,000.
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, New York, $1,050,000.
Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, $1,960,000.
Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, $4,650,000.
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, $5,300,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, $770,000.
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, $8,230,000.
England Air Force Base, Louisiana, $4,900,000.
George Air Force Base, California, $12,640,000.
Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, $16,850,000.
Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, $7,015,000.
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, $8,680,000.
Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, $14,780,000.
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, $8,850,000.
Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, $24,030,000.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, $14,600,000.
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, South Carolina, $430,000.
Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, $17,860,000.
Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, North Carolina, $2,320,000.
Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, $13,300,000.
Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida, $8,780,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Air Force Academy, Colorado, $10,310,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Lajes Field, Portugal, $25,285,000.
Rhein-Main Air Base, Germany, $11,600,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Camp Zama, Japan, $1,500,000.
Kadena Air Base, Japan, $27,650,000.
Misawa Air Base, Japan, $9,500,000.
Yokota Air Base, Japan, $13,750,000.
Kimhae Air Base, Korea, $10,400,000.
Kunsan Air Base, Korea, $9,000,000.
Kwang-Ju Air Base, Korea, $16,310,000.
Osan Air Base, Korea, $24,510,000.
Sachon Air Base, Korea, $310,000.
Diego Garcia Air Base, Indian Ocean, $5,300,000.
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $15,050,000.

SPACE COMMAND

Thule Air Base, Greenland, $12,350,000.
Sondrestrom Air Base, Greenland, $5,750,000.
GEODSS Site 5, Portugal, $14,650,000.
Pirinclik Air Station, Turkey, $2,600,000.
BMEWS Site III, Fylingdales, United Kingdom, $3,100,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Panama, $2,172,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Florennes Air Base, Belgium, $5,860,000.
Ahlhorn Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Bitburg Air Base, Germany, $9,050,000.
Einsiedlerhof, Germany, $2,900,000.
Hahn Air Base, Germany, $8,160,000.
Hessisch Oldendorf Air Station, Germany, $1,230,000.
Kapaun Air Station, Germany, $900,000.
Leipheim Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Marienfelde Communications Station, Germany, $2,550,000.
Norvenich Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Pruem Air Station, Germany, $1,250,000.
Ramstein Air Base, Germany, $17,470,000.
Sembach Air Base, Germany, $6,460,000.
Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany, $14,860,000.
Various Locations, Germany, $940,000.
Vogelweh Air Station, Germany, $1,250,000.
Wenigerath Storage Site, Germany, $1,700,000.
Zweibrucken Air Base, Germany, $4,550,000.
Aviano Air Base, Italy, $5,070,000.
Comiso Air Station, Italy, $6,280,000.
Decimomannu Air Base, Italy, $2,800,000.
San Vito Air Station, Italy, $1,590,000.
Morocco, $3,100,000.
Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands, $2,710,000.
Keizerveer Air Base, The Netherlands, $270,000.
Vught, The Netherlands, $310,000.
Ankara Air Station, Turkey, $950,000.
Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, $11,570,000.
Karatas, Turkey, $2,330,000.
RAF Alconbury, United Kingdom, $20,910,000.

RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom, $12,050,000.

RAF Chicksands, United Kingdom, $1,630,000.

RAF Fairford, United Kingdom, $7,400,000.

RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom, $2,840,000.

RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom, $10,320,000.

RAF Mildenhall, United Kingdom, $8,230,000.

RAF Molesworth, United Kingdom, $21,063,000.

RAF Sculthorpe, United Kingdom, $2,350,000.

RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom, $4,640,000.

Various Locations, United Kingdom, $3,600,000.

Base 25, Classified Location, $4,500,000.

Base 29, Classified Location, $3,500,000.

Base 30, Classified Location, $4,830,000.

Base 33, Classified Location, $9,450,000.

Various Locations, Europe, $4,450,000.

SEC. 302. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of the Air Force may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Florennes, Belgium, four hundred units, $29,200,000.

Hahn Air Base, Germany, four hundred and forty units, $33,000,000.

Ramstein Air Base, Germany, four hundred units, $30,000,000.

Osan Air Base, Korea, family housing support facilities, $1,200,000.

Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands, one hundred and forty units, $11,000,000.

Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, four hundred and fifty units, $37,900,000.

Belle Fourche Air Force Station, South Dakota, fifty units, $4,000,000.

SEC. 303. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $61,300,000, of which $19,939,000 is available only for energy conservation projects.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, twenty-four units, $1,200,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, three hundred and twenty-eight units, $12,532,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, thirty-two units, $2,873,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, one hundred and ten units, $3,724,000.

Ramstein Air Base, Germany, two hundred and eighty units, $10,279,000.

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, one hundred units, $6,605,000.

Kadena Air Base, Japan, two hundred and thirty-five units, $12,163,000.

Clark Air Base, Philippines, twenty-nine units, $1,042,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KRAMER

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KRAMER: Page 35, after line 16, insert the following new subsection:

(c) IMPROVEMENT PROJECT AT PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO.—(1) To support the United States Space Command (USSPACECOM), the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out an improvement project at Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, to add to and alter an existing facility and (notwithstanding section 2826 of title 10, United States Code) convert it to a family housing unit with a maximum net floor area of 3,100 square feet at a cost not to exceed $81,000.

(2) The amount of the project authorized by this subsection shall not be considered to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for functions of the Department of the Air Force.

(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term "net floor area" has the same meaning given that term by section 2826(f) of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not require any funds to be authorized in this bill in addition to what is already authorized. It is needed for the purpose of allowing the alteration of an existing facility at the Peterson Air Force Base which is necessary because of the activation of the U.S. Space Command.

I ask the House to approve the amendment.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment was presented by my colleague to the chairman of the committee and other Members. During the review process, we reviewed this amendment. There is no objection to the amendment from the subcommittee or from this side of the aisle, and I understand there is no objection to the amendment and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ATKINS

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ATKINS: Page 34, after line 8, insert the following:

Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, one hundred and sixty-three units, $14,200,000.

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds no additional spending authorization to the bill. It simply allows the Air Force to proceed with its plans for building 164 units of housing at Hanscom Air Force Base in Bedford.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee has reviewed the gentleman's amendment. We feel that it is meritorious and it does not add any money to the bill.

There is a family housing shortage in that particular area. What this simply does is move money from maintenance to construction to provide the opportunity for the housing to be built.

We have no objection to the amendment and accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ATKINS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title III?

If not, the Clerk will designate title IV.

The text of title IV is as follows:

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND LAND ACQUISITION FOR THE DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Property Disposal Office, Anchorage, Alaska, $1,390,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Alameda, California, $1,320,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Barstow, California, $825,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, San Diego, California, $600,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, San Pedro, California, $700,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Groton, Connecticut, $625,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Port Tampa, Florida, $595,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Fort Riley, Kansas, $965,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Newington, New Hampshire, $1,040,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Verona, New York, $1,395,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, $470,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, $8,085,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Texarkana, Texas, $2,635,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, $3,825,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, $750,000.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia, $5,355,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Richmond, Virginia, $650,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Manchester, Washington, $565,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming, $1,020,000.

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

Repromat Secure Storage Facility, Mineral Wells, Texas, $900,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort Meade, Maryland, $7,078,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Classified Location, $12,000,000.

Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, $25,000,000.

Classified Location, $3,142,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Property Disposal Office, Kaiserslautern, Germany, $360,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Chimu Wan, Okinawa, Japan, $8,160,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Pyongtaek, Korea, $5,820,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Uijongbu, Korea, $6,200,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Classified Locations, $7,150,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OVERSEAS DEPENDENTS SCHOOLS

Florennes, Belgium, $7,420,000.

Naval Air Station, Bermuda, $2,290,000.

Babenhausen, Germany, $760,000.

Bamberg, Germany, $5,800,000.

Butzbach, Germany, $3,420,000.

Hanau, Germany, $7,480,000.

Heidelberg, Germany, $1,910,000.

Heilbronn, Germany, $2,520,000.

Pirmasens, Germany, $1,630,000.

Schweinfurt, Germany, $3,930,000.

Sembach Air Base, Germany, $2,170,000.

Vilseck, Germany, $6,680,000.

Sigonella, Italy, $5,360,000.

Misawa Air Base, Japan, $4,780,000.

Okinawa, Japan, $745,000.

Osan Air Base, Korea, $2,780,000.

Pusan, Korea, $1,540,000.

Taegu, Korea, $730,000.

Soesterberg Air Base, Netherlands, $4,460,000.

Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $7,190,000.

Bicester, United Kingdom, $4,570,000.

Upwood, United Kingdom, $3,240,000.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, $1,060,000.

SEC. 402. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of Defense may construct or acquire twenty family housing units (including acquisition of land) at classified installations in the total amount of $1,800,000.

SEC. 403. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $110,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS: Page 38, strike out line 17.

Page 39, line 4, strike out "$745,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$300,000".

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the authorization for the Department of Defense overseas dependent schools by $2.735 million by deleting two elementary school projects. One is a proposed school in Bermuda which has a current cost estimate greatly in excess of the original estimate of $2.3 million. We have asked them to revise the estimate.

The other is a proposed $445,000 school in Okinawa. Because of a site change, the project should be deferred, and we are told that both projects will be resubmitted on the next fiscal year, 1987, military construction authorization budget request.

Simply to summarize, we are at this point on this amendment asking to reduce the figure by $2.7 million, and the two projects will be resubmitted in the next fiscal year military construction budget. At that time, we think the concerns that the subcommittee had with respect to these two projects will have been dealt with.

I ask that the amendment be favorably disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title IV?

If not, the Clerk will designate title V.

The text of title V is as follows:

TITLE V—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 501. AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS.

The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an amount not to exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 605 plus the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title V?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VI.

The text of title VI is as follows:

TITLE VI—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND RECURRING ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army in the total amount of $3,399,411,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 101(a), $1,107,056,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 101(b), $451,970,000.

(3) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, $26,000,000.

(4) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $31,000,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $136,100,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $356,491,000; and

(B) for support of military family housing (including the functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $1,290,794,000, of which not more than $1,520,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $132,047,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE I.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 101 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), and $73,000,000 (the amount authorized for the construction of the Eastern Distribution Center, New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania.

SEC. 602. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy in the total amount of $2,602,234,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 201(a), $1,521,450,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 201(b), $178,265,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $21,560,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $139,260,000.

(5) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $2,960,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $154,000,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $584,739,000, of which not more than $3,545,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $18,934,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE II.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 201 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 603. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE.

IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force in the total amount of $2,809,561,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 301(a), $1,224,617,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 301(b), $446,710,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $22,000,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $144,096,000.

(5) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $30,240,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $212,600,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $729,298,000, of which not more than $2,711,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $45,402,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE III.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 301 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 604. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Defense (other than the military departments), in the total amount of $205,760,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 401(a), $53,132,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 401(b), $95,928,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $4,000,000.

(4) For construction projects contingency construction authority of the Secretary of Defense under section 2804 of title 10, United States Code, $5,000,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $27,400,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $1,910,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $18,390,000, of which not more than $14,933,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal years before fiscal year 1986 for military construction functions of the Defense Agencies that remain available for obligation are hereby authorized to be made available, to the extent provided in appropriations Acts, for military construction projects authorized in section 401 in the amount of $42,025,000.

(c) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE IV.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 401 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) and the amount specified in subsection (b).

SEC. 605. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of construction projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure Program, as authorized by section 501, in the amount of $55,000,000.

SEC. 606. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS; EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AFTER TWO YEARS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), all authorizations contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor contained in sections 601 through 605) shall expire on October 1, 1987, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988, whichever is later.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) do not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 1987, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988, whichever is later, for construction contracts, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, or contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program.

(b) EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 1984 PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 607(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-115; 97 Stat. 780), authorizations for the following projects authorized in sections 101, 201, and 301 of that Act shall remain in effect until October 1, 1986, or the date of enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987, whichever is later:

(1) Consolidated heating system in the amount of $1,850,000 at Stuttgart, Germany.

(2) Consolidated heating system in the amount of $1,750,000 at Stuttgart, Germany.

(3) Range modernization in the amount of $2,450,000 at Wildflecken, Germany.

(4) Unaccompanied personnel housing in the amount of $1,400,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(5) Operations building in the amount of $370,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(6) Multipurpose recreation facility in the amount of $480,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(7) Unaccompanied Officer housing in the amount of $600,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(8) Operations building in the amount of $410,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(9) Multipurpose recreation facility in the amount of $620,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(10) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $1,000,000 at Elefsis, Greece.

(11) Operations control center in the amount of $7,800,000 at the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine.

(12) Engine test cell modifications in the amount of $1,180,000 at the Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida.

(13) Land acquisition in the amount of $830,000 at the Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California.

(14) Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing in the amount of $10,000,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida.

(15) Electrical distribution lines in the amount of $7,200,000 at the Naval Shipyard Mare Island, Vallejo, California.

(16) Family housing in the amount of $33,982,000 at RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom.

(17) Air freight terminal in the amount of $10,200,000 at Elmendorf, Alaska.

SEC. 607. ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW.

For projects or contracts initiated during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act or October 1, 1985, whichever is later, and ending on the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987 or October 1, 1986, whichever is later, the following amounts apply:

(1) The maximum amount for an unspecified minor military construction project under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, is $1,000,000.

(2) The amount of a contract for architectural and engineering services or construction design that makes such a contract subject to the reporting requirement under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, is $300,000.

(3) The maximum amount per unit for an improvement project for family housing

units under section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, is $30,000.

(4) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in the United States, Puerto Rico, or Guam under section 2828(b) of title 10, United States Code, is $10,000.

(5)(A) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in a foreign country under section 2828(c) of title 10, United States Code, is $16,800.

(B) The maximum number of family housing units that may be leased at any one time in foreign countries under section 2828(c) of title 10, United States Code, is 34,000.

(6) The maximum rental per year for family housing facilities, or for real property related to family housing facilities, leased in a foreign country under section 2828(f) of title 10, United States Code, is $250,000.

SEC. 608. EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS: Page 40, line 20, strike out "$3,399,411,000" and insert in lieu thereof $3,410,786,000".

Page 40, line 23, strike out "$1,107,056,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,120,111,000".

Page 41, line 3, strike out "$451,970,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$450,290,000".

Page 41, line 21, strike out "$1,520,000" and insert in lieu thereof "2,520,000".

Page 41, line 25, strike out "$132,047,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$131,047,000".

Page 42, line 12, insert the following before the period: ", and $101,000,000 (the amount authorized under section 101(b) for Various Locations, Germany)".

Page 45, line 6, strike out "$212,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$226,800,000".

Page 45, line 10, strike out "$729,298,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$715,098,000".

Page 46, line 8, strike out "$205,760,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$203,025,000".

Page 46, line 14, strike out "$95,928,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$93,193,000".

Page 49, line 10, strike out "and 301" and insert in lieu thereof "301, and 401".

Page 51, insert the following after line 2:

(18) Sewage system in the amount of $2,760,000 at the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida.

(19) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $1,000,000 at Fort Hunter Liggett, California.

(20) Child care center in the amount of $3,000,000 at Fort Polk, Louisiana.

(21) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $2,200,000 at Sierra Army Depot, California.

(22) Special Process Laboratories Building in the amount of $39,100,000 at Fort Meade, Maryland.

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a technical and conforming amendment in nature. It corrects clerical and printing errors in the bill. It brings title VI, which authorizes appropriations, in conformance with the other titles and extends certain prior-year authorizations to allow the military departments additional time to award projects, award contracts on projects that have been delayed for various reasons. This amendment changes no substantive provisions, and I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VI?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VII.

The text of title VII is as follows:

TITLE VII—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 701. AUTHORIZATION FOR GUARD AND RESERVE FACILITIES.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), the following amounts:

(1) For the Department of the Army—

(A) for the Army National Guard of the United States, $142,624,000, and

(B) for the Army Reserve, $66,289,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy, for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $61,800,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force—

(A) for the Air National Guard of the United States, $137,200,000, and

(B) for the Air Force Reserve, $70,650,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MONTGOMERY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONTGOMERY: Page 53, line 5, strike out "$142,624,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$145,924,000".

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide for authorization of funds to acquire land to expand the training area at Camp McCain in my home State of Mississippi. Camp McCain is an Army National Guard training site where Army Guard units from Mississippi and several surrounding States conduct weapons and maneuver training each year.

Due to the limited training area currently available at Camp McCain, any firing of weapons larger than 30 caliber requires travel to other training sites resulting in great expense to the Government. In addition to solving the weapons firing problems, this new acquisition will provide terrain badly needed for maneuver areas for the new M-1 tank already deployed at Camp McCain because the tanks can now be used only for stationary training, soldiers are experiencing loss of proficiency in their driving and firing-while-moving skills.

Although I considered doing so, I did not offer this project for consideration during committee markup because the required environmental studies had not been completed. These studies have since been completed and I have been advised that there has been a finding of "no significant impact."

Thus, there no longer seems to be any reason for delaying this land acquisition. The land owners are willing to sell at this time and, in fact, are wanting to know why the purchase is being delayed. The Army estimates that savings derived from this purchase will pay for the land in less than 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this will prove to be a very cost-effective expenditure of funds. Apparently, members of the Appropriations Committee feel the same since the funds for this project have been included in the fiscal year 86 military construction appropriations bill as reported, "subject to appropriations."

For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that was submitted after the committee carried out its responsibilities to mark up. The subcommittee reviewed the matter and agreed to support the gentleman's amendment. We have no objection and urge its approval.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MC DADE

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McDADE: Page 53, line 5, insert before "and" the following: "plus $7,565,000 for facilities at Scranton/Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania,".

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I had to present for the consideration of the distinguished chairman and ranking minority member after the committee had completed its deliberations. It involves an effort to solve a safety problem that exists because the National

Guard has decided to put a new helicopter unit in the State of Pennsylvania. The current facilities are not adequate to assure that the safety of the young men who must fly and maintain these choppers would be adequate unless we provide additional facilities.

I have discussed this with the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and I have discussed it as well with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER]. I am not aware of any objection to the amendment.

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

Mr. McDADE. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from California, my friend.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank my colleagues for yielding.

The Chair would like to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman did present this amendment. In fact, it was right after the markup. The gentleman was very concerned and raised an important safety matter. As a matter of fact, as I understand, some people lost their lives as a result of this situation.

The gentleman also presented the amendment to the minority side. When the Chair convened a meeting of the full subcommittee to review all amendments, the gentleman's amendment was reviewed and the subcommittee agreed to accept the gentleman's amendment. So it is not only this side, but the entire subcommittee sees the gentleman's amendment as meritorous, and we ask it be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEVILL

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEVILL: Page 53, line 5, insert before "and" the following: "plus $2,671,000 for facilities at various locations in Alabama,".

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Chairman, this is an authorization for four Army National Guard armories to be included in the bill. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] as well as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] and myself have consolidated this amendment for the three congressional districts involved.

The Alabama Military Department points out that these are badly needed. I have discussed them with the chairman and the ranking minority member, and as far as I know, there is no objection. As a matter of fact, we did not have the design already at the time the markup was held. The design is ready now, and Alabama is ready to make its local participation, which, as I understand it, is 25 percent.

So I urge the committee to adopt the amendment.

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

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

□ 1520

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, the chair would like to point out that this amendment also was reviewed by the subcommittee, and the members agreed to support and accept the gentleman's amendment. We have no objection to the amendment on this side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SKELTON: Page 53, line 5, insert before "and" the following: "plus $2,186,000 for facilities located in Missouri,".

Mr. SKELTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, without further explanation, I have discussed this with the chairman. It deals with the DISCOM headquarters in Jefferson City, MO, Lexington, MO.

I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was reviewed by the members of the subcommittee. The members chose to support the amendment. We have no objection to it and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS: Page 53, line 11, strike out "$137,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$139,000,000".

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to winterize the dormitories at Phelps Collins Air National Guard Base in Alpena, MI. This is the kind of wise use of our precious defense resources that I know the American taxpayer would support as well as an opportunity to positively effect defense readiness.

Phelps Collins ANG has been used for Guard training since 1953. It has an excellent reputation as an air training facility, but suffers from some deficiencies in its buildings.

The biggest problem revolves around its dormitories, which are not properly winterized. While Phelps Collins is a hustling, bustling center of activity during the warm weather months, training slows to a crawl during the winter. Northern Michigan winters make it prohibitive to use dormitories that are not insulated. If these dormitories were insulated, the Air National Guard would have additional training facilities that would increase Phelps Collins year-around capacity from 6,000 to an estimated 10,000 personnel annually. In other words, for a relatively small amount of money we could increase this important facility's usefulness by almost double. It is rare when we are given an opportunity to get that much bang for our military buck.

There is another important point that should be considered. There are only four permanent Air Guard training sites in the country, and if there is no room for units to train here, units must be deployed overseas for training. While there are some obvious benefits from sending a unit overseas for training, there is also one great disadvantage—cost. If, by winterizing Phelps Collins, we can keep one unit from having to train overseas, we can probably save enough money to immediately offset this $1.8 million outlay. A side benefit, of course, is that the economic impact which accompanies an activity such as this occurs here in this country rather than overseas.

Phelps Collins plays an important part in our total defense mission. It is a frequently used, popular site for guardsmen from all over the country. In one case, Phelps Collins played host to 59 F-15's and 1,300 personnel from the 1st Tactical Fighter Wing from Langley Air Force Base, VA. My amendment today is an important opportunity to add substantially to Phelps Collins capabilities.

Mr Chairman, I urge the adoption of this important amendment.

Mr. DELLUMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman said, this amendment entails a relatively small amount of money. It deals with a weatherizing program in an area that needs it, and members of the subcommittee believe that the gentleman's amendment is a meritorious one, and we have no objection to the amendment and would urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RICHARDSON

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDSON: Page 53, line 5, insert before "and" the following: "plus $755,000 for a facility in New Mexico,".

Mr. RICHARDSON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to commend my colleagues, Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. KRAMER for their hard work on this legislation. Their efforts are appreciated by us all. I am offering an amendment to H.R. 1409 today for Mr. SKEEN and myself to authorize an additional $755,000 for the construction of an Army armory in Hobbs, NM.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to offer an amendment authorizing additional funds for anything at this time when we are giving such careful consideration to all budget requests. In this instance, however, I feel the ultimate result will mean a savings—rather than a deficit—to the Federal Treasury.

Earlier this year, the State of New Mexico, in reasonable anticipation of receiving Federal funds for much-needed improvements at three New Mexico armories, appropriated matching funds of 25 percent for each facility under consideration. The New Mexico Legislature appropriated $299,000 for the facility to be built outside of Hobbs. Believing it had clear assurances from the Federal Government on this project, the State proceeded to expend $15,604 on architect/engineer services for the proposed facility. The Federal Government also spent $29,000 to complete the design phase of the project—as clear an indication as I know that all signals were go for the Hobbs Armory.

On top of these compelling facts, the proposed armory just outside of Hobbs is scheduled to replace two existing armories which are in such a state of disrepair, the construction of one new facility will cost less than the renovation and operation of the two armories in the area. This proposed consolidation move is part of an overall effort by the Guard to improve efficiency and effectiveness at its armories—the National Guard anticipates a net savings in the long term as a result of the consolidation of the two existing facilities.

Mr. Chairman, even if funds are not appropriated for this facility, there is a slim chance that it could receive funds if, for some reason, additional funds become available at DOD over the course of the fiscal year—but only if the project is authorized by us today.

Obviously, everyone is ready to proceed on this project—the State has appropriated the matching funds, the plans are complete, the initial investment has been made by both the State and the Federal Government and, most importantly, the National Guard in New Mexico is in desperate need of new facilities. The project was not dropped from the DOD budget request for lack of need—need is clearly indicated in all plans and studies. It was dropped from the DOD military construction request simply because not enough funds were anticipated to meet military construction needs in fiscal year 1986. While we are hoping DOD will come back with a request for fiscal year 1987, we are uncertain whether the State matching funds will still be around to supplement the building of the facility.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment which is important to both New Mexico and the training and military preparedness of our national guardsmen.

Mr. DELLUMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman explained, this is a project that has already received priority in that it was scheduled to be in the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1987.

The gentleman presented the subcommittee with a number of reasons why that program ought to be moved from fiscal year 1987 to fiscal year 1986, and the subcommittee sees no objection to it. We would urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VII?

If not, the Clerk will designate title VIII.

The text of title VIII is as follows:

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN PILOT PROGRAMS.

(a) BUILD-TO-LEASE PROGRAM.—Paragraph (9) of section 2828(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "October 1, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1986".

(b) RENTAL GUARANTEE PROGRAM.—Subsection (h) of section 802 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-115; 97 Stat. 783, 789), is amended by striking out "September 30, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1986".

SEC. 802. FAMILY HOUSING OCCUPANT LIABILITY.

(a) LIABILITY FOR FAILURE TO CLEAN SATISFACTORILY.—Subsection (a) of section 2775 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) A member of the armed forces—

"(A) who is assigned or provided a family housing unit; and

"(B) who fails to clean satisfactorily that housing unit (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense) upon termination of the assignment or provision of that housing unit,

shall be liable to the United States for the cost of cleaning made necessary as a result of that failure.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by inserting "(in the case of liability under subsection (a)(1))" after "including".

(2) Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended by striking out "subsection (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a)(1), or the cost of any cleaning made necessary by a failure to clean satisfactorily a family housing unit referred to in subsection (a)(2),".

(3) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by inserting "or failure to clean satisfactorily a family housing unit" after "(or the equipment or furnishings of a family housing unit)".

(4) Subsection (e) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section. Such regulations shall include—

"(1) regulations for determining the cost of repairs and replacements made necessary as the result of abuse or negligence for which a member is liable under subsection (a)(1);

"(2) regulations for determining the cost of cleaning made necessary as a result of the failure to clean satisfactorily for which a member is liable under subsection (a)(2); and

"(3) provisions for limitations of liability, the compromise or waiver of claims, and the collection of amounts owed under this section.".

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2775. Liability of members assigned to military housing".

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 165 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"2775. Liability of members assigned to military housing.".

SEC. 803. PREOCCUPANCY TERMINATION COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2828(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(d)"; and

(2) by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(2) The Secretary may enter into an agreement under this paragraph in connection with a lease entered into under subsection (c). Any such agreement shall be for any period not in excess of three years and shall be for the purpose of compensating a developer for any costs resulting from the termination of the lease during the construction of the housing units that are to be occupied pursuant to the lease. Any agreement entered into under this paragraph shall include a provision that the obligation of the United States to make payments under the

agreement in any fiscal year is subject to the availability of appropriations.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 804. ACTIVITIES INCLUDED WITHIN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION OF FAMILY HOUSING.—Section 2821 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Amounts authorized by law for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities include amounts for—

"(1) minor construction;

"(2) improvements to existing military family housing units and facilities;

"(3) relocation of military family housing units under section 2827 of this title; and

"(4) architectural and engineering services and construction design.".

(b) FAMILY HOUSING SUPPORT.—(1) Chapter 169 of such title is amended by adding after section 2832 the following new section:

"§ 2833. Family housing support

"Amounts authorized by law for support of military family housing include amounts for—

"(1) operating expenses;

"(2) leasing expenses;

"(3) maintenance of real property expenses;

"(4) payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred; and

"(5) payments of mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715m).".

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2832 the following new item:

"2833. Family housing support.".

SEC. 805. DOMESTIC FAMILY HOUSING LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2828(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "(3) Not" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not"; and

(2) by adding the following new subparagraph at the end thereof:

"(B) During fiscal years 1986 and 1987, the number of housing units that may be leased pursuant to the provisions of subparagraph (A) may be increased by 500 units for each such fiscal year. The Secretary concerned shall provide written notification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the location, purpose, and cost of the additional units permitted by this subparagraph. Such notification shall be made periodically as the leases are entered into.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 806. SALE-AND-REPLACEMENT TRANSACTIONS.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR SALE-AND-REPLACEMENT TRANSACTIONS.—Section 807(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law No. 98.115; 97 Stat. 786), is amended by striking out "October 1, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1986".

(b) APPROVAL OF TRANSACTIONS.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out the following sale-and-replacement transactions under the provisions of section 2667a of title 10, United States Code:

(1) The sale and replacement of warehousing facilities at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.

(2) The sale and replacement of a noncommissioned officers professional education center, a band center, and a combat operations center at March Air Force Base, California.

SEC. 807. TURN-KEY SELECTION PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subchapter III the following new section:

"§ 2862. Turn-key selection procedures

"(a)(1) The Secretaries of the military departments, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, may use one-step turn-key selection procedures for the purpose of entering into contracts for the construction of authorized military construction projects.

"(2) In this section, 'one-step turn-key selection procedures' means procedures used for the selection of a contractor on the basis of price and other evaluation criteria to perform, in accordance with the provisions of a firm fixed-price contract, both the design and construction of a facility using performance specifications supplied by the Secretary concerned.

"(b) The Secretary of a military department may not, during any fiscal year, enter into more than three contracts for military construction projects using procedures authorized by this section.

"(c) The authority of a Secretary of a military department under this section shall expire on October 1, 1991.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2861 the following:

"2862. Turn-key selection procedures.".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 808. COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary of Defense may use funds appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for planning and design purposes to provide community planning assistance when local resources are not sufficient, by grant or otherwise, as follows:

(1) To assist communities located near newly established Light Infantry Division Posts, $2,000,000.

(2) To assist communities located near newly established homeports under the Naval Strategic Dispersal Program, $3,000,000.

SEC. 809. MADIGAN ARMY MEDICAL CENTER, FORT LEWIS WASHINGTON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 601(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-407; 98 Stat. 1512), is amended by striking out "and the amount specified in subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof ", the amount specified in subsection (b)(1), and $326,800,000 (the amount authorized for the construction of the Madigan Army Medical Center, Fort Lewis, Washington)".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall become effective on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 810. INTERSERVICE EXCHANGES.

Section 2571 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) No agency or official of the executive branch of the Federal Government may establish any regulation, program, or policy or take any other action which precludes, directly or indirectly, the Secretaries concerned from carrying out this section.".

SEC. 811. PLAN FOR CLEANUP OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall develop and transmit, by December 31, 1985, to the Congress a report setting forth a comprehensive plan for completing the cleanup of contaminated sites, structures, equipment, and natural resources at or near the Rocky Mountain Arsenal near Denver, Colorado, by September 30, 1993.

(b) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—In such plan, the Secretary shall—

(1) describe in detail the various phases for the project, along with the completion dates and a priority ranking of the goals for each such phase;

(2) provide cost estimates for each such phase and for the total project;

(3) provide findings and conclusions reached as a result of consultation, before the transmittal of the plan, with State and local officials (including officials of water districts) and the general public;

(4) provide that consultation and coordination with such officials and the general public will be carried out throughout the process of cleaning up the Arsenal;

(5) provide for priority cleanup of—

(A) the most seriously contaminated areas at the Arsenal, including the areas known as Basin F, Basin A, and section 36;

(B) other areas at the Arsenal which should be afforded priority treatment for the benefit of the general public, including the areas known as sections 7, 8, 11, and 12; and

(C) any sites, structures, equipment, or natural resources located outside the Arsenal that have been contaminated by activities carried out at the Arsenal;

(6) provide for the cleanup of the areas described in paragraph (5) without regard to whether a final disposal site for hazardous substances from the Arsenal has been selected;

(7) establish, as a priority, the use of waste-treatment technologies that will reduce significantly the amount and toxicity level of hazardous substances at or near the Arsenal;

(8) provide for selection of a final disposal site for hazardous substances from the Arsenal in a manner that will take into consideration sites, within and outside of Colorado, that—

(A) are geologically suitable to serve as such a disposal site; and

(B) are located within areas the governing bodies of which have expressed a willingness to have such a disposal site located therein;

(9) provide that all activities in the plan will be carried out in compliance with the requirements of applicable Federal and State environmental laws, but, in the case of State laws, only to the extent that such laws are in effect on May 15, 1985;

(10) provide findings and conclusions reached as a result of studying the feasibility and cost of cleansing groundwater on an expedited basis at the sources of contamination on the Arsenal; and

(11) include a statement concerning any reprogramming or supplemental appropriation of funds that may be necessary for fiscal year 1986 in order to assure an expeditious implementation of the plan.

SEC. 812. PROJECT AMOUNT FOR FORT DRUM, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amount established for a project at Fort Drum, New York, by section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-407; 98 Stat. 1495) is hereby increased by $82,500,000.

(b) FUNDING.—Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal years before fiscal year 1985 for military construction functions of the Army that remain available

for obligation are hereby authorized to be made available, to the extent provided in appropriation Acts, for the military construction project described in subsection (a), in the amount of $82,500,000.

(c) COST OF PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the limit established by section 601(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, on the total cost of all projects carried out under section 101 of that Act is hereby increased by $82,500,000.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 813. MATERIAL AT NAVAL BASE, NORFOLK, VIRGINIA.

The Secretary of the Navy may provide, without compensation, to the City of Norfolk, Virginia, not more than 50,000 cubic yards of dredged material located at the Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia, if such city agrees to bear all costs and liabilities associated with loading, transporting, using, or otherwise handling such material.

SEC. 814. LAND CONVEYANCE TO THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE; COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of the Air Force (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the United States Olympic Committee, without monetary consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 3.98 acres of land and improvements near Colorado Springs, Colorado, that are being leased to such Committee by the Secretary pursuant to section 806 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1980.

(b) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance described in subsection (a) shall be subject—

(1) to the condition that the land and improvements so conveyed shall be used by the United States Olympic Committee solely for facilities and activities of such Committee;

(2) to the condition that if such land and improvements are not used for the purpose described in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to them shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon; and

(3) to such other conditions as the Secretary may prescribe to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact description of the land and improvements described in subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 815. ALTERATION IN TRAILER PARK EXPANSION, HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE, MASSACHUSETTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In providing for the trailer park at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, and the expansion of such park as authorized by section 302 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, the Secretary of the Air Force may enter into an agreement with the Massachusetts Port Authority to terminate leasehold rights of the Department of the Air Force in exchange for—

(1) leasehold rights to other land held by such Authority; and

(2) the construction, by such Authority or its designee, of roads, utilities, and trailer pads on such other land in accordance with specifications made by the Secretary.

(b) LIMITATION.—The termination of the leasehold rights by the Secretary shall not become effective until the completion of the construction described in subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 816. TRANSFERS CONCERNING THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

(a) TRANSFER TO THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.—The Administrator of General Services shall transfer, without reimbursement, to the Secretary of the Army a tract (with any improvements thereon) of 18.5 acres (more or less) adjacent to Fort McNair in the District of Columbia.

(b) TRANSFER BY THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.—Upon the relocation of the Army Intelligence and Security Command and other defense activities from Arlington Hall Station to new quarters, the Secretary of the Army shall transfer, without reimbursement, approximately 72 acres of the tract of land known as Arlington Hall Station, together with improvements thereon, to the Secretary of State to be used as a center for training in foreign affairs, and for other purposes as deemed appropriate by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 817. LAND EXCHANGE, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) through (f), the Secretary of the Navy (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the NEW MET Company (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Company") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 39.5 acres of unimproved land comprising a portion of the Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, located adjacent to the Ribault Bay Village Navy housing area.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—In consideration for the conveyance by the Secretary under subsection (a), the Company shall convey to the United States a parcel of land consisting of approximately 31.7 acres located in the vicinity of the Ribault Bay Village Navy housing area.

(c) OBLIGATIONS OF PARTIES.—The specific obligations of the Secretary and the Company are set forth in a memorandum of understanding between the parties dated February 19, 1985.

(d) PAYMENT BY THE COMPANY.—If the fair market value of the land conveyed under subsection (a) exceeds the fair market value of the land conveyed under subsection (b), as determined by the Secretary, the Company shall pay the difference to the United States.

(e) SURVEY.—The exact acreages and legal descriptions of the lands to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys which are satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of any such survey shall be borne by the Company.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the transaction authorized by this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 818. CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—Subject to subsections (b) through (g), the Secretary of the Navy (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the Westvaco Corporation (the principal address and place of business of which is 299 Park Avenue, New York, New York, and hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Corporation") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 47.83 acres of improved land comprising that portion of the Navy Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, located at Remount Road and Virginia Avenue, in the city of North Charleston.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—In consideration for the conveyance authorized by subsection (a), the Corporation shall pay all costs for construction and occupancy by the Navy of "in kind" facilities to replace those on the land to be conveyed. The replacement facilities shall be constructed by the Navy on the Naval Weapons Station described in subsection (a) at a site to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) OBLIGATIONS OF PARTIES.—The specific obligations of the Secretary and the Corporation are set forth in a memorandum of understanding between the parties that became effective April 17, 1985. The Secretary is authorized to receive, obligate, and disburse funds received under subsection (b) to cover design, construction, relocation, and related costs specified in the memorandum of understanding.

(d) VACATING PROPERTY.—Upon completion and occupancy of the replacement facilities by the Navy and payment of all costs by the Corporation, the Navy shall promptly vacate the property described in subsection (a) and convey it by quitclaim deed to the Corporation.

(e) PAYMENT OF ANY EXCESS.—If the fair market value of the improved land conveyed under subsection (a) exceeds the consideration paid under subsection (b), as determined by the Secretary, the Corporation shall pay the difference to the United States.

(f) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and legal description of any land conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey which is satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of such survey shall be borne by the Corporation.

(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interest of the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS: Page 59, line 5, strike out "Section" and insert in lieu thereof "Effective as of September 30, 1985, section".

Page 64, line 20, strike out "1985" and insert in lieu thereof "1986".

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is strictly technical in nature; it simply corrects clerical and printing errors in the bill; it changes no substantive provision. I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WHITEHURST

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITEHURST: Page 54, line 13, strike out "Secretary of De-

fense" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of Defense or Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy".

Page 54, after line 17, insert the following:

(b) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION.—Section 2775 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (b), by inserting after "the Secretary of Defense" the following: "and the Secretary of Transportation when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy"; and

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting after "or defense agency concerned" the following: ", or the operating expenses account of the Coast Guard, as appropriate".

Page 54, line 18, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

Page 55, line 7, insert after "Defense" the following: ", and the Secretary of Transportation when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy,".

Page 55, line 21, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)".

Mr. WHITEHURST (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would extend authority for the Secretary of Transportation to collect for damages to Government-furnished quarters and related equipment and furnishings administered by the Coast Guard. The current law authorizes the Department of Defense to collect for damages to quarters controlled by the Department and to credit the funds collected to the family housing and operational account of the appropriate service. The Department of Transportation does not have that same authority with respect to the Coast Guard. To date, the Coast Guard has had to absorb annual losses of approximately $70,000 due to this oversight.

I consider this as really a conforming amendment since the existing language of section 2775 technically includes the Coast Guard, and my amendment would merely clarify that the Secretary of Transportation could take action with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy.

Mr. DELLUMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITEHURST. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WHITEHURST] is a very diligent and hard-working member of the subcommittee; one of the senior members of the full Committee on Armed Services. He offered this amendment; we reviewed the amendment to make certain that we were within our appropriate committee jurisdiction, and the way the amendment is written and presented, Mr. Chairman, it conforms with the jurisdiction. We have no objection, and urge its approval.

Mr. WHITEHURST. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WHITEHURST].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKELTON

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SKELTON: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL GUARD ARMORIES.

(a) CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATES.—Subsection (e) of section 2233 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure, or contribute to any State such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary to procure, architectural and engineering services and construction design in connection with facilities to be established or developed under this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law."

(b) AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTION.—Subsection (b) of section 2236 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(b) A contribution made for an armory under section 2233(a) (4) or (5) of this title may not exceed the sum of—

"(1) 100 percent of the cost of architectural, engineering and design services (including advance architectural, engineering and design services under section 2233(e) of this title); and

"(2) a percentage of the cost of construction (exclusive of the cost of architectural, engineering and design services) calculated so that upon completion of construction the total contribution (including the contribution for architectural, engineering and design services) equals 75 percent of the total cost of construction (including the cost of architectural, engineering and design services).

For the purpose of computing the cost of construction under this subsection, the amount contributed by the State or Territory, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, whichever is concerned, may not include the cost or market value of any real property that it has contributed."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

Mr. SKELTON (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to permit the Secretary of Defense to advance to a State in connection with a contribution under section 2233 of title X for the construction of National Guard facilities, 100 percent of that cost of architectural, engineering and design services related to the construction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I point out that this proposed amendment would break the logjam that now exists by permitting the Secretary of Defense to advance 100 percent of the cost for architectural, engineering and design services for these projects such as armories and the like. It would not change the present, overall cost-sharing ratio of 75/25 percent.

Mr. DELLUMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment adds no additional funds to the amendment. It is a language change amendment, the authority to advance Federal funds for architect and engineering services for design of National Guard armories on a reimbursable basis.

The subcommittee has reviewed the gentleman's amendment and believes the language is meritorious and we urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I wish to engage the chairman in a short colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of the Missouri delegation are interested in a project in the St. Louis area, and I raise this issue because my colleague and friend, Congressman YOUNG from the St. Louis area is presently out of the country on business at this time, and there is the proposed project of renovating and putting back in better mobilization state the facility to manufacture ammunition in the St. Louis area, and I wish to direct this to the chairman; I know he is familiar with it, and would appreciate his comments at this time.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I appreciate the gentleman's concern about the well-being of my colleague's interest, who happens to be out of the country on important business.

Our staff has conversed with the gentleman's staff; and we have learned that the gentleman is prepared to submit the project in fiscal year 1987, and we have assured the gentleman that his request will receive serious consideration and hopefully be incorporated into the fiscal year 1987 military construction budget.

So we appreciate the gentleman's concern, as we understand that his prerogatives are being preserved, and we will simply move it back to next year's authorization bill.

Mr. SKELTON. That is certainly fine. I appreciate the gentleman's con-

sideration and his understanding on this issue.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DANIEL

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DANIEL: At the end of the title VIII (page 71, after line 9) add the following new section:

SEC. 819. FURNISHING OF BEDDING FOR HOMELESS.

Section 2546 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

"(d) The Secretary concerned may provide bedding for support of shelters for the homeless that are operated by entities other than the Department of Defense. Bedding may be provided under this subsection without reimbursement, but may only be provided to the extent that the Secretary determines that the provision of such bedding will not interfere with military requirements.".

Mr. DANIEL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

□ 1530

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, as the Members will recall, 2 years ago I offered a floor amendment to the Defense Authorization Act, 1984 (sec. 305, Public Law 98-94) giving the Secretary of Defense authority to assist efforts to provide shelter for the homeless. Specifically, it authorized the Secretary of Defense to repair and rehabilitate Department of Defense [DOD] facilities to make them more suitable for use as shelters. In addition, my amendment gave DOD the authority to spend money to provide transportation, bedding, utilities, security and insurance incidental to the establishment of a shelter.

Since that time, some progress has been made. Eight shelters have been opened and negotiations are underway for seven more. Altogether, DOD has spent over $1.7 million and this level of funding will steadily increase as the program becomes more established in the years ahead.

At the same time, however, I have been somewhat concerned about the lack of progress at some sites due to the reluctance of communities and charitable organizations to operate available facilities as shelters for the homeless. For example, DOD spent $200,000 to rehabilitate a barracks at Camp Parks, CA, but repeated efforts to find a qualified party to operate a shelter there have been unsuccessful. I think it is important to remember that DOD can only be a partner in these efforts. DOD can provide the facilities and pay some of the support costs, but DOD cannot manage or operate the shelters. This partnership can only work if communities and charitable organizations are willing to come forth with the assistance and effort needed to make an available facility into a functioning shelter.

The amendment I am offering today addresses an effort by DOD to increase its assistance of the homeless. For some time, DOD has been providing cots and blankets to non-DOD shelters on the basis of a temporary loan. Currently, DOD has about 2,000 cots and 4,000 blankets on loan to various shelters around the country.

By law, DOD cannot provide cots and blankets outright and this creates a number of problems. First, a temporary loan of cots or blankets is patently unrealistic and DOD does not expect to have these items returned after use by the homeless. Second, the accounting process involved with a temporary loan results in a lot of unnecessary red tape. For example, every 90 days, the Defense Logistics Agency is required to send out inspectors to verify the need to continue the loan. In addition, the stock fund carries these items as "open items" requiring reimbursement, but it is not legal to reimburse the stock fund from the O&M account for this purpose.

My amendment would remedy this situation by authorizing DOD to provide bedding to non-DOD shelters on a nonreimbursable basis. This will eliminate the need for "temporary loans" of these items and the resulting unnecessary bookkeeping and redtape. Finally, it will allow the O&M account to reimburse the stock fund for the cots and blankets provided so that they can be replaced with newer items.

In sum, my amendment supports DOD efforts to provide cots and blankets to non-DOD shelters as "free issue" items to the extent that it does not interfere with military requirements. Cold weather is almost upon us and the adoption of my amendment will insure that DOD is able to provide the maximum amount of assistance to these unfortunate people in their time of greatest need.

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman [Mr. DANIEL] is offering, in the Chair's estimation, a meritorious amendment.

What the gentleman seeks to do is to amend that portion of the bill to enable the Department of Defense to provide blankets and cots to nine DOD shelters for the homeless without reimbursement. This happens to be the "last train leaving."

My distinguished colleague is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness of the Committee on Armed Services which has as its jurisdiction the operation and maintenance account.

The gentleman is simply offering an amendment to this bill that by virtue of how it is written is appropriate in this bill. We think it is meritorious, and we have no objection whatsoever, and we urge enthusiastic support of the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KRAMER

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KRAMER: Page 62, line 26, insert after "Basin A," the following: "the South Plants Area,".

Page 64, line 3, strike out ", but" and all that follows through line 5 and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon.

Mr. KRAMER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is technical in nature. It simply is intended to clarify the intent of section 811 of H.R. 1409.

Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KRAMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered By Mr. PENNY: At the end of title VIII, add the following new section:

SEC. 819. LIMITATION ON TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED BY TITLES I THROUGH VIII.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act shall not exceed $8,405,206,000.

Mr. PENNY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. KRAMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I ask

the gentleman what the nature of the amendment is?

Mr. PENNY. If the gentleman will yield, it is a freeze at fiscal year 1985 levels.

Mr. KRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment together with my colleague from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL]. We all know that in this House authorizations fuel appropriations. If we continue to increase authorization levels as we have done in this military construction bill, we are going to lock ourselves into higher appropriation levels than we can afford in future years.

We have huge Federal budget deficits facing this Nation, and many of us in this House felt that one way to stop those deficits from growing is to freeze the budget across the board.

So far this year we have offered freeze amendments to most appropriations and authorization bills that have been brought forward. In almost every instance those amendments have been adopted, and in fact in many instances we have reduced spending in those measures below last year's levels.

In this area, in the area of military construction, we have seen phenomenal growth in the last 5 years. There has been a 250-percent increase in funding in this area of the Federal budget in just that 5-year timeframe. So if there is any one area in the budget where we certainly can live within a freeze level, it ought to be the military construction authorization programs.

In addition, we are now in conference committee with the other body on something called Hollings-Gramm-Rudman. That proposal will require us to make across-the-board reductions in the next several fiscal years in which we exceed certain spending targets. Those spending targets call for us to reduce by $36 billion per year the Federal deficit until we reach a balanced budget.

That is going to call for us to make some tough choices in the Federal budget. I think we can begin by making those tough choices here in the military construction bill today, and I advocate adoption of this freeze.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PENNY

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. LIMITATION ON AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the maximum amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act is $9,200,000.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend my distinguished colleague for offering his amendment. Certainly in my estimation, the thrust of the amendment is meritorious. We have chosen to offer a substitute amendment rather than challenging my colleague's amendment, simply reiterating why we are offering this amendment. With your indulgence, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to rehash recent history.

The President of the United States submitted to the Congress a military construction authorization bill at the level of $10.3 billion in a military budget in excess of $322 billion.

The House of Representatives, in the first concurrent budget resolution, agreed, in the course of that debate that waged over several days, that the military function would be frozen at fiscal year 1985 levels, which meant a reduction of approximately $3 billion from the President's request of $322 billion down to a figure of $292 billion, which would freeze the military budget at fiscal year 1985 authorization levels. That figure, $292 billion, was a figure given to the House Armed Services Committee as a ceiling against which they could not exceed. The Committee on Armed Services of the House, attempting to allocate its responsibilities within the framework of that charge to freeze at fiscal year 1985 levels the $292 billion, agreed to establish priorities within that. They decided that, based on rather rapid escalation in our procurement and R&D function, that those two functions would take the largest part of the cut. Therefore, the priorities would gravitate toward readiness and quality of life which, over the years, had not been a high priority but, I would submit, a secondary priority, because we have tended in this body to be grossly preoccupied with the technology of death and all the instruments therefor. But we have not focused as diligently as many of us think we should on the human side of this equation.

Therefore, the Committee on Armed Services gave the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, Military Construction, a smaller percentage cut but still within the framework of the $292 billion. We were given the figure of $718 million to cut. The subcommittee went about its business and not only achieved that mark but it exceeded that mark by a few million dollars.

We came in with a budget figure of $759 million below the President's request of $10.3 billion. We therefore reported to the full Committee on Armed Services, with their ratification, to the floor of this body a figure of $9.55 billion fully within the $292 billion freeze figure.

Now a very interesting thing, I would say to my colleague, that my colleague went to the conference with the other body and agreed to a $10 billion increase in the authorization level from $292 to $302 billion.

One would think then that the military construction budget would be increased. But when the smoke settled from the agreements that were arrived at in the large conference, the figure that was given to the military construction function was not $9.55 billion but $9.2 billion. What this amendment does is say, simply, notwithstanding any other action that we have taken on this floor, that this bill would not authorize appropriations in excess of the $9.2 billion, which would leave us at the amount agreed to in the conference, it would take us almost $4 billion below the $9.55 billion which was below the freeze level.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we authorized $9.16 billion last year. So we are only a pittance above the authorization level. I would simply say to my colleague that I understand freeze that appropriation level, but just one final point I would make: Authorization bills, unfortunately, by their nature, are always higher than appropriation bills because you must fund the entire project.

For example, if you fund a project at $30 million, we have to authorize $30 million.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELLUMS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DELLUMS. The Appropriations Committee can look at that $30 million authorization and say, "Look, you can only spend $6 million in this fiscal year." We therefore appropriate $6 million. You see, but you cannot authorize $6 million, you have to authorize the entire project. It may be funded over several years, and that is one of the reasons why the authorization bills tend to be a little higher.

What I would say to my colleague, as the gentleman knows, I take second to no one in this body to challenging the efficacy of the military budget—I have offered several alternatives myself, and believe that we ought to cut the military budget by substantial billions of dollars—but I would simply say that in this process we worked very diligently to enhance the quality of life. I would say if the gentleman were willing to accept the substitute, this gentleman certainly can promise that we

would not come in here higher than $9.02 billion, and we will try diligently to come in below that figure.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute so that I may yield to my distinguished colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PENNY. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I find the approach that the gentleman has suggested a reasonable middle ground because in fact it will leave us in this authorization bill with an authorization level that is about the same as it was for fiscal year 1985.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his cooperation.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, by reason of the diligence of our staff, I note a technical error, and I ask unanimous consent to modify my substitute amendment to read "$9,200,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELLUMS as modified as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. PENNY: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. LIMITATION ON AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the maximum amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act is $9,200,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], as modified, as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

The amendment, as modified, offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], as amended.

The amendment as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as we are about to conclude debate on the bill, I want to say to the members of the committee that I want to rise and congratulate my friend, the chairman of the committee, for his perseverance in behalf of junior enlisted people. He has a long-time record in this field. I remember several years back when we were debating a bill that came out of my Personnel Subcommittee at that time involving housing for junior enlisted personnel, the gentleman from California came to me and said, "Coach, I am ready to go in any time you need me."

He went to the well of this House, and we were able to pass that bill with his help.

It came about at a time a lot of people over in the other body were saying that we do not need junior enlisted quarters, "If the Army had intended for you to have a wife, they would have issued you one." I want to tell you how much I appreciate his efforts. The gentleman has always been a strong supporter in behalf of junior people in our military, so-called "grunts," as we call them.

I just felt that I should take the microphone and express to him my appreciation. I am sure other senior members of the committee share that as well.

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman very much.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2860 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2860. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"Funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for a fiscal year for military construction or military family housing purposes may remain available beyond such fiscal year to the extent provided in appropriation Acts."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to funds appropriated after the date of the enactment of Public Law 99-103.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

□ 1545

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is essentially a technical amendment which amends existing law under section 2860 of title 10. It is a necessary amendment as a part of an initiative to reform and oversee the actual use of appropriated funds for military construction. The provisions of existing law had their origin in a prior Appropriations Committee bill which became permanent law in the Military Construction Codification Act (Public Law 97-115). The provisions were initially adopted at the request of the Defense Department to give the services flexibility in the use of appropriated funds. However, the services have used this authority to excess in financing prior year projects with current year appropriations and funding current year projects with prior year appropriations. In other words, it has permitted the services to move projects between fiscal years without ever having to report it to the Congress or even to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. This has obviously created confusion and made it virtually impossible for the Defense Department or the Congress to determine the financial status of military construction accounts. For this reason, I am proposing the existing flexibility be rescinded by amending the existing law.

As the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee knows, our Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction had appeared before the Rules Committee seeking a waiver of clause 2 of rule 21 to our bill which contains this same basic provision. Mr. MONTGOMERY of your committee had objected to such a waiver strictly on procedural grounds indicating that it was legislation and should be included in this authorization bill. My understanding is that your committee has no objections to this amendment. Therefore, I urge its adoption.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that the gentleman's amendment is a contribution to the legislation before us. We have reviewed it. We accept it. We have no objection, and we urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PANETTA

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PANETTA: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. OFF-POST RENTAL HOUSING LEASE INDEMNITY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a pilot program to test the feasibility of implementing a program under which each Secretary of a military department may guarantee compensation of any person who leases a rental unit to any member of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary for any breach of the lease or any damage to the rental unit by the member.

(2) The program referred to in paragraph (1) shall be established before the expiration of the 90-day period following the date of the enactment of this Act, but not before October 1, 1985.

(b) ACTIONS BY SECRETARIES OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—(1) In accordance with

action taken by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a), each Secretary of a military department shall designate one military installation in the United States that is under the jurisdiction of such Secretary to participate in the program established under subsection (a).

(2) For purposes of carrying out this section, any Secretary of a military department, to the extent approved in advance in appropriation Acts, may enter into an agreement with any person who leases a rental unit to any member of the armed forces who is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Any agreement under this paragraph shall provide that—

(A) the term of the agreement shall not be for more than one year;

(B) the member shall not pay a security deposit;

(C) the Secretary (except as provided in subparagraphs (D) and (E)) shall compensate the lessor for any breach of the lease by the member and for any damage to the rental unit caused by the member or by any guest or dependent of the member;

(D) the total liability of the Secretary for any breach of the lease or for any damage described in subparagraph (C) shall not exceed an amount equal to the amount that the Secretary determines would have been required by the lessor as a security deposit absent the agreement authorized in this paragraph;

(E) the Secretary shall not compensate the lessor for any breach of the lease or for any damage described in subparagraph (C) until the lessor exhausts any remedies available to the lessor against the member for the breach or damage; and

(F) the Secretary shall be subrogated to the rights of the lessor in any case in which the Secretary compensates the lessor for any breach of the lease or for any damage described in subparagraph (C).

(3) Any authority of a Secretary of a military department under this subsection shall be exercised pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense.

(c) GARNISHMENT OF PAY OF MEMBER OF ARMED FORCES.—Any Secretary who compensates any lessor under subsection (b) for any damage to a rental unit or any breach of a lease by a member of the armed forces may issue a special order under section 1007 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the withholding from the pay of the member of an amount equal to the amount paid by the Secretary to the lessor as compensation for the breach or damage.

(d) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report concerning the pilot program established under subsection (a), including—

(A) findings and conclusions of the Secretary with respect to the pilot program; and

(B) recommendations as to the feasibility of implementing a program similar to the pilot program on all military installations.

(2) The report referred to in paragraph (1) shall be submitted before the expiration of the 18-month period following the date of the establishment of the pilot program under subsection (a).

(e) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of any Secretary of a military department to enter into any contract under subsection (b) shall terminate upon the expiration of the 18-month period following the date of the establishment of the pilot program under subsection (a).

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "armed forces" has the meaning given such term in section 101(4) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term "military department" has the meaning given such term in section 101(7) of title 10, United States Code.

Mr. PANETTA (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the military construction authorization, H.R. 1409, which directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a pilot program involving military personnel and their civilian landlords. This amendment would give the Secretary of each branch the authority to designate one military installation in the United States for participation in this program. Under this pilot program, landlords would agree to waive security deposits when renting housing units to military personnel. In return, the Secretary of Defense would agree to guarantee payment on any breach of lease or damage, and to take that money out of the service member's paycheck. This pilot program would run for 1 year, and at the end of that time, we could evaluate its results and consider the possibility of enlarging the program.

All of my colleagues are aware of the tremendous financial and emotional pressures inflicted on our military personnel and their families. This already tense situation is made even worse during a permanent change of station move. Travel and relocation expenses come out of the pockets of our service men and women. Reimbursement comes later, although only $1 out of every $4 spent on a PCS move are reimbursed under the existing system, according to an Air Force study. And when a military family arrives in a new location, it must meet the immediate costs of security deposits, first and last months' rent, utility deposits, and more. Before you can even blink, the military family can be $4,000 in debt. And 2 years later, the military family has to go through the whole process again.

This year, I am proud to say, the Congress has come a long way in dealing with the pressures and inequities inflicted on our men and women in uniform and their families. I am pleased that my own legislation, H.R. 1371, was the first legislative effort in this area. Many of my proposals regarding PCS moves and travel expenses were incorporated in the Department of Defense authorization passed by the House last month.

One of my proposals, however, and one which I feel could lead us even further down the road toward easing the financial burden on our military family, is my proposal to initiate a pilot program involving military personnel and their landlords. Under this program, a landlord would agree not to require a security deposit or last month's rent of a service member. In return, the military post at which the individual is stationed would agree to meet any financial obligations involved in damage or a breach of lease by the service member when that individual is transferred to another post. The amount of the reimbursement could not exceed the amount the Secretary determines would have been required by the lessor as a security deposit if no pilot program were in effect. The Secretary of Defense would then have the authority to garnish the wages of the service member in order to cover any funds paid out to the landlord.

Thus, no appropriation of funds is necessary because the service member would be ultimately responsible for meeting the costs of any damage or breach of lease. Although this pilot program would involve an initial outlay of funds to reimburse landlords, this outlay of funds would be done at the same time money was being withheld from the paycheck of the individual service member. Thus, this program would guarantee that any outlay of funds would be matched with incoming funds, so that no expenditure or appropriation is involved.

I know from my own experience that landlords on the Monterey Peninsula are interested in this program. They understand the hardships imposed on the military family, and they understand that this program guarantees payment for damages and breach of lease, so long as the payment does not exceed the amount of the usual security deposit. They realize, also, that this program would relieve some of the difficulties they experience in renting to military personnel. This program would give landlords one point of contact for all their military tenants and a source of information regarding military personnel who may soon be transferred, thus enabling landlords to prepare for a change in the lease.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the success of this pilot program could lead to a service wide program that would permanently solve one of the major problems facing our military personnel, and do away with certainly one of their largest financial burdens. What is more, no one loses in this program; everybody wins. Landlords are guaranteed their payment, our military personnel are able to use their much-needed money for necessities, and the services are guaranteed reimbursement for any outlays to jilted landlords. It is almost inconceivable that so much good can come from a program that will not cost us anything, and yet imagine the benefits.

When the House voted earlier to accept many of my proposals to ease the burdens on our military personnel, service men and women all over the world breathed a sigh of relief. But we have not yet addressed one of the most pressing, and financially disabling, issues. The test program I propose would address this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support it, so that one day our military men and women will not look on military service as a financially crippling and emotionally draining experience.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that this is a meritorious amendment. This amendment establishes a pilot program to allow the branches of services to establish a program whereby the security deposits can be waived for military personnel. I have toured a number of military bases in this country. You find a young married person with a couple of children. Let us say that they come back from overseas into the United States. They move into the Fort Ord area, which is a resort area, where the cost of living is rather high, and there is a dearth of affordable housing. That young couple has to come up with the first month's rent, the last month's rent, and, in some instances, exorbitant security deposits that force them to have to take advances on their salaries, and they seem to never catch up. Many of them say, "We are lucky if we catch up by the time we are ready to move to our new duty station."

We think that if our young people are going to serve in the military, they should certainly not be adversely affected in that respect. We think that this kind of a demonstration program may lead us to other rules and regulations that would make it much easier for our young married personnel to serve. As my distinguished colleague said, the day is over when we can make the statement that if the military wanted you to have a wife, they would have requisitioned you one. The military is indeed a married military, and we have to face that reality and face up to what our responsibilities are in light of that. The gentleman has offered an important amendment. We agree with it, and we urge its adoption.

Mr. PANETTA. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARLENEE

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARLENEE: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT FORT WILLIAM H. HARRISON, MONTANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of the Army (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey, without monetary consideration, to the State of Montana all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 65.4 acres of unimproved land located in the southeast corner of Fort William H. Harrison, Montana, and presently under license to the State of Montana for National Guard use.

(b) CONDITIONS.—(1) The conveyance authorized by subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the real property conveyed be used to establish a Montana State Veterans' Cemetery.

(2) If the property conveyed pursuant to subsection (a) is not used for the purposes described in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to such property shall revert at no cost to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon.

(3) The Secretary shall reserve to the United States a waterline easement for use by the Veterans' Administration Hospital.

(c) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) and of the easement to be reserved under subsection (b)(3) shall be determined by surveys that are satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of any such survey shall be borne by the State.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such other terms and conditions with respect to the conveyance as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. MARLENEE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer adding a new section to title VIII of H.R. 1409 would allow for 65.4 acres of Department of Defense land at Fort William H. Harrison in Montana, that is on long-term lease to the Montana National Guard to be used by the State of Montana for a veteran's cemetery. The reason for this transfer is to allow the State of Montana through the Montana National Guard to develop and maintain a cemetery for veterans. The Montana State Legislature has already appropriated funds for the establishment of the cemetery contingent upon our actions here today. In addition, the Montana Veterans' Association plans to donate $10,000 in startup funds. The State will, in their biennial appropriation process, fund the maintenance of the cemetery. This will not cost the Federal taxpayer one red cent.

As background, Montana does not have a national veteran's cemetery. The only cemetery accepting veterans in Montana was the Custer Battlefield National Monument in eastern Montana which has been full since January 1978. It is estimated that nearly 37,000 Montana veterans will pass away between now and the turn of the century. This amendment would provide a burial site for those who served our country.

In summary, my amendment has the support of the Army, the Montana National Guard, the Montana Governor and State Legislature, and the Montana Veterans' Association. Further and of great importance, and I repeat in this day of deficit budgets, is this measure will not cost the U.S. taxpayer any money, plus fully protecting the interests on the United States in seeing that the land is used for the intended purpose.

I urge all Members to support this amendment because it is the right thing to do. Mr. Chairman, thank you, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the gentleman has shared his amendment with those of us on the committee. What this entails is a land conveyance from the Army to the State of Montana for a veterans' cemetery. We certainly can find no objection to this utilization of land. Everyone who is a party to the matter is in agreement with it. We appreciate the gentleman offering the amendment. This side of the aisle finds no objection to it and we urge its adoption.

Mr. MARLENEE. I appreciate the cooperation of the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member and the good work that they have done in this Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOWARD

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD: Add the following new section at the end of title VIII of the bill (page 71, after line 9):

SEC. 819. FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENTS AT FORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary of the Army may, notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, carry out a project to improve 366 existing military family housing units at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, in the amount of $14,800,000. These housing units include 135 housing units authorized by section 101 of this Act and 231 housing units authorized in section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985.

Mr. HOWARD (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the chairman and the ranking minority member and the members of the subcommittee for this fine legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 1409 which would allow Fort Monmouth, a major military installation in my district, to exceed the $30,000 statutory limit per dwelling unit for major improvements to Wherry Housing.

Fort Monmouth needs the limit raised to $38,000 per dwelling unit so that the electrical distribution system can be upgraded to support the installation of kitchen areas, heating and air conditioning systems, hot water heaters, and other items in the Wherry Housing which will enhance the quality of life for Fort Monmouth junior enlisted soldiers and their families. The current electrical distribution system cannot provide the necessary power.

Fort Monmouth does not need a new appropriation to fund this increase. The additional expense will be paid with Army savings. All that is needed is an increased authorization.

Officials at Fort Monmouth have stated that, with this increased authorization, Fort Monmouth will be able to award contracts in fiscal year 1986 that would allow the major interior improvements and the upgrading of the electrical distribution system to be performed concurrently, thereby accelerating completion of the renovation program by 1½ years.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and provide Fort Monmouth with the authorization it needs.

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

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

Mr. DELLUMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman points out, there is no need for money. This is a language amendment. The amendment is a meritorious amendment. The subcommittee reviewed the amendment subsequent to markup and we have agreed to accept the amendment on this side. We urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VIII?

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we now come to the end of the debate and end of the markup on this important bill. The Chair tried to carry out his responsibilities that have been bestowed upon me by my colleagues to chair this committee. It is a responsibility that I accept and I appreciate very much. I think all of the Members at some point in our careers serving in this body would hope that we could have the opportunity to serve as subcommittee chairpersons or full committee chairpersons or exercise some leadership in this body. After 15 years, I have been granted that opportunity to do it. This is my third opportunity to come to the floor of this body to bring the military construction authorization bill to the floor. I have tried to carry out that responsibility. I have tried to address my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democrat, senior Member, junior Member. We have tried to carry out our business without discrimination, without prejudice, without rancor.

As everyone in this body knows, this gentleman has been a critic of our military policy over the years. I want to take a few moments to indicate why at this particular point, now that we have brought the bill to fruition, that this gentleman will rise in opposition to the legislation.

First, let me say why I am not rising in opposition to the legislation. I am not rising in opposition to this bill to cast any doubt or aspersions upon any of my colleagues on the subcommittee. Every single one of my colleagues worked very diligently to bring this bill to the floor. Every single one of my colleagues agreed with me that there was a great need for us to enhance the quality of human life. But where we all agreed to disagree is on the basic implications of our military policy. As the Members know, this gentleman felt strongly enough to bring an alternative military budget to the floor of this House, in the hope that my colleagues would engage in a serious and substantive debate on the principles and values upon which a rational and intelligent military policy ought to be about. We have, for the most part, tended to dance around that, Mr. Chairman, but I hope that, in the future, circumstances will force us to begin to debate more fully and more comprehensively the policies that we ought to be developing that act as the basis for our military budget.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I would like to say that when we chair subcommittees, we not only function institutionally, we not only have that responsibility, but we continue to have our responsibility to represent our respective constituencies. I do not give up my politics in order to chair a subcommittee. I accept it from my colleagues graciously, with a great sense of honor and respect, and with a great deal of appreciation. But all of my colleagues know that I would not abandon the integrity of my political beliefs in order to carry out that responsibility. I am trying to demonstrate that one can indeed be in the progressive wing of the body politic and bring a military bill to the floor of this House. I am also trying to point out that I do not think people ought to be one-man or one-woman or one-person shows, that this is a group-oriented process; so I have not tried to use the prerogatives of the chair to enhance myself on a personal basis, I have not tried to use the subcommittee in any political form whatsoever. I have simply tried to accommodate my colleagues where it was appropriate and where it made sense and where it was effective and where it attempted to take this country in the direction that the majority of my colleagues saw fit.

I can see lightening and hear thunder with the best of them, Mr. Chairman. I understand at this particular moment that my politics stand outside of the consensus that has been established by the majority of my colleagues. But nevertheless I still believe that it is important to those of us who have an alternative perspective to take the opportunity to stand up and articulate that point of view. I hope that I have communicated to my colleagues that I am able to carry out my institutional responsibilities, but I also hope that I am able to say to my colleagues and to everyone else assembled that chairing a committee does not require one to abandon one's politics. This bill came forward 43 to 1. That is not because I voted against family housing. I worked diligently to get family housing in the bill. I am not voting against the bill because we oppose the quality of life issue. I have worked like hell, Mr. Chairman, to try to get us to embrace issues of quality of life. But more I vote against the bill not for the specific work that we did on this tiny little committee trying to carry out its responsibilities with diligence and with a sense of responsibility, but more I cast my vote in opposition because this bill simply reflects back, with the exception of the quality of life issue, the priorities and principles that we have established in the larger bill.

So I would say to those colleagues who voted "no" on the larger bill that this bill simply reflects the same priorities. Those persons who voted for it, I see no reason why they would vote against this bill. In fact, I think that because of some of the attractive aspects of this bill, in my estimation, because it does indeed embrace the quality of life aggressively, that it probably has some more favorable reasons why people would want to support it.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELLUMS was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. DELLUMS. So, Mr. Chairman, let me just say this in more specific terms and read at least part of the dissenting views that I prepared to accompany the report that accompanies this bill, just to point out and explain why this gentleman voted no:

DISSENTING VIEWS OF HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities that reported this legislation, I know there are some very good projects included in H.R. 1409, as amended. This committee has placed a high priority on the quality of life of our military members, particularly the problems of the military families and their housing needs more specifically. This bill authorizes the construction of 5488 new housing units both in the United States and overseas for a total of over $430 million. While this bill has many benign aspects, such as accompanied and unaccompanied housing, child care centers, physical fitness facilities, family service centers, chapels, and recreational facilities, the majority of the funds are still used to carry out foreign and military policies which I disapprove or with which I disagree.

I support the housing needs of military personnel stationed overseas and believe that once assigned there they must be treated appropriately. However, I still question the policy decision that mandates the level of troop deployment in many of these countries. Overseas deployments continue to support policy decisions with which I disagree and believe should be reexamined.

The military construction budget does not exist in a vacuum, but rather exists in this larger context. It is separated from the larger defense authorization bill merely for legislative convenience. Both of these bills contain money for weapon systems to which I am opposed.

H.R. 1409, as amended, includes funding for the beddown of the following weapon systems which I continue to question:

B-1B manned bomber at $211 million;

C-5B cargo plane at $7 million;

F-15 fighter at $9 million;

Trident submarine and its missile system at $302.8 million;

M-X missile at $42 million;

Ground Launched Cruise Missile (GLCM) at $641.2 million;

Air Launched Cruise Missile (ALCM) at $29 million;

Sgt. York (DIVAD) gun at $8.9 million; and

Space Defense System at $15 million.

This bill also contains around $80 million first year funds to begin construction on two new homeports for the Navy. These two bases are estimated to cost at a minimum $300 million and the Navy is proposing to build five. I believe this decision by the Navy needs to be reexamined and looked at more carefully before we commit to spending millions of dollars on these facilities. Fuller answers must be given to determine the dangers involved with locating weapons so closely to major metropolitan areas, as well as a fuller explanation of the expected costs to the taxpayer and the local communities.

I believe that my analysis of the defense budget must be consistent and that the military construction budget is not a benign part of that process, but reflects the larger policy decisions. I stand in opposition to the military and foreign policy decisions of those who proposed these budgets and continue to oppose the results of the committee action.

There are also parts of the defense authorization bill that I support, yet it continues to impose a set of policies to which I am opposed. It assumes a military solution is possible to settle all conflicts in the world and does not accept the fact that many issues cannot be settled through the use of military force. Most conflicts are mainly political, economic and social in nature and must be met through diplomacy, not force. Therefore I believe that those who view the world in the same way I do would also come to the same conclusion about these bills.

I appreciate the responsibility which my colleagues on the committee have entrusted to me to chair this subcommittee and I hope that I have discharged my responsibilities as well as possible. However, the concerns of the constituency that elected me to Congress are not represented in this military construction budget and therefore I must cast my vote against the bill.

□ 1600

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just wish to add, and I recall mentioning this on a previous occasion. I do understand, for one, the policy differences that the gentleman has on this. But looking at it from the institutional point of view, I compliment you and I commend you and your committee, as the gentleman so aptly pointed out, the committee work under your leadership, for the institutional work that you have done, the many, many servicemen and servicewomen who will benefit and have a better life in the service because of the work that the gentleman has done on this bill.

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

Mr. SKELTON. I yield to the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's compliments and I appreciate his respect. It is not an easy thing, the first time this gentleman brought up a bill and said that he would oppose it, that was a joke. I think we have to deal with our dual responsibilities here and try to think them through clearly. Once the process was over, I took my lumps in the committee; I lost my political battles. I won a few and I lost a few.

At the end of that process, I had to step back and say, "If RON DELLUMS was not in the chair, would I support the bill?" If my answer was "no," then getting back in the chair did not change that. I hope that my remarks point out why I am opposing the bill, and I would like to believe that it is on policy and that it is on principle.

I appreciate the respect of my colleagues and I think my colleagues did a fantastic job in bringing what I believe to be a much better bill than might have been brought some years ago.

Mr. SKELTON. The gentleman certainly has our commendation and our respect.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments? If not, the question is on the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PANETTA] having assumed the chair, Mr. GLICKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1409) to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 196, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 354, nays 38, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

YEAS—354

Akaka	Archer	Bateman
Alexander	Armey	Beilenson
Anderson	Atkins	Bennett
Andrews	Barnard	Bentley
Annunzio	Barnes	Bereuter
Anthony	Bartlett	Berman
Applegate	Barton	Bevill

Biaggi
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boggs
Boland
Boner (TN)
Bonior (MI)
Bonker
Borski
Boucher
Boulter
Boxer
Breaux
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown (CA)
Brown (CO)
Broyhill
Bruce
Bryant
Burton (IN)
Byron
Callahan
Campbell
Carney
Carper
Chandler
Chapman
Chappell
Cheney
Clinger
Coats
Cobey
Coble
Coelho
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Conte
Cooper
Courter
Coyne
Craig
Daniel
Dannemeyer
Darden
Daschle
Daub
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Derrick
DeWine
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
DioGuardi
Donnelly
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Dowdy
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dyson
Early
Eckart (OH)
Eckert (NY)
Edgar
Edwards (OK)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Evans (IL)
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fiedler
Fields
Fish
Flippo
Florio
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Franklin
Frost
Fuqua
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Gray (IL)
Gray (PA)
Green
Gregg
Grotberg
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall, Ralph
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hansen
Hartnett
Hatcher
Hawkins
Hefner
Heftel
Hendon
Henry
Hertel
Hiler
Hillis
Holt
Hopkins
Howard
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jeffords
Jenkins
Johnson
Jones (NC)
Jones (OK)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kemp
Kennelly
Kildee
Kindness
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kolter
Kostmayer
Kramer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lantos
Latta
Leach (IA)
Leath (TX)
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Loeffler
Long
Lott
Lowery (CA)
Lowry (WA)
Luken
Lungren
Mack
MacKay
Madigan
Manton
Marlenee
Martin (IL)
Martin (NY)
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCain
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McDade
McEwen
McHugh
McKernan
McKinney
McMillan
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Mikulski
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Monson
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison (CT)
Morrison (WA)
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal
Nichols
Nielson
Nowak
Oakar
Olin
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Panetta
Parris
Pease
Penny
Pepper
Perkins
Petri
Pickle
Porter
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ray
Regula
Reid
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Roberts
Robinson
Roe
Roemer
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland (CT)
Rowland (GA)
Rudd
Russo
Sabo
Saxton
Schaefer
Schuette
Schulze
Schumer
Seiberling
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shelby
Shumway
Shuster
Sikorski
Siljander
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith, Robert (NH)
Smith, Robert (OR)
Snowe
Snyder
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
St Germain
Staggers
Stallings
Stangeland
Stenholm
Strang
Stratton
Stump
Sundquist
Sweeney
Swift
Swindall
Synar
Tallon
Tauzin
Taylor
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Torres
Traficant
Traxler
Udall
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Visclosky
Volkmer
Watkins
Weber
Wheat
Whitehurst
Whitley
Whittaker
Whitten
Wirth
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wortley
Wyden
Yatron
Young (FL)
Zschau

NAYS—38

Ackerman
Bates
Burton (CA)
Clay
Crane
Crockett
Dellums
Dymally
Edwards (CA)
Evans (IA)
Frank
Frenzel
Garcia
Gunderson
Hayes
Kastenmeier
Leland
Lundine
Markey
Miller (WA)
Mitchell
Oberstar
Obey
Owens
Rangel
Roybal
Savage
Scheuer
Schroeder
Smith, Denny (OR)
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Tauke
Towns
Walgren
Weiss
Yates

NOT VOTING—42

Addabbo
Aspin
AuCoin
Badham
Bedell
Bosco
Bustamante
Carr
Chappie
Collins
Conyers
Coughlin
Dixon
Horton
Jones (TN)
Kaptur
Lehman (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lujan
McCurdy
McGrath
Mineta
Moody
Nelson
O'Brien
Pashayan
Ritter
Rodino
Rogers
Schneider
Torricelli
Vento
Vucanovich
Walker
Waxman
Weaver
Williams
Wilson
Wright
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (MO)

□ 1620

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Jones of Tennessee for with Mr. Moody against.

Mr. Torricelli for with Mrs. Collins against.

Mr. Nelson of Florida for with Mr. Dixon against.

Mr. Rodino for with Mr. Williams of Montana against.

Messrs. RANGEL, OWENS, DYMALLY, DENNY SMITH, and LUNDINE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TORRES and Mr. VISCLOSKY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 196, I call up from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1042) to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DELLUMS

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DELLUMS moves, pursuant to House Resolution 196, to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill S. 1042, and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill, H.R. 1409, as passed by the House, as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1986".

TITLE I—ARMY

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZED ARMY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, $68,380,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, $32,530,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, $55,450,000.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, $610,000.
Fort Drum, New York, $2,990,000.
Fort Greely, Alaska, $2,500,000.
Fort Hood, Texas, $80,000,000.
Fort Hunter-Liggett, California, $11,100,000.
Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania, $5,300,000.
Fort Irwin, California, $30,050,000.
Fort Lewis, Washington, $110,880,000.
Fort McCoy, Wisconsin, $940,000.
Fort Meade, Maryland, $18,930,000.
Fort Ord, California, $25,820,000.
Fort Polk, Louisiana, $27,230,000.
Fort Richardson, Alaska, $3,600,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, $49,290,000.
Fort Sam Houston, Texas, $1,440,000.
Fort Sheridan, Illinois, $3,500,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia, $29,600,000.
Fort Wainwright, Alaska, $14,000,000.
Presidio of Monterey, California, $2,650,000.
Yakima Firing Center, Washington, $16,430,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY WESTERN COMMAND

Fort Shafter, Hawaii, $6,300,000.
Pohakuloa Training Area, Hawaii, $2,150,000.
Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, $32,460,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND

Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia, $6,450,000.
Fort Belvoir, Virginia, $7,100,000.
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, $5,300,000.
Fort Benning, Georgia, $39,650,000.
Fort Bliss, Texas, $31,760,000.
Fort Dix, New Jersey, $6,100,000.
Fort Gordon, Georgia, $46,040,000.
Fort Knox, Kentucky, $20,770,000.
Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, $6,900,000.
Fort Lee, Virginia, $15,471,000.
Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, $12,350,000.
Fort McClellan, Alabama, $39,350,000.
Fort Pickett, Virginia, $420,000.
Fort Rucker, Alabama, $11,950,000.
Fort Sill, Oklahoma, $52,000,000.
Fort Story, Virginia, $1,950,000.

MILITARY DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

Fort Myer, Virginia, $8,300,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, $4,670,000.
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama, $8,960,000.
Army Materiel and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts, $770,000.

Corpus Christi Army Depot, Texas, $4,400,000.
Detroit Arsenal, Michigan, $320,000.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, $8,650,000.
Fort Wingate, New Mexico, $490,000.
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, Missouri, $19,000,000.
McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, Oklahoma, $2,300,000.
Navajo Depot Activity, Arizona, $240,000.
New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania, $88,000,000.
Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, $1,000,000.
Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, $19,000,000.
Pueblo Depot Activity, Colorado, $200,000.
Red River Army Depot, Texas, $820,000.
Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, $25,750,000.
Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, $29,000,000.
Sacramento Army Depot, California, $6,450,000.
Savanna Army Depot, Illinois, $510,000.
Seneca Army Depot, New York, $1,410,000.
Sierra Army Depot, California, $2,600,000.
Tooele Army Depot, Utah, $11,490,000.
Umatilla Depot Activity, Oregon, $260,000.
Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona, $240,000.

AMMUNITION FACILITIES

Holston Army Ammunition Plant, Tennessee, $320,000.
Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Indiana, $210,000.
Iowa Army Ammunition Plant, Iowa, $810,000.
Kansas Army Ammunition Plant, Kansas, $570,000.
Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, Missouri, $930,000.
Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant, Louisiana, $640,000.
Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia, $2,910,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY INFORMATION SYSTEMS COMMAND

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, $2,050,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, New York, $23,700,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY HEALTH SERVICES COMMAND

Fort Detrick, Maryland, $7,600,000.
Tripler Army Medical Center, Hawaii, $970,000.
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia, $1,150,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND

Bayonne Military Ocean Terminal, New Jersey, $3,200,000.
Oakland Army Base, California, $330,000.
Sunny Point Military Ocean Terminal, North Carolina, $1,200,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Humphreys Engineer Center, Supt. Activity, Virginia, $11,000,000.

ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Various, United States, $3,000,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Army may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

UNITED STATES ARMY, JAPAN

Japan, $1,050,000.

EIGHTH UNITED STATES ARMY

Camp Carroll, Korea, $25,380,000.
Camp Casey, Korea, $12,920,000.
Camp Castle, Korea, $1,100,000.
Camp Colbern, Korea, $550,000.
Camp Edwards, Korea, $1,090,000.
Camp Gary Owen, Korea, $580,000.
Camp Giant, Korea, $1,050,000.
Camp Greaves, Korea, $420,000.
Camp Hovey, Korea, $8,300,000.
Camp Howze, Korea, $1,980,000.
Camp Humphreys, Korea, $9,750,000.
Camp Kittyhawk, Korea, $1,600,000.
Camp Kyle, Korea, $3,580,000.
Camp Liberty Bell, Korea, $800,000.
Camp Market, Korea, $710,000.
Camp Page, Korea, $32,650,000.
Camp Pelham, Korea, $2,400,000.
Camp Red Cloud, Korea, $1,730,000.
Camp Stanley, Korea, $5,500,000.
K-16 Army Airfield, Korea, $2,350,000.
Location 177, Korea, $2,290,000.
Yongin, Korea, $2,550,000.
Yongson, Korea, $9,800,000.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Kwajalein, $14,600,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES COMMAND OVERSEAS

Panama, $5,480,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE, AND SEVENTH ARMY

Amberg, Germany, $850,000.
Ansbach, Germany, $14,390,000.
Bad Kreuznach, Germany, $1,100,000.
Bad Toelz, Germany, $1,850,000.
Bamberg, Germany, $6,490,000.
Baumholder, Germany, $900,000.
Darmstadt, Germany, $29,200,000.
Frankfurt, Germany, $18,680,000.
Friedberg, Germany, $9,150,000.
Fulda, Germany, $7,200,000.
Giessen, Germany, $1,700,000.
Goeppingen, Germany, $10,250,000.
Grafenwoehr, Germany, $2,450,000.
Haingruen, Germany, $680,000.
Hanau, Germany, $48,140,000.
Heidelberg, Germany, $8,800,000.
Heilbronn, Germany, $2,200,000.
Hohenfels, Germany, $6,300,000.
Kaiserslautern, Germany, $3,450,000.
Karlsruhe, Germany, $4,020,000.
Neu Ulm, Germany, $1,000,000.
Nuremberg, Germany, $8,500,000.
Pirmasens, Germany, $14,000,000.
Schoeninger, Germany, $700,000.
Schweinfurt, Germany, $17,840,000.
Stuttgart, Germany, $4,500,000.
Vilseck, Germany, $10,290,000.
Wiesbaden, Germany, $2,900,000.
Wildflecken, Germany, $20,000,000.
Wuerzburg, Germany, $48,070,000.
Various Locations, Germany, $101,000,000.
Various Locations, Greece, $1,440,000.
Various Locations, Italy, $1,850,000.
Various Locations, Turkey, $7,440,000.

SEC. 102. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of the Army may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Fort Ord, California, six hundred units and seventy manufactured home spaces, $50,640,000.
Fort Carson, Colorado, fifty manufactured home spaces, $712,000.
Fort Stewart, Georgia, twenty manufactured home spaces, $253,000.
Bamberg, Germany, one hundred and six units, $7,209,000.
Various locations, ninety-eight units, $6,120,000.
Vilsek, Germany, three hundred and seventy units, $26,830,000.
Fort Riley, Kansas, fifty manufactured home spaces, $700,000.
Fort Campbell, Kentucky, fifty manufactured home spaces, $689,000.
Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center, Massachusetts, one unit, $154,000.
Fort Devens, Massachusetts, twenty manufactured home spaces, $317,000.
Fort Drum, New York, eight hundred units, $67,500,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, two units by reconfiguration and fifty manufactured home spaces, $637,000.
Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, one hundred and four units and twenty-four manufactured home spaces, $8,674,000.
Fort Myer, Virginia, six units, $596,000.

SEC. 103. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $167,521,000, of which $10,950,000 is available only for energy conservation projects.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Army may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, District of Columbia, one unit, $99,000.
Fort Bragg, North Carolina, one hundred and sixty-four units, $4,712,000.
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, eighty-one units, $2,762,000.

TITLE II—NAVY

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZED NAVY CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, California, $530,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, $6,905,000.
Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center, Bridgeport, California, $1,470,000.
Marine Corps Camp Detachment, Camp Elmore, Norfolk, Virginia, $3,995,000.
Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, $24,140,000.
Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California, $25,175,000.
Marine Corps Air Facility, Camp Pendleton, California, $14,310,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $36,450,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, $30,375,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii, $17,420,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, New River, North Carolina, $10,780,000.
Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina, $3,610,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California, $17,970,000.
Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California, $22,670,000.
Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia, $7,060,000.
Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, $14,700,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL RESEARCH

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, District of Columbia, $28,900,000.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE NAVY

Navy Finance Center, Cleveland, Ohio, $2,940,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, $1,880,000.

Naval Space Command, Dahlgren, Virginia, $4,700,000.

Navy Regional Data Automation Center, Jacksonville, Florida, $10,300,000.

Naval Space Surveillance Field Station, Lewisville, Arkansas, $675,000.

Navy Tactical Interoperability Support Activity, Mayport, Florida, $470,000.

Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, $13,000,000.

Navy Tactical Interoperability Support Activity, North Island, California, $585,000.

Navy Regional Data Automation Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $10,880,000.

Intelligence Center, Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $2,900,000.

Naval Space Surveillance Field Station, San Diego, California, $600,000.

Commandant Naval District, Washington, District of Columbia, $6,300,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine, $3,040,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida, $29,835,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $9,960,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida, $5,800,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia, $16,370,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, $10,820,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, $365,000.

Naval Station, New York, New York, $86,260,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $10,675,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia, $800,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, $16,940,000.

Naval Facility, Radio Island, North Carolina, $17,640,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

Naval Facility, Adak, Alaska, $2,650,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California, $8,650,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Bangor, Washington, $5,200,000.

Amphibious Task Force, Camp Pendleton, California, $9,020,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, $16,150,000.

Naval Station, Everett, Washington, $17,640,000.

Naval Air Station, Fallon, Nevada, $36,500,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, $2,300,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California, $17,230,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California, $385,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California, $18,593,000.

Commander, Oceanographic System, Pacific, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $1,180,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $2,900,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, California, $16,197,000.

Naval Submarine Base, San Diego, California, $14,120,000.

Naval Station Mare Island, Vallejo, California, $735,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, $2,650,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Fleet and Mine Warfare Training Center, Charleston, South Carolina, $1,180,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Coronado, California, $9,330,000.

Surface Warfare Officers School Command Detachment, Coronado, California, $5,200,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas, $4,360,000.

Fleet Combat Training Center, Atlantic, Dam Neck, Virginia, $9,640,000.

Naval Explosive Ordnance Disposal School, Eglin, Florida, $13,700,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, $20,740,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, $2,460,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Little Creek, Virginia, $420,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee, $11,695,000.

Naval Air Station, Meridian, Mississippi, $450,000.

Naval Submarine School, New London, Connecticut, $13,300,000.

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island, $19,580,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida, $9,400,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, $225,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, Pensacola, Florida, $5,670,000.

Naval Construction Training Center, Port Hueneme, California, $4,800,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, $7,850,000.

Fleet Combat Training Center, Pacific, San Diego, California, $305,000.

Fleet Training Center, San Diego, California, $4,750,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California, $2,900,000.

Naval Technical Training Center, San Francisco, California, $1,570,000.

Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, $810,000.

NAVAL MILITARY PERSONNEL COMMAND

Navy Band, Washington, District of Columbia, $1,900,000.

NAVAL MEDICAL COMMAND

Naval Medical Clinic, Annapolis, Maryland, $12,540,000.

Naval Hospital, Groton, Connecticut, $8,720,000.

Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida, $18,600,000.

Naval Hospital, Long Beach, California, $6,300,000.

Naval Hospital, Oak Harbor, Washington, $13,900,000.

Naval Hospital, Pensacola, Florida, $7,250,000.

Naval Hospital, San Diego, California, $450,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIEL

Naval Air Rework Facility, Alameda, California, $24,980,000.

Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington, $30,945,000.

Naval Supply Center, Bremerton, Washington, $1,520,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, $4,070,000.

Polaris Missile Facility, Atlantic, Charleston, South Carolina, $1,620,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Cherry Point, North Carolina, $17,620,000.

Naval Weapons Center, China Lake, California, $9,315,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey, $3,720,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Mississippi, $2,550,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Maryland, $1,570,000.

Naval Supply Center, Jacksonville, Florida, $1,555,000.

Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station, Keyport, Washington, $2,440,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Kings Bay, Georgia, $388,360,000.

Naval Air Engineering Center, Lakehurst, New Jersey, $600,000.

Long Beach Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, $7,160,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Louisville, Kentucky, $16,950,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, Norfolk, Virginia, $13,080,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia, $2,350,000.

Naval Air Rework Facility, North Island, California, $9,465,000.

Naval Supply Center, Oakland, California, $7,890,000.

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $1,860,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $13,700,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pensacola, Florida, $8,430,000.

Pacific Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, California, $10,200,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, $23,650,000.

Naval Ship Weapon Systems Engineering Station, Port Hueneme, California, $10,780,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, Portsmouth, Virginia, $3,255,000.

Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia, $6,690,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, San Diego, California, $27,450,000.

Naval Supply Center, San Diego, California, $7,100,000.

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Activity, Saint Inigoes, Maryland, $15,550,000.

Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California, $5,915,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Warminster, Pennsylvania, $4,220,000.

Naval Mine Warfare Engineering Activity, Yorktown, Virginia, $4,120,000.

NAVAL OCEANOGRAPHY COMMAND

Naval Oceanography Command Facility, Jacksonville, Florida, $390,000.

Naval Western Oceanography Center, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, $4,500,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Radio Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, $785,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Activity, Adak, Alaska, $980,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Northwest, Chesapeake, Virginia, $1,385,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Skaggs Island, California, $395,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, $3,280,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Navy may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps Air Station, Iwakuni, Japan, $1,775,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Futenma, Okinawa, Japan, $2,990,000.

Marine Corps Base Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa, Japan, $2,250,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, ATLANTIC FLEET

Naval Facility, Argentia, Newfoundland, Canada, $700,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, $22,410,000.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, $1,270,000.

Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $7,100,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico, $14,700,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC FLEET

Navy Support Facility, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $16,530,000.

Naval Air Facility, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $22,450,000.

Naval Magazine, Guam, $11,270,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, $6,550,000.

Naval Station, Guam, $10,200,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Guam, $990,000.

Naval Magazine, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $250,000.

Naval Ship Repair Facility, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, $13,270,000.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF, UNITED STATES NAVAL FORCES EUROPE

Naval Activities, London, United Kingdom, $7,635,000.

Naval Support Activity, Naples, Italy, $7,750,000.

Naval Air Station, Sigonella, Italy, $5,930,000.

Personnel Support Activity, London, United Kingdom, $450,000.

CHIEF OF NAVAL MATERIEL

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, $1,080,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Yokosuka, Japan, $4,400,000.

NAVAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Naval Communication Area Master Station, Western Pacific, Guam, $8,945,000.

Naval Communication Station, Harold E. Holt, Exmouth, Australia, $2,690,000.

NAVAL SECURITY GROUP COMMAND

Naval Security Group Detachment, Diego Garcia, Indian Ocean, $3,700,000.

HOST NATION INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

Various Locations, $980,000.

SEC. 202. FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Navy may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Naval Air Station, Adak, Alaska, one hundred units, $15,500,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California, two hundred and eighty-two units, $29,800,000.

Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twentynine Palms, California, one hundred units, $8,400,000.

Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, two hundred units, $15,200,000.

Fleet Training Group Pacific, Warner Springs, California, forty-four units, $4,400,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Earle, New Jersey, two hundred units, $15,400,000.

Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, one unit, $170,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, three hundred units, $24,180,000.

(b) NAVAL PUBLIC WORKS CENTER, SAN DIEGO.—The Secretary of the Navy may construct the two hundred housing units authorized by subsection (a) for the Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, at Telegraph Point or at any other suitable and appropriate site.

SEC. 203. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $34,020,000.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Navy Public Works Center, San Diego, California, three hundred seventy-two units, $17,610,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, one unit, $56,500.

SEC. 204. TRANSIENT HOUSING UNITS, CHINHAE, KOREA.

The Secretary of the Navy may convert the four existing transient housing units contained in Building 706 in Chinhae, Korea, to family housing units.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZED AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations inside the United States:

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Hill Air Force Base, Utah, $28,280,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, $41,699,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, California, $63,129,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Georgia, $7,350,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $33,100,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, $21,890,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Brooks Air Force Base, Texas, $2,500,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, California, $7,250,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, $14,560,000.

Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, $27,150,000.

Sunnyvale Air Force Station, California, $2,700,000.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Billy Mitchell Field, Wisconsin, $500,000.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Buckley Air National Guard Base, Colorado, $12,370,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, $1,730,000.

Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas, $29,950,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi, $10,500,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, $22,750,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, $1,900,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, $6,850,000.

Mather Air Force Base, California, $2,700,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, $3,200,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Texas, $3,250,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas, $16,150,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $4,210,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Arizona, $660,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Gunter Air Force Station, Alabama, $6,000,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, $12,000,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Attu Research Site, Alaska, $910,000.

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, $44,950,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, $5,000,000.

King Salmon Airport, Alaska, $8,600,000.

Shemya Air Force Base, Alaska, $45,900,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, $13,160,000.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, $10,120,000.

Base 24, Classified Location, $6,170,000.

Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, $250,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina, $1,620,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, $3,090,000.

Eglin Auxiliary Field 9, Florida, $1,700,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, $60,330,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Washington, $2,240,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, $16,100,000.

Norton Air Force Base, California, $4,570,000.

Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, $440,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, $17,150,000.

Travis Air Force Base, California, $10,300,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, $480,000.

Wheeler Air Force Base, Hawaii, $5,050,000.

SPACE COMMAND

Cape Cod Air Force Station, Massachusetts, $600,000.

Cavalier Air Force Station, North Dakota, $950,000.

Clear Air Force Station, Alaska $4,500,000.

Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, $5,200,000.

SPECIAL PROJECT

Various Locations, $55,000,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, $1,400,000.

Base 34, Classified Location, $8,920,000.

Beale Air Force Base, California, $6,950,000.

Belle Fourche Air Force Station, South Dakota, $4,080,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Arkansas, $4,260,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Texas, $3,150,000.

Castle Air Force Base, California, $3,300,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Texas, $16,950,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, $72,064,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington, $12,500,000.

F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, $12,550,000.
Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, $62,730,000.
Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, $2,740,000.
Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, $1,700,000.
K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base, Michigan, $22,580,000.
Malmstrom Air Force Base, Montana, $1,300,000.
March Air Force Base, California, $9,000,000.
McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, $71,490,000.
Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, $5,000,000.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, $4,740,000.
Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire, $1,200,000.
Plattsburgh Air Force Base, New York, $1,050,000.
Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, $1,960,000.
Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, $4,650,000.
Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Michigan, $5,300,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, $770,000.
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, $8,230,000.
England Air Force Base, Louisiana, $4,900,000.
George Air Force Base, California, $12,640,000.
Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico, $16,850,000.
Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, $7,015,000.
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, $8,680,000.
Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, $14,780,000.
MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, $8,850,000.
Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, $24,030,000.
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, $14,600,000.
Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, South Carolina, $430,000.
Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, $17,860,000.
Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, North Carolina, $2,320,000.
Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, $13,300,000.
Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida, $8,780,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Air Force Academy, Colorado, $10,310,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of the Air Force may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Lajes Field, Portugal, $25,285,000.
Rhein-Main Air Base, Germany, $11,600,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCES

Camp Zama, Japan, $1,500,000.
Kadena Air Base, Japan, $27,650,000.
Misawa Air Base, Japan, $9,500,000.
Yokota Air Base, Japan, $13,750,000.
Kimhae Air Base, Korea, $10,400,000.
Kunsan Air Base, Korea, $9,000,000.
Kwang-Ju Air Base, Korea, $16,310,000.
Osan Air Base, Korea, $24,510,000.
Sachon Air Base, Korea, $310,000.
Diego Garcia Air Base, Indian Ocean, $5,300,000.
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $15,050,000.

SPACE COMMAND

Thule Air Base, Greenland, $12,350,000.
Sondrestrom Air Base, Greenland, $5,750,000.
GEODSS Site 5, Portugal, $14,650,000.
Pirinclik Air Station, Turkey, $2,600,000.
BMEWS Site III, Fylingdales, United Kingdom, $3,100,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Panama, $2,172,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Florennes Air Base, Belgium, $5,860,000.
Ahlhorn Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Bitburg Air Base, Germany, $9,050,000.
Einsiedlerhof, Germany, $2,900,000.
Hahn Air Base, Germany, $8,160,000.
Hessisch Oldendorf Air Station, Germany, $1,230,000.
Kapaun Air Station, Germany, $900,000.
Leipheim Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Marienfelde Communications Station, Germany, $2,550,000.
Norvenich Air Base, Germany, $350,000.
Pruem Air Station, Germany, $1,250,000.
Ramstein Air Base, Germany, $17,470,000.
Sembach Air Base, Germany, $6,460,000.
Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany, $14,860,000.
Various Locations, Germany, $940,000.
Vogelweh Air Station, Germany, $1,250,000.
Wenigerath Storage Site, Germany, $1,700,000.
Zweibrucken Air Base, Germany, $4,550,000.
Aviano Air Base, Italy, $5,070,000.
Comiso Air Station, Italy, $6,280,000.
Decimomannu Air Base, Italy, $2,800,000.
San Vito Air Station, Italy, $1,590,000.
Morocco, $3,100,000.
Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands, $2,710,000.
Keizerveer Air Base, The Netherlands, $270,000.
Vught, The Netherlands, $310,000.
Ankara Air Station, Turkey, $950,000.
Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, $11,570,000.
Karatas, Turkey, $2,330,000.
RAF Alconbury, United Kingdom, $20,910,000.
RAF Bentwaters, United Kingdom, $12,050,000.
RAF Chicksands, United Kingdom, $1,630,000.
RAF Fairford, United Kingdom, $7,400,000.
RAF Greenham Common, United Kingdom, $2,840,000.
RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom, $10,320,000.
RAF Mildenhall, United Kingdom, $8,230,000.
RAF Molesworth, United Kingdom, $21,063,000.
RAF Sculthorpe, United Kingdom, $2,350,000.
RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom, $4,640,000.
Various Locations, United Kingdom, $3,600,000.
Base 25, Classified Location, $4,500,000.
Base 29, Classified Location, $3,500,000.
Base 30, Classified Location, $4,830,000.
Base 33, Classified Location, $9,450,000.
Various Locations, Europe, $4,450,000.

SEC. 302. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of the Air Force may construct or acquire family housing units (including acquisition of land) at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Florennes, Belgium, four hundred units, $29,200,000.
Hahn Air Base, Germany, four hundred and forty units, $33,000,000.
Ramstein Air Base, Germany, four hundred units, $30,000,000.
Osan Air Base, Korea, family housing support facilities, $1,200,000.
Camp New Amsterdam, The Netherlands, one hundred and forty units, $11,000,000.
Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, four hundred and fifty units, $37,900,000.
Belle Fourche Air Force Station, South Dakota, fifty units, $4,000,000.
Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, one hundred and sixty-three units, $14,200,000.

SEC. 303. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

(a) AMOUNT AUTHORIZED.—Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $61,300,000, of which $19,939,000 is available only for energy conservation projects.

(b) WAIVER OF MAXIMUM PER UNIT COST FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out projects to improve existing military family housing units at the following installations in the number of units shown, and in the amount shown, for each installation:

Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, twenty-four units, $1,200,000.
Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, three hundred and twenty-eight units, $12,532,000.
Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, thirty-two units, $2,873,000.
Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, one hundred and ten units, $3,724,000.
Ramstein Air Base, Germany, two hundred and eighty units, $10,279,000.
Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, one hundred units, $6,605,000.
Kadena Air Base, Japan, two hundred and thirty-five units, $12,163,000.
Clark Air Base, Philippines, twenty-nine units, $1,042,000.

(c) IMPROVEMENT PROJECT AT PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE, COLORADO.—(1) To support the United States Space Command (USSPACECOM), the Secretary of the Air Force may carry out an improvement project at Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado, to add to and alter an existing facility and (notwithstanding section 2826 of title 10, United States Code) convert it to a family housing unit with a maximum net floor area of 3,100 square feet at a cost not to exceed $81,000.

(2) The amount of the project authorized by this subsection shall not be considered to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for functions of the Department of the Air Force.

(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term "net floor area" has the same meaning given that term by section 2826(f) of title 10, United States Code.

TITLE IV—DEFENSE AGENCIES

SEC. 401. AUTHORIZED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AND LAND ACQUISITION FOR THE DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) INSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the follow-

ing installations and locations inside the United States:

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Property Disposal Office, Anchorage, Alaska, $1,390,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Alameda, California, $1,320,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Barstow, California, $825,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, San Diego, California, $600,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, San Pedro, California, $700,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Groton, Connecticut, $625,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Port Tampa, Florida, $595,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Fort Riley, Kansas, $965,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Newington, New Hampshire, $1,040,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Verona, New York, $1,395,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, $470,000.

Defense Depot, Memphis, Tennessee, $8,085,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Texarkana, Texas, $2,635,000.

Defense Depot, Ogden, Utah, $3,825,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah, $750,000.

Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia, $5,355,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, Richmond, Virginia, $650,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Manchester, Washington, $565,000.

Defense Property Disposal Office, F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming, $1,020,000.

DEFENSE MAPPING AGENCY

Repromat Secure Storage Facility, Mineral Wells, Texas, $900,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort Meade, Maryland, $7,078,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Classified Location, $12,000,000.

Fort McNair, Washington, District of Columbia, $25,000,000.

Classified Location, $3,142,000.

(b) OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Defense may acquire real property and may carry out military construction projects in the amounts shown for each of the following installations and locations outside the United States:

DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

Defense Property Disposal Office, Kaiserslautern, Germany, $360,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Chimu Wan, Okinawa, Japan, $8,160,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Pyongtaek, Korea, $5,820,000.

Defense Fuel Support Point, Uijongbu, Korea, $6,200,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Classified Locations, $7,150,000.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OVERSEAS DEPENDENTS SCHOOLS

Florennes, Belgium, $7,420,000.

Babenhausen, Germany, $760,000.

Bamberg, Germany, $5,800,000.

Butzbach, Germany, $3,420,000.

Hanau, Germany, $7,480,000.

Heidelberg, Germany, $1,910,000.

Heilbronn, Germany, $2,520,000.

Pirmasens, Germany, $1,630,000.

Schweinfurt, Germany, $3,930,000.

Sembach Air Base, Germany, $2,170,000.

Vilseck, Germany, $6,680,000.

Sigonella, Italy, $5,360,000.

Misawa Air Base, Japan, $4,780,000.

Okinawa, Japan, $300,000.

Osan Air Base, Korea, $2,780,000.

Pusan, Korea, $1,540,000.

Taegu, Korea, $730,000.

Soesterberg Air Base, Netherlands, $4,460,000.

Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, $7,190,000.

Bicester, United Kingdom, $4,570,000.

Upwood, United Kingdom, $3,240,000.

Woodbridge RAF Station, United Kingdom, $1,060,000.

SEC. 402. FAMILY HOUSING.

The Secretary of Defense may construct or acquire twenty family housing units (including acquisition of land) at classified installations in the total amount of $1,800,000.

SEC. 403. IMPROVEMENTS TO MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING UNITS.

Subject to section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may make expenditures to improve existing military family housing units in an amount not to exceed $110,000.

TITLE V—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

SEC. 501. AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO MAKE CONTRIBUTIONS.

The Secretary of Defense may make contributions for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program as provided in section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, in an amount not to exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated in section 605 plus the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

TITLE VI—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS AND RECURRING ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, ARMY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Army in the total amount of $3,410,786,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 101(a), $1,120,111,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 101(b), $450,290,000.

(3) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, $26,000,000.

(4) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $31,000,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $136,100,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $356,491,000; and

(B) for support of military family housing (including the functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $1,290,794,000, of which not more than $2,520,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $131,047,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE I.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 101 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), and $73,000,000 (the amount authorized for the construction of the Eastern Distribution Center, New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania), and $101,000,000 (the amount authorized under section 101(b) for Various Locations, Germany).

SEC. 602. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NAVY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Navy in the total amount of $2,602,234,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 201(a), $1,521,450,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 201(b), $178,265,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $21,560,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $139,260,000.

(5) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $2,960,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $154,000,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $584,739,000, of which not more than $3,545,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $18,934,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE II.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 201 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 603. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, AIR FORCE.

IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Air Force in the total amount of $2,809,561,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 301(a), $1,224,617,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 301(b), $446,710,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $22,000,000.

(4) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $144,096,000.

(5) For advances to the Secretary of Transportation for construction of defense access roads under section 210 of title 23, United States Code, $30,240,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $226,800,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $715,098,000, of which not more than $2,711,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and Guam, and not more than $45,402,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE III.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variation authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 301 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

SEC. 604. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, DEFENSE AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for military construction, land acquisition, and military family housing functions of the Department of the Defense (other than the military departments), in the total amount of $203,025,000 as follows:

(1) For military construction projects inside the United States authorized by section 401(a), $53,132,000.

(2) For military construction projects outside the United States authorized by section 401(b), $93,193,000.

(3) For unspecified minor construction projects under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, $4,000,000.

(4) For construction projects contingency construction authority of the Secretary of Defense under section 2804 of title 10, United States Code, $5,000,000.

(5) For architectural and engineering services and construction design under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, $27,400,000.

(6) For military family housing functions—

(A) for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities, $1,910,000; and

(B) for support of military housing (including functions described in section 2834 of title 10, United States Code), $18,390,000, of which not more than $14,933,000 may be obligated or expended for the leasing of military family housing units in foreign countries.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF UNOBLIGATED FUNDS.—Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal years before fiscal year 1986 for military construction functions of the Defense Agencies that remain available for obligation are hereby authorized to be made available, to the extent provided in appropriations Acts, for military construction projects authorized in section 401 in the amount of $42,025,000.

(c) LIMITATION ON TOTAL COST OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AUTHORIZED IN TITLE IV.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the total cost of all projects carried out under section 401 may not exceed the total amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) and the amount specified in subsection (b).

SEC. 605. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, NATO.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for contributions by the Secretary of Defense under section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, for the share of the United States of the cost of construction projects for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure Program, as authorized by section 501, in the amount of $55,000,000.

SEC. 606. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS; EXTENSION OF CERTAIN PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS AFTER TWO YEARS.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), all authorizations contained in titles I, II, III, IV, and V for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor contained in sections 601 through 605) shall expire on October 1, 1987, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988, whichever is later.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) do not apply to authorizations for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, and contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program (and authorizations of appropriations therefor), for which appropriated funds have been obligated before October 1, 1987, or the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1988, whichever is later, for construction contracts, land acquisition, family housing projects and facilities, or contributions to the NATO Infrastructure Program.

(b) EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN FISCAL YEAR 1984 PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the provisions of section 607(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-115; 97 Stat. 780), authorizations for the following projects authorized in sections 101, 201, 301, and 401 of that Act shall remain in effect until October 1, 1986, or the date of enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987, whichever is later:

(1) Consolidated heating system in the amount of $1,850,000 at Stuttgart, Germany.

(2) Consolidated heating system in the amount of $1,750,000 at Stuttgart, Germany.

(3) Range modernization in the amount of $2,450,000 at Wildflecken, Germany.

(4) Unaccompanied personnel housing in the amount of $1,400,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(5) Operations building in the amount of $370,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(6) Multipurpose recreation facility in the amount of $480,000 at Argyroupolis, Greece.

(7) Unaccompanied Officer housing in the amount of $600,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(8) Operations building in the amount of $410,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(9) Multipurpose recreation facility in the amount of $620,000 at Perivolaki, Greece.

(10) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $1,000,000 at Elefsis, Greece.

(11) Operations control center in the amount of $7,800,000 at the Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine.

(12) Engine test cell modifications in the amount of $1,180,000 at the Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida.

(13) Land acquisition in the amount of $830,000 at the Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California.

(14) Unaccompanied enlisted personnel housing in the amount of $10,000,000 at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida.

(15) Electrical distribution lines in the amount of $7,200,000 at the Naval Shipyard Mare Island, Vallejo, California.

(16) Family housing in the amount of $33,982,000 at RAF Upper Heyford, United Kingdom.

(17) Air freight terminal in the amount of $10,200,000 at Elmendorf, Alaska.

(18) Sewage system in the amount of $2,760,000 at the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida.

(19) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $1,000,000 at Fort Hunter Liggett, California.

(20) Child care center in the amount of $3,000,000 at Fort Polk, Louisiana.

(21) Physical fitness training center in the amount of $2,200,000 at Sierra Army Depot, California.

(22) Special Process Laboratories Building in the amount of $39,100,000 at Fort Meade, Maryland.

SEC. 607. ESTABLISHMENT OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS REQUIRED TO BE SPECIFIED BY LAW.

For projects or contracts initiated during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act or October 1, 1985, whichever is later, and ending on the date of the enactment of the Military Construction Authorization Act for fiscal year 1987 or October 1, 1986, whichever is later, the following amounts apply:

(1) The maximum amount for an unspecified minor military construction project under section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, is $1,000,000.

(2) The amount of a contract for architectural and engineering services or construction design that makes such a contract subject to the reporting requirement under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, is $300,000.

(3) The maximum amount per unit for an improvement project for family housing units under section 2825 of title 10, United States Code, is $30,000.

(4) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in the United States, Puerto Rico, or Guam under section 2828(b) of title 10, United States Code, is $10,000.

(5)(A) The maximum annual rental for a family housing unit leased in a foreign country under section 2828(c) of title 10, United States Code, is $16,800.

(B) The maximum number of family housing units that may be leased at any one time in foreign countries under section 2828(c) of title 10, United States Code, is 34,000.

(6) The maximum rental per year for family housing facilities, or for real property related to family housing facilities, leased in a foreign country under section 2828(f) of title 10, United States Code, is $250,000.

SEC. 608. EFFECTIVE DATE FOR PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

TITLE VII—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 701. AUTHORIZATION FOR GUARD AND RESERVE FACILITIES.

There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1985, for the costs of acquisition, architectural and engineering services, and construction of facilities for the Guard and Reserve Forces, and for contributions therefor, under chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code (including the cost of acquisition of land for those facilities), the following amounts:

(1) For the Department of the Army—

(A) for the Army National Guard of the United States, $145,924,000, plus $7,565,000 for facilities at Scranton/Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, plus $2,671,000 for facilities at various locations in Alabama, plus $2,186,000 for facilities located in Missouri, plus $755,000 for a facility in New Mexico, and

(B) for the Army Reserve, $66,289,000.

(2) For the Department of the Navy, for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $61,800,000.

(3) For the Department of the Air Force—

(A) for the Air National Guard of the United States, $139,000,000, and

(B) for the Air Force Reserve, $70,650,000.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN PILOT PROGRAMS.

(a) BUILD-TO-LEASE PROGRAM.—Paragraph (9) of section 2828(g) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "October 1, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1986".

(b) RENTAL GUARANTEE PROGRAM.—Subsection (h) of section 802 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law 98-115; 97 Stat. 783, 789), is amended by striking out "September 30, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1986".

SEC. 802. FAMILY HOUSING OCCUPANT LIABILITY.

(a) LIABILITY FOR FAILURE TO CLEAN SATISFACTORILY.—Subsection (a) of section 2775 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) A member of the armed forces—

"(A) who is assigned or provided a family housing unit; and

"(B) who fails to clean satisfactorily that housing unit (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of Transportation with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) upon termination of the assignment or provision of that housing unit,

shall be liable to the United States for the cost of cleaning made necessary as a result of that failure.".

(b) AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION.—Section 2775 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsections (a) and (b), by inserting after "the Secretary of Defense" the following: "and the Secretary of Transportation when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy"; and

(2) in subsection (d), by inserting after "or defense agency concerned" the following: ", or the operating expenses account of the Coast Guard, as appropriate".

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by inserting "(in the case of liability under subsection (a)(1))" after "including".

(2) Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended by striking out "subsection (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a)(1), or the cost of any cleaning made necessary by a failure to clean satisfactorily a family housing unit referred to in subsection (a)(2),".

(3) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by inserting "or failure to clean satisfactorily a family housing unit" after "(or the equipment or furnishings of a family housing unit)".

(4) Subsection (e) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Transportation when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section. Such regulations shall include—

"(1) regulations for determining the cost of repairs and replacements made necessary as the result of abuse or negligence for which a member is liable under subsection (a)(1);

"(2) regulations for determining the cost of cleaning made necessary as a result of the failure to clean satisfactorily for which a member is liable under subsection (a)(2); and

"(3) provisions for limitations of liability, the compromise or waiver of claims, and the collection of amounts owed under this section.".

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2775. Liability of members assigned to military housing".

(2) The item relating to such section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 165 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"2775. Liability of members assigned to military housing.".

SEC. 803. PREOCCUPANCY TERMINATION COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2828(d) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(d)"; and

(2) by adding the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(2) The Secretary may enter into an agreement under this paragraph in connection with a lease entered into under subsection (c). Any such agreement shall be for any period not in excess of three years and shall be for the purpose of compensating a developer for any costs resulting from the termination of the lease during the construction of the housing units that are to be occupied pursuant to the lease. Any agreement entered into under this paragraph shall include a provision that the obligation of the United States to make payments under the agreement in any fiscal year is subject to the availability of appropriations.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 804. ACTIVITIES INCLUDED WITHIN AUTHORIZATIONS FOR MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING.

(a) CONSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITION OF FAMILY HOUSING.—Section 2821 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Amounts authorized by law for construction and acquisition of military family housing and facilities include amounts for—

"(1) minor construction;

"(2) improvements to existing military family housing units and facilities;

"(3) relocation of military family housing units under section 2827 of this title; and

"(4) architectural and engineering services and construction design.".

(b) FAMILY HOUSING SUPPORT.—(1) Chapter 169 of such title is amended by adding after section 2832 the following new section:

"§ 2833. Family housing support

"Amounts authorized by law for support of military family housing include amounts for—

"(1) operating expenses;

"(2) leasing expenses;

"(3) maintenance of real property expenses;

"(4) payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred; and

"(5) payments of mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715m).".

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of such chapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2832 the following new item:

"2833. Family housing support.".

SEC. 805. DOMESTIC FAMILY HOUSING LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2828(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "(3) Not" and inserting in lieu thereof "(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), not"; and

(2) by adding the following new subparagraph at the end thereof:

"(B) During fiscal years 1986 and 1987, the number of housing units that may be leased pursuant to the provisions of subparagraph (A) may be increased by 500 units for each such fiscal year. The Secretary concerned shall provide written notification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the location, purpose, and cost of the additional units permitted by this subparagraph. Such notification shall be made periodically as the leases are entered into.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 806. SALE-AND-REPLACEMENT TRANSACTIONS.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR SALE-AND-REPLACEMENT TRANSACTIONS.—Effective as of September 30, 1985, section 807(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1984 (Public Law No. 98.115; 97 Stat. 786), is amended by striking out "October 1, 1985" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1986".

(b) APPROVAL OF TRANSACTIONS.—The Secretary of Defense may carry out the following sale-and-replacement transactions under the provisions of section 2667a of title 10, United States Code:

(1) The sale and replacement of warehousing facilities at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii.

(2) The sale and replacement of a noncommissioned officers professional education center, a band center, and a combat operations center at March Air Force Base, California.

SEC. 807. TURN-KEY SELECTION PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of subchapter III the following new section:

"§2862. Turn-key selection procedures

"(a)(1) The Secretaries of the military departments, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, may use one-step turn-key selection procedures for the purpose of entering into contracts for the construction of authorized military construction projects.

"(2) In this section, 'one-step turn-key selection procedures' means procedures used for the selection of a contractor on the basis of price and other evaluation criteria to perform, in accordance with the provisions of a

firm fixed-price contract, both the design and construction of a facility using performance specifications supplied by the Secretary concerned.

"(b) The Secretary of a military department may not, during any fiscal year, enter into more than three contracts for military construction projects using procedures authorized by this section.

"(c) The authority of a Secretary of a military department under this section shall expire on October 1, 1991.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding after the item relating to section 2861 the following:

"2862. Turn-key selection procedures.".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 808. COMMUNITY PLANNING ASSISTANCE.

The Secretary of Defense may use funds appropriated for fiscal year 1986 for planning and design purposes to provide community planning assistance when local resources are not sufficient, by grant or otherwise, as follows:

(1) To assist communities located near newly established Light Infantry Division Posts, $2,000,000.

(2) To assist communities located near newly established homeports under the Naval Strategic Dispersal Program, $3,000,000.

SEC. 809. MADIGAN ARMY MEDICAL CENTER, FORT LEWIS WASHINGTON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 601(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-407; 98 Stat. 1512), is amended by striking out "and the amount specified in subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof ", the amount specified in subsection (b)(1), and $326,800,000 (the amount authorized for the construction of the Madigan Army Medical Center, Fort Lewis, Washington)".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall become effective on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 810. INTERSERVICE EXCHANGES.

Section 2571 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) No agency or official of the executive branch of the Federal Government may establish any regulation, program, or policy or take any other action which precludes, directly or indirectly, the Secretaries concerned from carrying out this section.".

SEC. 811. PLAN FOR CLEANUP OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN ARSENAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall develop and transmit, by December 31, 1985, to the Congress a report setting forth a comprehensive plan for completing the cleanup of contaminated sites, structures, equipment, and natural resources at or near the Rocky Mountain Arsenal near Denver, Colorado, by September 30, 1993.

(b) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS.—In such plan, the Secretary shall—

(1) describe in detail the various phases for the project, along with the completion dates and a priority ranking of the goals for each such phase;

(2) provide cost estimates for each such phase and for the total project;

(3) provide findings and conclusions reached as a result of consultation, before the transmittal of the plan, with State and local officials (including officials of water districts) and the general public;

(4) provide that consultation and coordination with such officials and the general public will be carried out throughout the process of cleaning up the Arsenal;

(5) provide for priority cleanup of—

(A) the most seriously contaminated areas at the Arsenal, including the areas known as Basin F, Basin A, the South Plants Area, and section 36;

(B) other areas at the Arsenal which should be afforded priority treatment for the benefit of the general public, including the areas known as sections 7, 8, 11, and 12; and

(C) any sites, structures, equipment, or natural resources located outside the Arsenal that have been contaminated by activities carried out at the Arsenal;

(6) provide for the cleanup of the areas described in paragraph (5) without regard to whether a final disposal site for hazardous substances from the Arsenal has been selected;

(7) establish, as a priority, the use of waste-treatment technologies that will reduce significantly the amount and toxicity level of hazardous substances at or near the Arsenal;

(8) provide for selection of a final disposal site for hazardous substances from the Arsenal in a manner that will take into consideration sites, within and outside of Colorado, that—

(A) are geologically suitable to serve as such a disposal site; and

(B) are located within areas the governing bodies of which have expressed a willingness to have such a disposal site located therein;

(9) provide that all activities in the plan will be carried out in compliance with the requirements of applicable Federal and State environmental laws;

(10) provide findings and conclusions reached as a result of studying the feasibility and cost of cleansing groundwater on an expedited basis at the sources of contamination on the Arsenal; and

(11) include a statement concerning any reprogramming or supplemental appropriation of funds that may be necessary for fiscal year 1986 in order to assure an expeditious implementation of the plan.

SEC. 812. PROJECT AMOUNT FOR FORT DRUM, NEW YORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The amount established for a project at Fort Drum, New York, by section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985 (Public Law 98-407; 98 Stat. 1495) is hereby increased by $82,500,000.

(b) FUNDING.—Funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal years before fiscal year 1986 for military construction functions of the Army that remain available for obligation are hereby authorized to be made available, to the extent provided in appropriation Acts, for the military construction project described in subsection (a), in the amount of $82,500,000.

(c) COST OF PROJECTS.—Notwithstanding the cost variations authorized by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, and any other cost variations authorized by law, the limit established by section 601(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, on the total cost of all projects carried out under section 101 of that Act is hereby increased by $82,500,000.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 813. MATERIAL AT NAVAL BASE, NORFOLK, VIRGINIA.

The Secretary of the Navy may provide, without compensation, to the City of Norfolk, Virginia, not more than 50,000 cubic yards of dredged material located at the Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia, if such city agrees to bear all costs and liabilities associated with loading, transporting, using, or otherwise handling such material.

SEC. 814. LAND CONVEYANCE TO THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE; COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of the Air Force (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the United States Olympic Committee, without monetary consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 3.98 acres of land and improvements near Colorado Springs, Colorado, that are being leased to such Committee by the Secretary pursuant to section 806 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1980.

(b) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance described in subsection (a) shall be subject—

(1) to the condition that the land and improvements so conveyed shall be used by the United States Olympic Committee solely for facilities and activities of such Committee;

(2) to the condition that if such land and improvements are not used for the purpose described in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to them shall revert to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon; and

(3) to such other conditions as the Secretary may prescribe to protect the interests of the United States.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact description of the land and improvements described in subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 815. ALTERATION IN TRAILER PARK EXPANSION, HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE, MASSACHUSETTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In providing for the trailer park at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, and the expansion of such park as authorized by section 302 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985, the Secretary of the Air Force may enter into an agreement with the Massachusetts Port Authority to terminate leasehold rights of the Department of the Air Force in exchange for—

(1) leasehold rights to other land held by such Authority; and

(2) the construction, by such Authority or its designee, of roads, utilities, and trailer pads on such other land in accordance with specifications made by the Secretary.

(b) LIMITATION.—The termination of the leasehold rights by the Secretary shall not become effective until the completion of the construction described in subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 816. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER CERTAIN EXCESS PROPERTY WITHOUT REIMBURSEMENT.

(a) TRANSFERS UNDER EXCESS PROPERTY PROVISIONS AUTHORIZED.—In accordance with the provisions of section 202 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 483) governing transfers of excess property—

(1) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer the real property described in subsection (b) of this section without reimbursement, if such property is transferred to the Secretary of the Army; and

(2) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer the real property described in subsection (c) of this section without reimbursement, if such property is transferred to the Secretary of State.

(b) REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT FORT MCNAIR.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1), the property described in this subsection is a tract of land of approximately 10.5 acres, to-

gether with improvements thereon, adjacent to Fort McNair in the District of Columbia.

(c) REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT ARLINGTON HALL STATION.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the property described in this subsection is a tract of land of approximately 72 acres, together with improvements thereon, known as Arlington Hall Station in Arlington County, Virginia.

SEC. 817. LAND EXCHANGE, JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) through (f), the Secretary of the Navy (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the NEW MET Company (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Company") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 39.5 acres of unimproved land comprising a portion of the Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, located adjacent to the Ribault Bay Village Navy housing area.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—In consideration for the conveyance by the Secretary under subsection (a), the Company shall convey to the United States a parcel of land consisting of approximately 31.7 acres located in the vicinity of the Ribault Bay Village Navy housing area.

(c) OBLIGATIONS OF PARTIES.—The specific obligations of the Secretary and the Company are set forth in a memorandum of understanding between the parties dated February 19, 1985.

(d) PAYMENT BY THE COMPANY.—If the fair market value of the land conveyed under subsection (a) exceeds the fair market value of the land conveyed under subsection (b), as determined by the Secretary, the Company shall pay the difference to the United States.

(e) SURVEY.—The exact acreages and legal descriptions of the lands to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys which are satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of any such survey shall be borne by the Company.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the transaction authorized by this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 818. CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT NAVAL WEAPONS STATION, CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONVEY.—Subject to subsections (b) through (g), the Secretary of the Navy (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey to the Westvaco Corporation (the principal address and place of business of which is 299 Park Avenue, New York, New York, and hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Corporation") all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 47.83 acres of improved land comprising that portion of the Navy Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina, located at Remount Road and Virginia Avenue, in the city of North Charleston.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—In consideration for the conveyance authorized by subsection (a), the Corporation shall pay all costs for construction and occupancy by the Navy of "in kind" facilities to replace those on the land to be conveyed. The replacement facilities shall be constructed by the Navy on the Naval Weapons Station described in subsection (a) at a site to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) OBLIGATIONS OF PARTIES.—The specific obligations of the Secretary and the Corporation are set forth in a memorandum of understanding between the parties that became effective April 17, 1985. The Secretary is authorized to receive, obligate, and disburse funds received under subsection (b) to cover design, construction, relocation, and related costs specified in the memorandum of understanding.

(d) VACATING PROPERTY.—Upon completion and occupancy of the replacement facilities by the Navy and payment of all costs by the Corporation, the Navy shall promptly vacate the property described in subsection (a) and convey it by quitclaim deed to the Corporation.

(e) PAYMENT OF ANY EXCESS.—If the fair market value of the improved land conveyed under subsection (a) exceeds the consideration paid under subsection (b), as determined by the Secretary, the Corporation shall pay the difference to the United States.

(f) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and legal description of any land conveyed under this section shall be determined by a survey which is satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of such survey shall be borne by the Corporation.

(g) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions under this section as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interest of the United States.

SEC. 819. TERMINATION DATE FOR CERTAIN AUTHORITY.

Section 808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1983, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) The authority of the Secretary to carry out this section shall terminate on October 1, 1990.".

SEC. 820. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA.

(a) TRANSFER.—The Secretary of the Navy shall transfer, without reimbursement, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs approximately 15.31 acres of real property, including improvements thereon, at the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida.

(b) USE OF LAND.—The real property transferred pursuant to subsection (a) shall become part of the Barrancas National Cemetery and shall be administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under chapter 24 of title 38, United States Code.

(c) CONDITION.—If the real property transferred pursuant to subsection (a) is not used for the purpose described in subsection (b), the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall transfer such property, without reimbursement, to the Secretary of the Navy.

(d) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and location of the land and improvements described in subsection (a) shall be determined in a survey approved by the Secretary.

SEC. 821. AVIGATION RIGHTS ON SANTA ROSA ISLAND, FLORIDA.

The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to sell and convey to Okaloosa County, State of Florida, all right, title, and interest in the United States in and to a portion of Santa Rosa Island, Florida, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1229), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5. The prohibition contained in subdivision d. of the first section against the erection of any structure or obstacle on the land conveyed under this Act in excess of seventy-five feet above mean low-water level shall be deemed to be a prohibition against the erection of a structure or obstacle in excess of two hundred feet above mean low-water level in the case of that portion of such land on Santa Rosa Island which is east of the Destin East Pass and known as Holiday Isle.".

SEC. 822. LAND CONVEYANCE, DAVIS-MONTHAN AIR FORCE BASE, TUCSON, ARIZONA.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the highest and best use of the lands described or identified in subsection (b) is public park and recreational use or public health use;

(2) the city of Tucson, Arizona, has indicated a willingness to extend the existing lease to the United States Air Force of the lands described in subsection (c) for an additional fifty years commencing in 2002 at the existing rental rate of $773 per year;

(3) therefore, the Administrator of General Services should—

(A) assign to the Secretary of the Interior lands described in subsection (b)(1) for use as a park or recreational area; and

(B) assign to the Secretary of Health and Human Services lands identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2) for public health use;

(4) the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretaries of the Interior and Health and Human Services, as the case may be, should, simultaneously with the acceptance of the extension of the lease for the lands described in subsection (c), convey to the city of Tucson, Arizona—

(A) the property described in subsection (b)(1) for use as a park recreational area through a public benefit discount conveyance under section 203(k)(2) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(2)), and

(B) such land as is identified in subsection (b)(2) for public health use through a public benefit discount conveyance under section 203(k)(1)(B) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 484(k)(1)(B)).

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND SUITABLE FOR PARK OR RECREATIONAL USE AND FOR PUBLIC HEALTH USE.—(1) The property described in this paragraph is 61 acres of real property adjacent to Golf Links/Craycroft Intersection, Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona.

(2) The property identified in this paragraph is such portion (not exceeding eight acres) of the land described in paragraph (1) as the Secretary of Health and Human Services, with the concurrence of the Secretaries of the Interior and Defense, determines to be suitable for conveyance for public health use.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY SUBJECT TO LEASE.—The property described in this subsection is 4,348.81 acres of real property owned by the city of Tucson, Arizona, at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base.

(d) SURVEYS OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal descriptions of the real property to be conveyed under this section shall be determined by surveys that are satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior, or the Secretaries of the Interior and Health and Human Services, as the case may be. The cost of such surveys shall be borne by the city of Tucson, Arizona.

SEC. 823. ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING SERVICES RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL GUARD ARMORIES.

(a) CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATES.—Subsection (e) of section 2233 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary of Defense may procure, or contribute to any State such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary to procure, architectural and engineering serv-

ices and construction designs in connection with facilities to be established or developed under this chapter which are not otherwise authorized by law.".

(b) AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTION.—Subsection (b) of section 2236 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(b) A contribution made for an armory under section 2233(a) (4) or (5) of this title may not exceed the sum of—

"(1) 100 percent of the cost of architectural, engineering and design services (including advance architectural, engineering and design services under section 2233(e) of this title); and

"(2) a percentage of the cost of construction (exclusive of the cost of architectural, engineering and design services) calculated so that upon completion of construction the total contribution (including the contribution for architectural, engineering and design services) equals 75 percent of the total cost of construction (including the cost of architectural, engineering and design services).

For the purpose of computing the cost of construction under this subsection, the amount contributed by the State or Territory, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, whichever is concerned, may not include the cost or market value of any real property that it has contributed.".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1985.

SEC. 824. FURNISHING OF BEDDING FOR HOMELESS.

Section 2546 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

"(d) The Secretary concerned may provide bedding for support of shelters for the homeless that are operated by entities other than the Department of Defense. Bedding may be provided under this subsection without reimbursement, but may only be provided to the extent that the Secretary determines that the provision of such bedding will not interfere with military requirements.".

SEC. 825. LIMITATION ON AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the maximum amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act is $9,200,000,000.

SEC. 826. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2860 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2860. Availability of appropriations

"Funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for a fiscal year for military construction or military family housing purposes may remain available beyond such fiscal year to the extent provided in appropriation Acts.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to funds appropriated after the date of the enactment of Public Law 99-103.

SEC. 827. OFF-POST RENTAL HOUSING LEASE INDEMNITY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall establish a pilot program to test the feasibility of implementing a program under which each Secretary of a military department may guarantee compensation of any person who leases a rental unit to any member of the armed forces under the jurisdiction of the Secretary for any breach of the lease or any damage to the rental unit by the member.

(2) The program referred to in paragraph (1) shall be established before the expiration of the 90-day period following the date of the enactment of this Act, but not before October 1, 1985.

(b) ACTIONS BY SECRETARIES OF MILITARY DEPARTMENTS.—(1) In accordance with action taken by the Secretary of Defense under subsection (a), each Secretary of a military department shall designate one military installation in the United States that is under the jurisdiction of such Secretary to participate in the program established under subsection (a).

(2) For purposes of carrying out this section, any Secretary of a military department, to the extent approved in advance in appropriation Acts, may enter into an agreement with any person who leases a rental unit to any member of the armed forces who is under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Any agreement under this paragraph shall provide that—

(A) the term of the agreement shall not be for more than one year;

(B) the member shall not pay a security deposit;

(C) the Secretary (except as provided in subparagraphs (D) and (E)) shall compensate the lessor for any breach of the lease by the member and for any damage to the rental unit caused by the member or by any guest or dependent of the member;

(D) the total liability of the Secretary for any breach of the lease or for any damage described in subparagraph (C) shall not exceed an amount equal to the amount that the Secretary determines would have been required by the lessor as a security deposit absent the agreement authorized in this paragraph;

(E) the Secretary shall not compensate the lessor for any breach of the lease or for any damage described in subparagraph (C) until the lessor exhausts any remedies available to the lessor against the member for the breach or damage; and

(F) the Secretary shall be subrogated to the rights of the lessor in any case in which the Secretary compensates the lessor for any breach of the lease or for any damage described in subparagraph (C).

(3) Any authority of a Secretary of a military department under this subsection shall be exercised pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense.

(c) GARNISHMENT OF PAY OF MEMBER OF ARMED FORCES.—Any Secretary who compensates any lessor under subsection (b) for any damage to a rental unit or any breach of a lease by a member of the armed forces may issue a special order under section 1007 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the withholding from the pay of the member of an amount equal to the amount paid by the Secretary to the lessor as compensation for the breach or damage.

(d) REPORT REQUIREMENT.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report concerning the pilot program establishing under subsection (a), including—

(A) findings and conclusions of the Secretary with respect to the pilot program; and

(B) recommendations as to the feasibility of implementing a program similar to the pilot program on all military installations.

(2) The report referred to in paragraph (1) shall be submitted before the expiration of the 18-month period following the date of the establishment of the pilot program under subsection (a).

(e) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority of any Secretary of a military department to enter into any contract under subsection (b) shall terminate upon the expiration of the 18-month period following the date of the establishment of the pilot program under subsection (a).

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term "armed forces" has the meaning given such term in section 101(4) of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term "military department" has the meaning given such term in section 101(7) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 828. CONVEYANCE OF LAND AT FORT WILLIAM H. HARRISON, MONTANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of the Army (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to convey, without monetary consideration, to the State of Montana all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 65.4 acres of unimproved land located in the southeast corner of Fort William H. Harrison, Montana, and presently under license to the State of Montana for National Guard use.

(b) CONDITIONS.—(1) The conveyance authorized by subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the real property conveyed be used to establish a Montana State Veterans' Cemetery.

(2) If the property conveyed pursuant to subsection (a) is not used for the purposes described in paragraph (1), all right, title, and interest in and to such property shall revert at no cost to the United States, which shall have the right of immediate entry thereon.

(3) The Secretary shall reserve to the United States a waterline easement for use by the Veterans' Administration Hospital.

(c) LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The exact acreage and legal description of the property to be conveyed under subsection (a) and of the easement to be reserved under subsection (b)(3) shall be determined by surveys that are satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of any such survey shall be borne by the State.

(d) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such other terms and conditions with respect to the conveyance as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

SEC. 829. FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENTS AT FORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY.

The Secretary of the Army may, notwithstanding the maximum amount per unit for an improvement project under section 2825(b) of title 10, United States Code, carry out a project to improve 366 existing military family housing units at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, in the amount of $14,800,000. These housing units include 135 housing units authorized by section 101 of this Act and 231 housing units authorized in section 101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1985.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 1409) was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1042

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 196, I move that the House insist

on its amendment to the Senate bill, S. 1042, to authorize certain construction at military installations for fiscal year 1986, and for other purposes, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPIN, DELLUMS, MONTGOMERY, HUTTO, LEATH of Texas, DICKINSON, WHITEHURST, and KRAMER.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 1042, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION ACT, 1986

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the House amendment to the Senate bill, S. 1042, the Clerk be authorized to make such technical and conforming changes, including section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the Senate bill, S. 1042.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION REQUIRING DEATH PENALTY FOR HIJACK MURDERERS

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate hijacking recently which resulted in the death of Leon Klinghoffer gave us an example of a loophole that exists in our current law. Only last year this Congress passed a law making it a crime for a terrorist to strike against the United States or Americans anywhere in the world, to make that a Federal crime. That is the first time that ever happened; however, the harshest sentence we can mete out to such a terrorist is life imprisonment. I think the murder of Leon Klinghoffer has pointed out that that is not strong enough or good enough. We currently have a death penalty for someone who commits a killing during an aircraft hijacking, but that is not the case in these other forms of terrorism. There should be no difference.

Therefore, a terrorist who kills an American in a case like this in terrorism should be given the same kind of sentence as one who does it in an aircraft hijacking.

We need to close this loophole in the law. Today I have introduced legislation that will authorize capital offense, or the death penalty, for anyone who commits murder during an act of terrorism against U.S. citizens anywhere in the world.

I urge my colleagues to join with me to correct this loophole in the law and to mete out a proper sentence for people like these terrorists who struck against Mr. Klinghoffer recently.

EXTENDED VOLUNTARY DEPARTURE

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been 7 long years since the civil war in El Salvador erupted. The war has claimed thousands of innocent lives and has devastated this tiny country—which is about the size of my home State of Massachusetts.

Today, the violence, the indiscriminate killings, and the terror continue.

President Duarte, convinced that the current climate in El Salvador is unsafe, recently sent his family members to the United States to wait out the storm. In a sense, President Duarte is affording his family members a sort of extended voluntary departure status.

Mr. Speaker, the understandable anguish and fear that President Duarte has over the safety of his family should also be extended to the thousands of refugees who have fled El Salvador in search of a temporary safe haven.

For this reason, I have sent President Reagan a letter today urging that he reconsider his stand against granting Salvadoran refugees extended voluntary departure. The general conditions of violence and civil unrest in El Salvador are a clear justification for Salvadorans to be afforded this temporary status.

In the meantime, I urge my colleagues in the House to support my legislation, H.R. 822, which would grant Salvadorans now in the United States a temporary stay of deportation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit to the RECORD a copy of my letter to President Reagan as well as two excellent articles describing the current situation in El Salvador:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 15, 1985.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I share your concerns over the future of El Salvador and pray that a peaceful resolution to the current conflict can soon be reached.

However, the violence and civil unrest which has plagued El Salvador since 1979 continues to be a fact of life in that tiny country. In fact, as the Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Salvador, Arturo Rivera y Damas, has said, "Many are feeling the sensation that they are returning to the worst years of social intranquillity."

Two recent reports published by the Americas Watch Committee and Amnesty International document a recent resurgence of death squad activity in El Salvador, numerous civilian casualties as a result of the indiscriminate nature of aerial bombardments and an increase in civilian deaths due to the harsh tactics of the Salvadoran guerrillas. In short, El Salvador is a country still very much in turmoil.

The recent decision by President Jose Napoleon Duarte to send his family members to the United States to wait out the storm, dramatizes the fear that so many Salvadoran refugees who have fled their country must feel. We can all understand President Duarte's anguish in sending his family to the United States for temporary safety. However, I believe we should also recognize that the Salvadoran refugees who are now in the United States have the same concerns.

Therefore, I respectfully urge you to reconsider your stated position against granting Salvadoran refugees extended voluntary departure. Granting Salvadorans temporary safety from the current violence in their homeland would be a great humanitarian gesture, and could very well result in the saving of many innocent lives.

Sincerely,

JOHN JOSEPH MOAKLEY,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 14, 1985]

A YEAR AFTER TALKS, SALVADOR PEACE RECEDES

(By James LeMoyne)

SAN SALVADOR, October 13.—A year ago, Salvadoran leftist guerrillas and President Jose Napoleon Duarte met for the first time in the mountain village of La Palma and raised the hopes of their countrymen that peace might come after five years of civil war.

Those hopes may have been impossibly high, but their loss today is palpable and has even reached into Mr. Durate's home. The President, who walked unarmed into the heart of a war zone to meet the guerrillas, is now imploring them to release his kidnapped daughter.

Conversations with dozens of Salvadorans from all classes of society give the strong impression that exhaustion is gaining hold in a country that has joined Northern Ireland and Lebanon as a land in which violence is normal. Resignation, cynicism and a simple hunger to survive have replaced the fragile faith that many placed in Mr. Duarte and the rebels' promise to try to stop fighting 12 months ago.

In a grim sermon last Sunday, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Salvador, Arturo Rivera y Damas, said, "Many are feeling the sensation that they are return-

ing to the worst years of social intranquillity."

"What one sees most of all," said an elderly Catholic priest who often works with refugees here, "is the suffering of the common people. They don't see an exit. There isn't an exit."

In two meetings last October and November, the Government and rebels failed to narrow the differences between their separate visions of El Salvador's future.

The Government insists the rebels give up their guns and stand in elections. The rebels insist on being given a share of power first. Each side accuses the other of demanding total surrender and each has returned to the battlefields with a vengeance.

Someone is killed for political reasons virtually every day somewhere in this small, overcrowded country. Rebel sabotage frequently knocks out electricity and there is seldom an evening when gunfire or an exploding bomb does not echo in some part of the capital.

At least 4,000 soldiers, guerrillas and civilians are estimated to have been killed or wounded in the year since La Palma. At least 40 soldiers and 10 guerrillas died in a single rebel attack four days ago. It is difficult to meet a Salvadoran who has not lost a friend or relative in the years of fighting.

A new development in a war that has been noted for its inhumanity has been a sharp increase in human rights abuses by the rebels of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front. In a newly declared "war of attrition" the guerrillas have carried out indiscriminate mining of roads, two attacks in which 27 unarmed people were killed, the kidnapping of 23 mayors, and several shootings of civilians who refused to accept the rebels' demand that all highway traffic cease.

In the last week the guerrillas machine-gunned a pickup truck, killing four civilians. A young boy died when he stepped on a rebel mine.

300,000 ARE REFUGEES

Right-wing death squad killings have fallen dramatically, but they are more frequent than the Government cares to admit. A teen-ager was found beheaded last week, a university lecturer was shot dead and three other men were found tied and shot through the head.

Government security forces have largely stopped killing prisoners, but the police arrest hundreds of suspects each month and detainees frequently say they are beaten or threatened with death. More than 300,000 Salvadorans are refugees from the war. Army troops have forced hundreds of rebel supporters to leave their homes, burning their fields and ordering them to enter refugee camps.

There are other markers to measure the emotional and political distance the country has slid from the giddy heights of last year's talks. According to one of Mr. Duarte's closest aides, Julio Adolfo Rey Prendes, the rebels' decision to kidnap Mr. Duarte's daughter a month ago has "changed the rules of the game" by making targets of family members of political leaders. He said the action has set back the possibility of peace. "We have regressed rather than advanced in the question of humanizing the conflict," Mr. Rey Prendes said.

Nidia Diaz, one of the rebel commanders who sat down with Mr. Duarte at the La Palma bargaining table, is recovering in a police cell, shot five times by an army helicopter gunship that ambushed a guerrilla patrol. Her diary recording each side's statements at La Palma was shot through by machine-gun bullets.

DEADLOCK SEEN DEVELOPING

Though they will not say it on the record, American diplomats privately concede that a deadlock is developing. The Government, they say, can contain the rebels but not defeat them. And though the guerrillas have never had, and probably will never gain, the support of the majority of the population, they appear capable of carrying out sabotage, assassinations, kidnappings and ambushings indefinitely.

"Things have gotten worse because they have not gotten better," a foreign diplomat here said, noting a hardening in the guerrillas' position. "I was very optimistic a year ago. I'm not now."

The handful of Social Democrats who make up the democratic wing of the largely Marxist rebel movement have never looked weaker or appeared to have a smaller say in guerrilla actions than today. Guillermo Ungo, head of the small band of political representatives in the Democratic Revolutionary Front, who attended La Palma and called it the "first step of a positive dialogue," now warns of more war to come. "The Reagan administration no longer talks of a quick victory in El Salvador," he said in a recent interview.

Mr. Duarte has also moved closer to Government army commanders. He frequently lauds the army's performance in the field, and has made a special point of wooing army support as he moves into his second year of war as leader of the country.

The senior guerrilla military commander, Joaquin Villalobos, emphasized the guerrillas' new determination when he invited reporters to his mountain headquarters four months ago. The rebels, he said, will never lay down their arms until the United States withdraws its assistance from El Salvador.

DUARTE "THE MAIN ENEMY"

The guerrillas' verbal attacks on Mr. Duarte and his Christian Democratic Party reflect the tougher line.

"Napoleon Duarte is not a simple executioner like Roberto d'Aubuisson," the rebel radio, Venceremos, said last week. "He is the main enemy, the Christian Democratic Party is the main enemy, the criminal of today only with a new style." Mr. d'Aubuisson is a right-wing political leader who has frequently been accused of leading death squads.

Guerrilla commanders say their strategy is to wear the Government down and force it to make concessions.

The continuing war reflects the militarism and sectarianism that have characterized Salvadoran politics and society for a century.

But as the country's head of state, Mr. Duarte is stuck with the burden of office and he risks being blamed for a conflict that continues to defy political solutions. This week El Salvador will begin its seventh year at war.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1985]

DUARTE SENDS THREATENED FAMILY MEMBERS TO U.S.

(By Edward Cody)

SAN SALVADOR, October 14.—President Jose Napoleon Duarte, reacting to threats of more kidnapings against his family, sent three daughters and their children to the United States today aboard a U.S. Air Force jet.

The Salvadoran leader, whose daughter Ines was abducted by gunmen Sept. 10, said an unknown caller has telephoned several times since then claiming to have plans to kidnap more members of his family. As a result, they have been living "penned up" for security, he added. One bodyguard was killed and an other wounded in the kidnaping of Ines.

"Even this morning there was a car following up on my daughter, and we had to take special precautions," Duarte said after seeing his children depart on the white-and gray DC9 from the capital's Ilopongo military airport.

The president's decision to send threatened relatives to the United States was interpreted as a measure of concern here over the possibility of more attacks on Salvadoran or U.S. officials and their families by urban commandos working with the leftist rebels' Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front.

Although only a precaution, it amounted to indirect recognition that the threat is considered serious enough that already tight security measures surrounding Duarte and his family are seen as insufficient.

The rebel front, known by its Spanish initials as the FMLN, has not officially acknowledged kidnaping Duarte's daughter and has made no public threats against his other children. But Information and Culture Minister Julio Rey Prendes has said repeatedly that the rebels are holding the daughter and that the government is dealing with FMLN officials in two-way radio contacts designed to gain her freedom in exchange for captured rebel leaders.

U.S. soldiers also have been threatened with capture or assassination by the rebels' official Radio Venceremos, leading to what one diplomat described as sharply increased worry among U.S. personnel stationed here.

Four U.S. marines who were embassy guards and two other Americans were killed at a sidewalk cafe June 19 in assassinations later acknowledged by the FMLN. More recently, the front said in a communique that the main objective of its attack last Thursday on the Salvadoran Army's main training base was killing or capturing U.S. military advisers stationed there.

U.S. Ambassador Edwin Corr, who accompanied Duarte at the airport, said no American diplomats, military advisers or their families have left the country.

Duarte has four daughters, the kidnaped Ines Guadalupe Duarte de Duran, 35, and the three who left today with their children. He also has two sons. One of them, Alejandro, also accompanied the president as he saw off his daughters and grandchildren. "The men of the family and my wife are remaining here," he said.

[El Salvador's ambassador in Washington, Pablo Alberge, said he was expecting Duarte's daughters, Maria Elena and Lorena, and Lorena's husband and child in Washington. He said the four would stay with him indefinitely at the embassy residence. One of Duarte's sons, Napoleon, a World Bank employe, already lives in Virginia.

[Alberge also said Alejandro Duarte's wife and three children were flown to Miami and would remain there, while the other daughter of Duarte, Maria Eugenia, was flown to Atlanta with her husband and one child.]

Corr said the plane was a scheduled government flight from U.S. Southern Command headquarters in Panama bound for Washington with possible stops on the way.

Duarte emphasized that he continues to act as president and that the government continues to function. This was seen as a re-

sponse to reports that some military officers have expressed fears that the government, by negotiating with the kidnapers and seeming willing to bow to their demands for releasing prisoners, would appear weak and give the rebels the status of a legitimate belligerent in the war.

The president's decision came one year after his first meeting with rebel officials at the mountain town of La Palma for what was intended to be the beginning of a dialogue aimed at ending El Salvador's five-year-old civil war.

"The guerrillas have forgotten the spirit of La Palma," he declared.

GROUNDBREAKING CEREMONY FOR THE U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, this morning in the company of distinguished colleagues from the House, Senate, the President's Cabinet, and ambassadors of many countries, I had the moving privilege of participating in the groundbreaking ceremonies for the Holocaust Memorial Museum.

It is my intention, when the proceedings of this whole event are available, to place them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in their entirety.

This morning I wish to share with my colleagues the words of the witness, victim, chronicler, and conscience of the Holocaust—Elie Wiesel—who lifted the occasion to its appropriate historical height:

In this place, dedicated to the noble and urgent cause of remembrance, we pledge to tell as much as possible, as truthfully as possible, what Nazi Germany and its accomplices did to six million Jews and to the other millions of victims of Nazi atrocities.

We realize that the full story of that crime, and the resistance to that crime, can never be told. Yet we know that we must try.

We shall tell the tale, not to divide people, but on the contrary to bring them closer together. We shall evoke past suffering, not to inflict more suffering, but, on the contrary, to diminish it. We shall remind of what took place in Auschwitz and Treblinka, sites of ultimate degradation and humiliation, not to humiliate anyone, but, on the contrary, to teach future generations, and our own, to humiliate no one.

In this place we shall try to bear witness for the dead and the living.

The text of Elie Wiesel's moving speech follows:

ADDRESS BY ELIE WIESEL

Secretary Hodel, Ambassador Rosenne, Distinguished Members of the Senate and House, your Excellencies, Mark Talisman, Linda Chavez, and friends.

Today, as we begin to lend a physical dimension to our relentless quest to remembrance, it is fitting to express our profound gratitude to Congress and to the people of the United States for the help and encouragement they have offered us in carrying out our historical mandate.

Outside of Israel, ours is the only nation in the world that has made a commitment to establish such a national museum.

The help we have received has always been bipartisan in both Houses of Congress now and since years ago when, at the initiative of Jimmy Carter, we began this historic project. The administration—irrespective of its political party—has never refused to assist us in our various efforts. The Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of State and their respective staffs have given us their indispensable support. The general public has responded to our appeals with the characteristic generosity of the American people. As for the President of the United States, not only has he often participated in our Remembrance Ceremonies, but he has also graciously accepted to serve as Honorary Chairman of our Campaign to Remember. On behalf of the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, its advisers and staff, I thank them, and I thank you—from the depths of my heart.

Now it is up to us to continue. If we fulfill our mission, future generations will benefit from it. But the task is neither simple nor easy. The story we must tell cannot be told—not in its entirety. In our case, the sum of the fragments does not convey the full message. Words, images, memories, prayers, fears, agonies: How does one communicate the burning of a ghetto? Or the arrival of a convoy at Birkenau at midnight? Or the daily massacre of ten thousand men, women, and children, some buried alive, at Babi Yar? Woe unto us, for the killer's imagination surpassed that of his victims. Furthermore, by pushing the crime to its ultimate limits he deprived us of the language to speak of his crime.

What, then, do we wish the future visitor to remember, to learn? The fragility of the human condition? The vulnerability of culture and education? The monstrous powers of political fanaticism? The dangers inherent in indifference? The fact that it was possible for an evil regime to consider cynically, calmly, scientifically, the annihilation of an entire people and be persuaded of its right and obligation to do so? All this is part of the tale—and more, much more.

Some lessons may have an immediate and urgent effect. Terror must be fought wherever it is aimed against innocent civilians. Individual terror that cost the life of an old Jewish invalid is today as abhorrent as state terror was when, from Hitler's Berlin, it dominated part of Europe from 1933 to 1945.

Terror must be outlawed as must genocide. We cannot leave this place today without appealing once more to the United States Senate to ratify the Genocide Treaty introduced by CHRIS DODD. I am not sure whether such treaties will prevent mass murder, but the absence of such treaties may give the enemy of humankind the wrong signal. Would a Genocide Treaty have prevented the murder of the Jews by the Nazis? I doubt it. But its absence gave the enemy of humankind the wrong signal.

In killing Jews the killer has killed more than Jews. This tragedy has affected more than its Jewish victims. Whoever kills Jews ends up killing other minorities, other adversaries, other religious groups, other nationalities.

In occupied Europe, the Nazis and their local accomplices, oppressed, tormented, persecuted, imprisoned and executed French heroes of the resistance, Yugoslav and Greek and Russian partisans, Ukrainian peasants, Bulgarian and Polish patriots, Dutch workers, Belgian students, Norwegian intellectuals, Danish policemen, German and Austrian anti-Nazi militants, Italian anti-Fascists, Czechoslovakian freedom fighters. Lidice and Oradour are but extreme examples of what SS rulers intended to do—and often did—throughout their universe in order to crush those who refused to submit to their terror. And they eliminated Gypsies, homosexuals, the mentally retarded, the mentally sick. Using death as an instrument, they sought to rearrange the universe so as to give violence and injustice the attributes of divinity.

But their main effort was directed against the Jewish people. "Who remembers the Armenians?" Hitler asked with disdain. Who will remember the Jews?

In a perverse way, he was right. No one cared about the Jews. They were abandoned. The world knew and kept silent. Hitler knew that the world knew—and thus felt reassured in his belief that he was doing humankind a favor by cleansing it of its Jewish elements. And so more ghettos were erected and emptied, more communities uprooted and massacred. How are we to remember them? If we could inscribe their names on stone, the monument would be larger than this entire city. What other way is there for us to turn past experiences into acts of remembrance? What should we emphasize first? The helplessness of the victim? The inexorable urge of the killer to destroy? The children, frightened children, marching quietly in procession toward the flames? The old men and women chased toward mass graves? In those times we were a people without children, and children without grandparents. We have seen them vanish into darkness and ascend an invisible ladder of fire reaching the sky.

One enters those memories with fear and trembling; for one's sanity is endangered. But we must enter them. We open them as one opens gates to secret kingdoms. Come and see. Come and learn. Learn what human beings can do to other human beings. Learn the limits of humanity. Learn, and hope is possible—forget, and despair is inevitable.

This Museum is not intended to awaken hatred nor to separate people—quite the opposite: it is meant to bring people closer together. Faced with our memories, the visitor will have no choice but to become more sensitive to his or her fellow being's anguish.

One day a child will stop here and ask his father: what is this building about? They will go inside. After a while the child will ask his father: is all this true? have so many killers really killed so many victims in so many cruel ways? Yes—will say the father. In those times the angel of death had many faces and many allies. But, why? the child will ask. Why have all those victims perished?

Why has the catastrophe occurred? I wonder what the father's answer will be.

I know what mine is: I do not know. I do not know why the Holocaust happened. I will never know; no one ever will.

Why Theresienstadt? Why Ravensbruck? Why Belzec? Why Treblinka? Why Auschwitz?

Why the indifference of allied leaders? Why the silence our common enemies? Why the abandonment of the Jews?

In this Museum we shall try to tell the story. We shall try to recall what happened—to whom—by whom—and how it happened. But not why it happened. God alone may have some answers—and, in the

case of one million Jewish children consumed by flames—all answers are the wrong answers.

The killer killed them once—and there is nothing on earth that we can do about it. But, if they are forgotten, they will be killed a second time—and this we can—and must—prevent.

A great Hasidic Master once said, "if you wish to find the spark, look for it in the ashes."

GOOD NEWS ABOUT SMALL BUSINESS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALENTINE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. IRELAND] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot these days about the plight of business in America. People everywhere are talking about trade deficits and the threat of imports to our domestic manufacturing base. But we need to take a few moments and look beyond this smokescreen of bad news.

There is an incredible new spirit of personal initiative rising in this country—and the credit belongs to individual Americans across the Nation. We, as a country, enjoy a unique place in history—our energy comes from one of our most abundant resources—the hearts and minds of the American people.

This Nation has no mission of mediocrity—we were never meant to be second best. It is this bold spirit—one of pride, confidence, and courage—that continues to allow us to achieve our dreams.

Let's talk a moment about small business in America.

Small business is the backbone of Main Street America. American entrepreneurs continue to be the frontrunners in innovation, research, and development. And they create jobs.

As a member of the Small Business Committee, I take a very personal interest in the continued success of small business; and I am always encouraged when I hear new success stories—high startup rates, rising sales, and increased innovation.

The Census Bureau gave us more good news last week—the number of black-owned firms in this country rose substantially from 1977 to 1982. It is estimated that there could be more than 434,000 black-owned businesses by yearend.

Black entrepreneurs are discovering new opportunities at every turn, they are reaching out in new directions, especially high technological and service industries. And the vast majority of these black businesses are sole proprietorships where families are working together to succeed. This is indeed good news for America.

The story, however, is more than just plain statistics.

According to the Census Bureau, much of the recent growth among black-owned businesses is attributed to the economic recession of the 1970's. As many individuals were laid off, these same people went into business on their own. Now, while a recession is never good news, there is a point here worth recognizing. We as Americans, have the ability—when the going gets rough—to dig deep down inside that strong will and creative spirit which helped build this great Nation. And we are successful.

We lead the world in innovations. Do you realize that from 1980 to 1983, Americans received a total of 68 percent of the Nobel Prize awards for science? In 1983, we actually took them all. Not a bad track record.

Yes, business is booming in America. The youth of today, no matter what their ethnic or social background, can have great hopes for their future. America is embarking on a massive peaceful revolution, and the revolutionaries come from all sectors of our melting pot society, blacks, whites, orientals, hispanics—who recognize the great promise of opportunity which America offers.

We must ignore the prophets of failure who are paralyzed with fear. We must set our sights ever and ever higher. We can achieve our dreams by continuing to be the America whose initiative, ingenuity and audacity have made us the envy of the world. Ours is an opportunity society, and we must continue to offer an environment in which individuals, no matter how humble their beginnings, can develop their full potential.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the vitality of our small businesses is another reason we can truly—feel good about America.

□ 1635

INSURED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ACT OF 1985

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNDINE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker today my colleague from Delaware, Mr. CARPER, and I are introducing legislation which addresses one of the most fundamental problems facing our Nation's network of financial institutions.

One of the basic ingredients of a sound national banking system must be consistent and effective examination of federally insured financial institutions. Through regular and rigorous reviews of banks, thrifts and credit unions, potential problems can be caught early. Many of the problems which our system has experienced in the last year or so could have been caught and dealt with earlier through more diligent examination procedures. For example, inadequacies in our current examination procedures were cited during congressional hearings and other discussions are contributing to last year's near failure of Continental Illinois.

The key to an effective, efficient examination system is competent and highly trained examiners. The periodical examination of financial institutions is, as one can imagine, a very time consuming and arduous process which requires a high level of training. Examiners are required to travel a great deal and work under very stressful conditions. In many parts of the country, the pay for these professionals is far below what they could earn in the private sector. Consequently, many of the best examiners do not remain in Government service for more than 4 or 5 years.

The bill which Congressman CARPER and I are introducing today, the "Insured Financial Institutions Examination Act of 1985," addresses many of the problems currently plaguing our Federal examination structure. First, the bill removes Federal examiners from Federal civil service pay scales and establishes pay scales that are roughly comparable to those in private industry. These new pay scales would be based upon geographic location, length of service and experience, and levels of training and responsibility. Second, the bill provides for the consolidation and upgrading of the training of all Federal examiners. Presently, each regulatory agency trains its own examiners. Our bill would require that the examiners of the Federal Reserve Board, The Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board all undergo the same training program. Because training for examiners is paid for through assessments on the various insurance funds, these changes will not cost the taxpayer any money, nor will such changes have any budgetary impact. In fact, we estimate that there will be an overall savings from such consolidation, and our bill dictates that any such savings be used to hire more examiners. Finally, our bill will provide for more coordination between Federal and State examiners for State-chartered institutions that are federally insured.

While there have been hearings in both the House and Senate on proposals to reform the Federal deposit insurance system, and while I applaud the committees' efforts in this area, the question of the adequacy of current review and examination procedures must also be addressed. In a very real sense, the competence and experience of those who examine our Nation's financial institutions affect us all. We must recruit the most talented people to perform this difficult task. We cannot afford to have the most knowledgeable and conscientious ex-

aminers leave Government service after a few years for the more lucrative world of the private sector.

Over 25 members of the House Banking Committee are already cosponsors of this bill, and I hope that other Members of the House will join us in this effort. Thank you.

WORLD FOOD DAY

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to focus the attention of this body on today's observance of World Food Day. Recent events such as the "live aid" concert and the USA for Africa production of "We Are the World" only in part document the incredible contribution that thousands of Americans are making toward ending world hunger.

Since 1979, the National Committee for World Food Day, under the leadership of its distinguished chairwoman, Patricia Young, and the auspices of the World Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO] has undertaken hundreds of projects and programs related to the world's hunger problem. Without World Food Day and the organizations involved with its celebration, the groundswell needed that made the recent media events possible would never have existed.

Americans can be proud of the fact that one-half of all the food committed this year to Africa has been donated by the United States. Individuals have contributed over $125 million to private voluntary organizations such as "care" and "save the children."

Additionally, the U.S. Government has sent a total of $1.25 billion for the drought since the emergency first came to national attention last October. This is in addition to $1 billion the U.S. Government is spending on non-emergency projects in Africa this year.

Yet, despite this impressive outpouring of support, the problem of world hunger persists. According to a recent FAO report, some countries in Africa are still being impacted by drought—over 150 million people. And 13 million are at immediate risk of dying. Unicef informs us that every 24 hours, 42,000 children under the age of 5 die as a result of hunger and related diseases.

These grim statistics underscore the critical need for a continued commitment of private and Government funds to ending hunger. But emergency relief aid is not enough. A concerted effort must be made to improve the deteriorating conditions that result in tragedy after tragedy—the same conditions that allow famine and starvation to persist and remain a reality in a world with more than enough resources to feed its population. It is time for us, for our Nation and the world of nations, to work to prevent disasters from occurring—to solve the problems which face Africa now.

Recently, I introduced H.R. 2782, legislation to prevent famine in Africa, which responds to the root of the problem that faces a continent whose population is growing at the fastest rate in the world—3 percent per year—while at the same time the productivity of its land is declining rapidly. Since 1967, Africa's grain output per person has dropped by nearly one-third and 40 percent of the continent's people live in countries where grain yields are lower than a generation ago.

In order to help Africa become self-sufficient and economically independent, there must be a global effort made to restore and preserve its own productive resources.

Reversing Africa's decline will involve immediate response to the crisis of decertification—that is, degeneration of land's productivity—which results from overly intensive and exploitative use of land in response to the needs of the growing population. At this point in time, 77.2 percent of the 4,500 million hectares of dryland in the world are already affected by decertification and 21 million of these per year are reduced to near or total uselessness. If this trend is not reversed, there will be no end to Africa's dependency on more developed countries for food and economic assistance.

A major cause of Africa's current problems is the lack of a renewable energy supply. Firewood, the most widely used source of fuel, is becoming increasingly scarce due to the overharvesting of trees. Forests in coastal West Africa were being cleared at a rate of 5 percent per year in the early eighties; at that rate, in 13 years those forests will be half of their original size. The scarcity of trees also has implications for soil and crop quality. Trees help to prevent soil erosion caused by damaging winds and floods. Without any protection, soil ceases to be fertile enough to produce significant quantitiesr of food.

Simply to maintain Africa's present per capita food consumption, agricultural output will have to grow 50 to 60 percent between the year 1980-2000. Considering the monumental suffering that exists with the present level of food consumption, it is clear that drastic measures must be taken to revive Africa's capacity to produce.

The time has come to begin to turn back the tide of the degradation of Africa's agricultural resource base that should be providing food for that continent's people. The decertification and deforestation which have played a major role in causing the present catastrophe in Africa needs our immediate attention if we are to put an end to this cycle of famine.

Mr. Speaker, we have the ability, the technology and the wherewithall to end world hunger. All we need is the commitment—and I urge my colleagues to help rally that kind of commitment.

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND], who has been the chairman of our Select Committee on Hunger, and who for so many years has led the fight in this Congress to stamp out world hunger.

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding and certainly want to commend him for his leadership, not just now to present this issue to the American people today because this is, indeed, a very special day, but also for his leadership historically, for what he has done to bring to the attention of the Congress the matter of ending hunger, world hunger, that is.

So I am happy also to associate myself with all of the remarks the gentleman has made.

Today, World Food Day 1985, is the occasion for the issuance by the U.S. Postal Service of the "help end hunger" stamp throughout the Nation. Please allow me, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Hunger and as chairman of the Postal Operations and Services Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, to express my pride in the issuance of the stamp. Let me at this time thank especially former Postmaster General Bolger and the current Postmaster General Carlin for their efforts. Without their help the stamp never would have been created.

The Postal Service has made a great contribution to the effort to end hunger by enabling us to send 120 million messages calling on our brother and sister Americans to "help end hunger."

The stamp captures the pathos and vulnerability of hungry individuals, young and old. It evokes a compassionate response, similar to that awakened last year by the visual appearance of the famine stricken Ethiopians on television last year. Mr. Jerry Pinkney, designer of the stamp, reminds us that every person who suffers hunger is unique. In his artistry we see in a child or an old person someone we might know, weakened by lack of adequate nutrition. Aggregate numbers, no matter how startling, do not have the same effect.

The American people have always responded magnificently to such appeals. The magnanimity of our citizens during the past year as hunger stalked much of Africa and the homeless stood in souplines in our cities was extraordinary. Although the countless opportunities for giving in a free socie-

ty make a precise calculation of donated funds and services impossible, an example of the generosity of Americans giving through private agencies can be gained from interaction. This coalition of over 100 private, voluntary organizations involved in developing countries reports its member agencies have received over $125 million in donations from the American public for famine recovery activities in sub-Saharan Africa. Additionally, more than $100 million has been raised to help victims of drought and famine in Africa by USA for Africa and live aid efforts.

The same spirit is being demonstrated in response to domestic hunger and malnutrition. The private sector in the United States has responded to those poor who need food aid regularly or occasionally. There are now more food banks, soup kitchens and church pantries providing food than ever before. An estimate of the food contributed through the Second Harvest, a single organization serving food banks throughout the Nation, is $114 million in 1984.

Private individuals, corporations and voluntary, nonprofit organizations have greatly expanded their efforts to alleviate hunger. But their resources are not sufficient. The interfaith hunger appeal released a report yesterday stating that chronic malnutrition affects 500 million people in the world.

All the needs are not far away. In my own city, Houston, the private agencies report a 30-percent increase in requests for emergency food in 1985. Bread for the World, a broad coalition of Christian churches, surveyed 36 localities across the Nation. In most of the cities and counties surveyed the food need requirements were well beyond the capacities of voluntary groups.

It is clear that food assistance and a new commitment to attacking the conditions that allow hunger in a world of plenty are required. Every individual and every government must act in the consciousness that indeed, "we are the world." Morally, most of us acknowledge that the human family suffers with the pain or loss of any of its members. Yet, we live in a world where 2 million children die each year of measles complicated by malnutrition and lack of health care.

In 1974, the first World Food Conference was convened by the United Nations in Rome. The conference adopted recommendations and pledged to eliminate hunger within 10 years. The failure to achieve that goal was acknowledged last year at a 10th anniversary conference in Addis Ababa. Clearly the task is difficult and requires more than rhetoric. It requires hard choices and sacrifice.

The Interfaith Hunger Appeal report is a clear guide to the challenge ahead. It states the emergency needs and long-term development requirements. It was prepared by Church World Services, Catholic Relief Services and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, three experienced agencies who joined together in an educational effort to address hunger in 1978.

The report states that "famine and hunger are more the products of human neglect than of natural phenomena." It calls on all who are in a position to affect public and private policy to do so on behalf of the world's hungry. In a democracy, that's all of us.

The Interfaith Hunger Appeal has given us a document that gives substance to the message of the postal stamp, help end hunger. I commend to your attention on World Food Day an important document significantly entitled "World Food Security: A Personal Responsibility."

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your time and certainly want to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for not only his time, but also his leadership.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman from Texas for not only being our leader of our Select Committee on Hunger and for his long-term devotion and dedication to the cause, but for his very comprehensive and moving statement in support of World Food Day.

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentleman.

Let me at this time also commend the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] for her leadership. She happens to be the ranking minority member on the Select Committee on Hunger.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TAUKE], who also has been involved in this issue for many years, and has been a strong supporter of World Food Day concerns.

Mr. TAUKE. I thank the gentleman and certainly want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his leadership on this issue, and to commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND] and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], the leaders of our Select Committee on Hunger for their ongoing effort that has been under way for some time now to bring this issue to the attention of the House.

This morning I left the State of Iowa, and as I took off on the plane and flew over our State, I saw hundreds of farmers out there in their fields harvesting crops. It is indeed an abundant crop that they are harvesting in Iowa and across the Midwest this year, because this year our Nation will bring into the bins record amounts of grain and record amounts of food will be stored.

At a time when we are trying to figure out where we can find more storage capacity for food, it must seem strange to many Americans that we still have this problem of world hunger.

As we watch nightly newscast footage of refugee camps for the starving in Ethiopia and other nations of the world, looking at the wasted bodies, the eyes devoid of hope, the barren land, we begin to sense the magnitude of the problem and the scope of the effort that is required to meet the immediate needs of the starving and malnourished of the world. Starvation continues to claim 25 victims worldwide every minute. For nations afflicted with hunger, the road to recovery is long and hard.

But the twin problems of food production and food distribution can be solved if the will of the nations and the peoples of the world is strong enough and our commitment deep enough. I have reason to be optimistic about that will and that commitment. I am optimistic when I read that Americans have contributed $143 million to 34 private voluntary organizations to feed the starving in Africa and that more than 35 million starving people have received nourishment.

I am most optimistic about our ability to sustain this commitment over the long haul ahead when I think of the letter I received last December from Grant Weeks, a fourth-grader from Clinton, IA. I want to share Grant's letter with you:

> DEAR MR. TAUKE: I have seen on the news these people starve in Ethiopia. I know you are a leader in Washington. Could you maybe see that the children have food? I am willing to give the allowance I have been saving. I know you will do what you can do.
>
> GRANT WEEKS.

Grant had enclosed $3.

Grant's letter gives me hope. Our Nation's children realize and understand the problem of world hunger and the need for nations and peoples to work together to solve that problem.

Let us renew our will and our commitment today, World Food Day, to a world in which starvation and malnourishment are specters of the past.

□ 1700

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his supportive remarks and thank him for his long-term commitment to this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], who has been the outstanding minority leader of our Select Committee on Hunger, and who has for so many years been concerned and dedicated to this issue.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague on the

House Select Committee on Hunger, Mr. BENJAMIN GILMAN, in celebrating this October 16 as World Food Day.

Today, the United States is joined by about 150 other countries around the world in highlighting the crucial importance of agriculture and food distribution for survival and good health of individuals and nations.

Today is a time to reflect upon the problem of hunger, how far we have come, and how far we have yet to travel. The problem as I see it, has been to answer the question of why do we even have this problem at all? Since we, as a nation, produce more and spend more on food aid, why do we have overabundance and the tragedy of hunger at the same time? Why does this problem continue to stay ahead of our capacity to solve it? Why with all our resources, can we not better match supply and need? We know the questions. We must search for answers.

The African famine has captured the hearts and souls of the American people, and illuminated the problem of hunger in tragic proportions. As the ranking Republican on the Select Committee on Hunger, I had the opportunity to view this crisis first-hand with a group of my House colleagues during a trip to Ethiopia last year. Words cannot describe the anguish I felt at Korem and Mekele and other refugee camps. My sense of helplessness was overwhelming.

When I saw with my own eyes tens of thousands of persons in Ethiopia weakened by hunger and near starvation, I joined with my Hunger Committee colleagues and sent an urgent message to President Reagan. We informed him that food aid was needed immediately. Our action and the President's answer to our call led to the diversion of a ship that was en route elsewhere and its grain was made available to famine victims of Ethiopia.

Actually, the past year has seen one of the worst famines in human history. For the third year in a row, half or more of the countries of Africa have faced food emergencies. Tens of millions of persons faced the threat of death by starvation and hunger-related illness. U.S. resources were mobilized and massive food shipments were sent by our Agency for International Development [AID] to many African countries.

Our President and the Congress embraced as a national policy of our country the principle that "the starving child knows no politics." This principle has been applied by AID, under the able and energetic leadership of Mr. M. Peter McPherson, in providing aid to all those African countries suffering food shortages in the current African famine. The United States has led all donor nations in providing 3 million metric tons of food to the African nations in need. Those numbers are truly impressive. More meaningful is the fact that they have saved millions of lives.

However, there is a great deal that remains to be done.

There is an excellent new book, edited by the Hunger Project, entitled "Ending Hunger, an Idea Whose Time Has Come." The idea of ending hunger has been brought home to tens of millions of Americans by news reports of the African famine, the "We Are the World" song of United Support of Artists for Africa—USA for Africa—the Live-Aid Concert, and hundreds of hunger-related activities across our land. Americans' private contributions in the past year exceeded $200 million in lifesaving assistance.

We know the problems are severe. We know that many lives depend each day on our work. We know that the massive efforts required have been begun. We have a lot more to do.

Yesterday, the U.S. Postal Service issued a new national stamp. Its message is simple: "Help End Hunger." It was private citizen Phyllis Alroy of Princeton, NJ, who led a national campaign to obtain the signatures of tens of thousands of Americans in support of the "Help End Hunger" stamp. Hunger Committee Chairman LELAND pressed the idea in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and won key support for it. As World Food Day comes and goes, I am hopeful that this national stamp will help seal our efforts throughout the year in alleviating hunger. I urge that all of us who can buy this special stamp now, while it is available, and use it to send out our mail through the coming months. It will help keep the "end hunger" message going across our land and around the world, as we send our mail to other countries.

In my home State of New Jersey, Governor Kean issued a special call to the people of our State to capture the spirit of World Food Day. Rev. John Barton, working with Church World Service/Crop, is a leader of New Jersey's impressive array of World Food Day activities. I am sure that the people of New Jersey will heed the call of World Food Day, as will millions of others across the land. Indeed, many in New Jersey have been leading the call already.

One such person is Victor Cino. This May, a resident of Tenafly, NJ, through his own desire to help the world's neediest, with untiring energy, organized the New Jersey Council on African Relief. He now chairs this council, comprised of many organizations in the State that are active in overseas hunger relief efforts, including emergency shipments of medicines. Mr. Cino's success certainly shows that an individual with commitment and hard work can work with others and save lives. If there were time, I could report on the individual, corporate, and group contributions of many others, as well. They all deserve our hearty commendation.

To carry the spirit of World Food Day forward, I have cosponsored the House resolution to have November 24, the Sunday before Thanksgiving, designated as the "National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger." The resolution encourages Americans who are able to forgo one or more meals and contribute the money saved to a hunger-relief organization of their choice. This will give us each a special chance to experience hunger concerns more personally while raising substantial sums help to those who suffer from hunger.

Crisis intervention does not substitute for our long-term development goals. We must take care to help prepare the recipient nations to begin to provide for their own basic needs. There is a point at which emergency food can deter local food production. We must avoid that counterproductive result. Our goal must be to meet critical emergency needs while promoting self-sufficiency, not dependency. We must ensure that these nations do not become permanent wards of the world.

We must help bring the benefits of a new "green revolution" to Africa. The United States supports African development through the transfer of agricultural technology and aid assistance. Indeed, our participation in the World Bank's International Development Association [IDA], the International Fund for Agricultural Development [IFAD], and the FAO has created many local success stories. For instance, IFAD's role is to work with the poorest rural farmers in the developing world to assist them in enhancing their food production. If we are to help the sub-Saharan region of Africa overcome the current crisis and move toward self-sufficiency, we must direct our attention to the small farmer on whom this region relies. Each of these programs remains crucial to the momentum of agricultural innovation.

However, without fundamental changes in the agricultural, economic, and population policies of governments, the seeds of progress sown by agricultural innovation will fail to flower. We must work to change the ill-conceived and regressive perceptions of governments that view agriculture as the primitive sector of their economies, to be tolerated and taxed solely for the benefit of the urban and industrial sectors. Only when this antiagricultural mindset of post-colonial Africa changes, can genuine progress be made toward the elimination of the conditions that foster these catastrophic famines.

Clearly, a massive effort by numerous governments, international organizations, private groups, and millions of

individuals is required to end the scourge of hunger. I stand with my fellow Members of Congress, with the President and our executive agencies, and with those in the private sector who are dedicated to ending hunger in our time.

I wish to commend Hunger Committee member, BENJAMIN GILMAN, for proposing the World Food Day resolution, the President for again answering our call and leading our national observance, the more than 300 American groups and organization members of the National Committee for World Food Day for their mobilization of local support, and the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization [UN/FAO] for its leading work toward food security for all peoples.

We can all be proud of the leading role our country and so many of its private citizens and organizations have played in the alleviation of hunger and malnutrition in the United States and in other countries around the world. Sadly, we cannot rest on our past accomplishments and just return to our every day lives satisfied that we have done what we could and more than any others have done.

We cannot because the crisis of food shortages in many countries and in many individual households in all countries persists. The solutions lie in long-term efforts to increase food production in the poorest countries and to improve international distribution and incountry delivery systems.

World Food Day is based on the important idea that the people of the world should share in a partnership in the search for solutions to the problems of hunger and malnutrition. I hope that our national commemoration of World Food Day will lead millions of Americans to listen, read, and reflect on the continuing problems of hunger affecting millions of persons daily. More importantly, I hope that it will encourage many to contact domestic and international organizations that are working to solve hunger problems and to form lasting links with them in their ongoing efforts to alleviate hunger and malnutrition in our time.

Mr. GILMAN. I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] not only for her leadership as our ranking minority member of our Select Committee on Hunger, but also for her extensive work in finding new initiatives for helping us to resolve this critical issue of world hunger.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I thank the gentleman again.

□ 1710

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ].

Mr. MARTINEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as we take this time to commemorate World Food Day and to reflect on the problem of world hunger, very few of us can help from feeling a great sense of the tragedy that hunger represents. The fact that hunger will claim the lives of millions of people throughout the world each year is truely distressing. It is easy to be overwhelmed by the magnitude of the problem, and by what seems to be our inability to ease the pain of all those who suffer. However, we have a responsibility both as legislators and as concerned Americans to continue the fight against hunger with vigor that cannot be relaxed.

While the extent of hunger throughout the world is undoubtedly a great tragedy, what seems to me to be an even greater atrocity is the fact that here, in the land of plenty, we have millions of people who too will go to bed every night hungry, and who suffer the ill effects of malnutrition. An estimated 34.4 million people live below the poverty line, and, as a result, are denied a nutritionally adequate diet. The evidence of hunger in America is pouring in as souplines and pantry kitchens throughout the Nation report a doubling, even a tripling of people seeking their assistance. Sadly, those who are seeking emergency food assistance are families with children who were once able to make it financially. Unfortunately, unemployment and the rising cost of living and energy have forced many of our citizens to seek the assistance of private charities. I am touched by the effort of our courageous citizens who donate so much of their time, energy, and resources to aid the hungry. Here or abroad however, the message they are sending to Washington is clear: Private charities and food banks simply do not have the resources or ability to meet the needs of the rising population of hungry Americans.

Much has been said over the past 6 years about the need to reduce the Federal deficit. I wholeheartedly agree that this is a major problem and must be addressed. However, I question the wisdom on cutting back on programs that are designed to assist the hungry. A healthy population is as essential to America as is our national defense. It seems ironic to me that so much of our resources will be placed on bombs and nuclear weaponry, while many of our children will suffer from malnutrition. Across the street from the White House there is a park full of the homeless and hungry who live in the streets, picking through trash for their meals, and seeking shelter in subways from the cold winter nights. This scenario occurs in every city throughout the Nation. Do we not have a responsibility to these people? Are they not our brothers and sisters? I believe that our budget priorities should incorporate the basic values of human rights, which include the right to a sound and healthy diet.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman from California for his pertinent comments and for his dedication to this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention a recent article, a feature article, prepared by the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Africa, a Blueprint for Survival," written by David K. Willis, who has been the Monitor's Third World correspondent for a number of years.

I would like to quote from a portion of that which is headed, "A Blueprint for African Survival," which summarizes the principles set forth in this article.

Mr. Speaker, it states as follows:

A BLUEPRINT FOR AFRICAN SURVIVAL

Recognize that to fight famine in the long term, African earth, water, trees, and livestock need urgent help to survive.

Help to lower population growth rates, the highest in the world, with sustained cooperation between aid donors and local governments, stressing positive benefits rather than negative fears.

Help primarily the small African farmer by:

1. Refocusing aid away from huge, showcase projects originated by urban planners largely to benefit urban populations, and into local, specific ideas to boost subsistence crops.

2. Involving African women much more in aid planning and projects at all levels. Women perform up to 80 percent of all tasks connected with food production. No longer can plans be laid by males for males on the assumption that males grow the food Africans eat.

Aid local farmers not in high-tech but in low-tech ways.

Provide more money for intensified research into the higher-yielding, hardier, drought-resistant crops that are eaten in tropical and arid climates (millet, sorghum, maize [corn], cassava, yams, cowpeas, and more).

Finance much more drilling for underground water across the Sahel region, in Ethiopia, Sudan, and northern Kenya, as well as more catchments, mini-ponds, terracing, and no-till farming techniques to conserve the rain that does fall.

Vastly expand farm extension work, especially to spread the word that "slash and burn" shifting cultivation no longer works, because populations are growing too fast to allow land to lie fallow for the long periods it takes to recover.

Adopt plans drawn up by a UNESCO unit in Kenya to limit the number of livestock carried on semiarid lands. Nomadic pastoralists who settle around grain-distribution points must send out herders to keep moving their camels from pasture to pasture rather than keeping them near the home base.

Balance the competing needs of livestock and wild game where drought hits hard.

Persuade the United States and Europe to concentrate much more on diplomacy aimed at easing Africa's ruinous civil wars, which divert resources, block distribution, and

keep too many eyes focused on the short term rather than on the future.

Mr. Speaker, I thought these suggestions were worthy of our review, and I hope that my colleagues will take a good, hard look at these constructive proposals.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, today I rise to speak to you about world hunger. Given that we live in a kind of "media age," what we pay attention to often depends on what is prominent in the media at the moment.

An apartment-house fire, an airplane crash, a murder—these are the items of interest that make up our daily news diet. As discrete events, relevant largely only to the current moment, they come and go in our lives with little real impact. They speak to no enduring concern.

The persistence of world hunger is one of those issues that permeates the background of life. With the exception of the occasional news making events, typically, a famine, in which the human disaster is so acute that it cannot be ignored, hunger lives as a process, a persistent, and chronic condition. People are dying from hunger everyday and because this is the norm, it is not news.

For those of us who are adequately fed and for whom food is commonplace in our daily life, hunger—if it is thought of at all—is something out there—something tragic—horrible—awful—something we wish did not exist. It is not, however something we keep front and center as one of our primary and fundamental concerns.

According to a recent study by "The Hunger Project," 1 billion people are chronically undernourished; 13 to 18 million people die a year from hunger, 35,000 people a day, 24 people a minute, 18 of whom are children, die from hunger. Yet, because we view hunger in the background of life, this terrible toll does not enter our headlines, nor, for most of us, our concerns.

As I stated during the debate on the Food Security Act, the policy of our Government has been to pay farmers not to produce crops in an effort to keep commodity prices at profitable levels. Meanwhile, millions of people go undernourished here and in Third World countries. Whatever the reasons were or are for this policy, growing domestic and world hunger begs this question—"Should we be in the business of paying farmers not to grow food? In light of both domestic and world hunger, the answer is a crystal clear "no."

We need to really reassess and re-think the guiding principals on which we base our farm policies. If there is a problem with storing excess commodities—lets correct it. If there is a problem with marketing excess commodities—lets correct it. If there is a problem with giving food to hungry people, by all means—let's correct it. In light of domestic and world hunger, how long can we continue to pay farmers not to produce food? How long are we going to suppress the resources of our food producing industry simply to line the pockets of a few with inflated profits?

All of us have been "hungry" at some time or other. This usually means simply that we have an appetite. But the hunger experienced by hundreds of millions of people is not an appetite that comes and goes; it is a consuming, debilitating, minute-by-minute, day-after-day experience. Hunger—the presistent, chronic, relentless condition—keeps people from working productively and thinking clearly. It decreases their resistance to disease, and is intensely painful. Prolonged hunger can result in permanent damage to the body and mind. Ultimately, as the number of deaths I mentioned earlier indicate, if hunger goes on long enough, it kills.

Mr. Speaker, we must address the hunger crisis now. It is widespread and it is increasing. The time to react has passed. The time to act is now.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleagues on the Select Committee on Hunger for organizing this colloquy in celebration of World Food Day. There is no doubt that hunger is a very real and pressing problem in today's world.

We can be proud of the fact that by all measures, the United States has taken the lead in providing relief of all kinds to the drought-stricken areas of Africa. In the last year, we have provided over 3 million metric tons of food to Africa, valued at just over $1 billion. This is roughly 6 times the amount provided in fiscal year 1984.

Funds appropriated in fiscal year 1985 and added to in the March supplemental appropriations bill should be sufficient to meet the critical food needs for most of Africa. Substantial rains have come to many drought areas, however, due to population displacement and land damage, the upcoming harvest will still be subnormal. The situation is certainly not great, but it is considerably better than at this time last year.

The most critical problem at the moment is the lack of transportation to get the food to those who need it. While the supplemental provided adequate funds for food relief, it was clearly insufficient in the transportation and other nonfood aid provisions. Food in Ethiopia is not rotting on the docks, as some have said, but it is piling up in storage facilities and backing up in the system. If there is not an immediate effort to provide trucks, gasoline, spare parts, and some airplanes, the food storage will become critical. The deplorable state of Ethiopia's infrastructure is not atypical of most of the other famine-stricken nations. At this time, AID has no plans to provide further transportation assistance.

Another serious need in the famine-effected areas is health assistance. Disease is a big problem, and could become an even greater threat if living conditions are not improved and medical assistance does not reach large numbers of people.

A new supplemental request for nonfood aid may well be needed to address the critical problems of transportation and health assistance. I hope that this body will continue to monitor the situation closely and be ready to take action if necessary.

I feel strongly that we must carefully assess not only the efficiency of our relief efforts in response to the Africa famine crisis, but also the background of economic development and foreign assistance prior to the crisis. While providing emergency food assistance is obviously of great importance, it is even more crucial that we restructure our ongoing development efforts so as to help prevent these types of disasters. We must evaluate the effectiveness of our foreign aid efforts in addressing the long-range needs of Africa and other developing nations. We must also lend our support to those international organizations, such as the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Fund for Agricultural Development, that are doing such a commendable job of addressing the long-term development needs of the Third World. For after all, these countries do not want our food so much as they want to be able to feed themselves.

While world hunger is a well recognized problem, there is also a growing hunger problem here at home. Reports done in recent years point to large increases in the demand for emergency food. Bread for the World's recently released 1985 "Hunger Watch U.S.A." survey reports a 16.2-percent increase in the average number of people served monthly by emergency food assistance sites in the past year. Other disturbing statistics show that increasing numbers of families are finding it difficult to feed their children. The U.S. Conference of Mayors reports that the number of families and children requesting emergency food aid increased by over 35 percent in 1984 alone. Adequate funding for Domestic Nutrition Assistance Program is the key to bringing hunger in the United States under control.

There is no doubt that the resources exist to solve the problems of hunger. What is needed is the will to do so. I encourage all my colleagues in Congress to join in working for a solution to this problem.

Mr. TOWNS, Mr. Speaker, today marks the fifth observance of World Food Day and the 40th anniversary of the founding of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization. These events make today's special order an appropriate time to address hunger concerns.

There are many people at home and abroad who are suffering from serious nutrition deficiencies. The number of men, women, and children who are dying from starvation and dietary deficiencies has reached crisis proportions. It shocks the conscience to know that this day of highly advanced technology and agricultural development, we still have millions of people, here at home and abroad, whose basic dietary needs are not being met. This situation is indeed a very sad commentary on the world community and perhaps more importantly, our Nation.

On this day of observance, we must rededicate ourselves to the elimination of world hunger. However, let me add these words of caution. It will be very difficult to show the world community that we are genuinely committed to this just and noble

cause if we are not equally committed and determined to elimnate hunger in America. We cannot very well attack the problem of world hunger without first eliminating domestic hunger.

There are still too many hungry Americans across this Nation and the figures are rising. The sharp increase in the early 1980's was thought to be a short-term increase caused primarily by the recession, high unemployment, and reductions in Federal public assistance programs; that is, AFDC families, food stamps and other nutritional programs. The trend since the early 1980's has been one of declining Federal support to those who need Federal assistance the most. According to the most recent report of Hunger Watch U.S.A., between fiscal year 1982 and fiscal year 1985, the Food Stamp Program was cut by over $7 billion from its pre-1982 levels. Furthermore, the effect of the reduction has been to terminate benefits to over 1 million people and reduce benefits to virtually all other eligible beneficiaries. These cutbacks and the resulting ramifications are not indicative of a Congress which has committed itself to the elimination of hunger throughout the world. The Food Stamp Program desperately needs to be expanded to allow more households to participate.

This program is only one avenue which should be pursued in an effort to reduce the level of hunger in the United States. Let's us demonstrate to the world that we view hunger as the No. 1 issue at home and abroad in the 1980's.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in a Capitol Hill setting, at a ceremony hosted by the Select Committee on Hunger and attended by the Postmaster General of the United States, 10 individuals received citations for their extraordinary efforts to end world hunger. From all parts of the country, all ages and walks of life they came, in honor of the first day of issue of a U.S. Postal Service stamp bearing the legend "Help End Hunger." One of the persons honored, Dorsey Lawson of Pasadena, CA, came from the 22d District of California which I represent.

Dorsey Lawson is not just dedicated to this cause; for her it is a way of life. The name of her support group really says it all, "Results." Dorsey by her steadfast devotion to a cause shows us all what it takes to make a difference in the lives of others. Dorsey represents the meaning of individual effort at its very best. She never forgets, and she never lets you forget, and we are all the better for it.

Today is World Food Day 1985; a day on which we can truly celebrate the good news that since 1961, 51 countries representing over 1.5 billion people have ended hunger as a national issue within their borders. It is also a day during which we can pay homage to Dorsey Lawson and her counterparts all over this Earth for their remarkable efforts to first bring the crisis to our attention, to take action and then most important of all to be able to show "results." That is what this day is all about and that is what Dorsey Lawson is all about.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of World Food Day.

In 1979, the then 147-member nations of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations passed the resolution establishing World Food Day. They hoped that an internationally celebrated event would focus public attention on the gravity of the world food situation, particularly in developing countries, and would stimulate public participation in efforts to over come hunger.

Today, hundreds of thousands will gather to express and reaffirm in their own way, their commitment to end hunger. They will focus compassion, energy, and vision on helping to develop comprehensive farm, food, and health policies—policies which increase the availability of nutritious food for all. In this individual commitment, by people in countries throughout the world, lies the true strength and ability to eliminate hunger and malnutrition.

As I look back over the years, I can see the result of increased concern and united compassion for the hungry. Hunger groups have grown and developed into widely effective organizations. Through efforts of these groups, individuals and policymakers have become more educated and directed in their approach to eliminate hunger permanently.

While our country has not yet succeeded in eliminating domestic hunger, indeed we have witnessed an increase in the past few years, our country has been able to respond to hunger with a broad and often successful attack, using mechanisms which have taken years to develop.

Today we have established food banks, procedures for commercial and governmental contributions to food distribution programs, school lunch and breakfast programs, distribution of surplus commodities, child nutrition, and the Women, Infant and Children [WIC] Programs, and food stamps.

This ability to respond has improved tremendously since 1935, when Congress first directed the U.S. Department of Agriculture to operate food assistance programs aiding the low-income population, and to purchase and donate surplus farm commodities to school lunch programs serving low-income populations.

In the late 1960's, President Kennedy launched an all-out campaign to eliminate hunger. And we made strong progress. In 1961, the first pilot Food Stamp Program began operation. Over a decade later, in 1972, the first supplemental food program for Women, Infants and Children [WIC] was mandated. These programs were expanded and improved through the 1970's, and they seemed to be working.

However, 1980 was a hard year on food assistance programs. Child Nutrition Program funds were reduced, school lunch subsidy rates were reduced, nutrition education programs, breakfast programs and others suffered setbacks. Since 1980, the Nation, and the world as a whole, has suffered from the recession. Reports have indicated that there is a growing number of children admitted into hospitals who are showing symptoms likely to be nutrition related. Demand for emergency assistance has risen faster than the ability of food assistance programs to respond.

The occurrence of hunger internationally has been underlined by the tragic drought in Africa. Millions of Africans face hunger and the threat of starvation daily. Yet, there has been an incredible response to this famine. Shortly after the BBC broadcast last fall, the relief organizations from the United States witnessed a flood of contributions for the drought victims. While the U.S. Government has sent emergency food aid, and other assistance, private citizens have also contributed food, money, and their time. We have seen a variety of group efforts—the live-aid concert, fundraising functions, and community benefits—to raise funds. The concern felt for the plight of the famine victims has resulted in one of the largest broad-reaching fundraising efforts to battle hunger in history, and has saved millions of lives.

No; we have not yet eliminated hunger. We have not been successful in feeding all the Africans or those who are starving in other areas of our world. Yet, we have established a momentum. And, we have proved what can be accomplished when we try.

World Food Day is an event to encourage this determination to eliminate hunger. And, we must be careful not to let our enthusiasm wane.

As the richest nation in the world, we feel a moral obligation to share our abundance of food with others less fortunate than ourselves.

The United States is the No. 1 agricultural producer in the world. It is a national shame to have people go hungry in a land as wealthy as ours.

We are now viewing hunger and malnutrition as a health risk as we learn more about the effects of inadequate nutrition and its impact on the health of the elderly, expectant mothers, newborn and growing children.

We must recognize the ills of hunger from an educational point of view; hunger and inadequate nutrition can reduce the ability of our children, tomorrow's leaders, to concentrate and learn.

Finally, policymakers are beginning to view hunger from a cost perspective. It has been estimated that for every dollar we spend on providing good nutrition domestically, we can save up to $3 dollars in health care costs and in the loss of good education.

Yet, an effective program for eliminating hunger requires much more than emergency food assistance. We must develop a more permanent approach which addresses the causes of hunger and malnutrition.

Hunger and malnutrition occur for a variety of reasons: unfair and uneven distribution of wealth; lack of a social system to help the disabled, the young, and the old; shortages or uneven distribution of food—created by natural or political restrictions; inability for a community to be food self-

sufficient; social and cultural factors regarding right to food; and ignorance.

In America, hunger is not a result of a limited food supply, but the inability to pay for it. Government benefits alone will not be the solution to eliminating this problem. What we really must strive for is insuring an adequate supply of nutritious foods at affordable prices to all citizens.

Avoiding artifically high prices, encouraging urban and individual gardening projects, instituting direct farmer-to-consumer marketing, reducing unemployment, and encouraging food and personal contributions to community assistance programs for the needy will all serve as important foundations for increasing the availability of nutritious foods.

Increasing our understanding of nutrition, both nationally through research, and individually through education is vital. It is estimated that one out of every seven Americans is malnourished or has a deficiency in one or more essential vitamins or minerals. For a large portion of these people, this is not due to hunger, but rather poor eating habits and ignorance regarding nutrition. Our schools can and should offer nutrition education, but more needs to be done to educate all our citizens regarding food consumption and the need for proper nutrition.

Because I feel strongly that nutrition research and on-going nutrition monitoring of our citizens is essential to assessing and increasing our country's health, I have introduced, along with my colleagues Congressmen MACKAY and WALGREN, the National Nutrition Monitoring and Related Research Act of 1985.

On an international level, communication and cooperation is important to win the battle against hunger. The famine in Africa has resulted in increased efforts to coordinate food assistance with other countries. And I hope this trend will continue in the future.

However, just as in America, direct food assistance will not result in a permanent reduction of hunger. Increased education, technology transfer, developing low-resource, sustainable agriculture systems applicable to each area, natural resource conservation and maintenance programs, and social and political involvement is needed.

Today, we have the resources, the knowledge, and the ability to reduce—even eliminate—hunger. What we lack is the needed commitment of our world leaders, of our community leaders, and individuals. World Food Day was created to help bring hunger to our attention, and to help foster this commitment.

I commend everyone who has taken part in this effort. From those who have contributed their time to volunteer in food assistance programs or joined education efforts, to those who have contributed or raised money for hunger-related projects, to those who have educated policymakers, to all who have participated in research and the development of technology and knowledge needed to eliminate hunger completely.

We have taken great steps in reducing hunger in our world. I encourage all to join these efforts and to continue to press toward our goal of eliminating hunger in our lifetime.

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for arranging this special order on hunger. Representatives MICKEY LELAND, BEN GILMAN, and MARGE ROUKEMA have done an excellent job with the Select Committee on Hunger in making us all aware of the plight of the world's hungry.

Certainly there is no greater cause facing us than to insure that all the world's people are fed. Without this basic need fulfilled, we cannot even begin to hope that the millions of people throughout the world that are hungry—particularly those in the developing world—will be able to have any kind of normal life.

Politics must be cast aside when we consider this issue. Our efforts must, instead, be focused on feeding the hungry no matter where they are, no matter what kind of government they labor under. The best way for us to do this is to continue with efforts such as this—getting Members of Congress together to talk about hunger and what can be done to eliminate it. That's the first step, making people aware of the magnitude of this problem, Hunger is not confined to Ethiopia; it exists throughout Africa, as well as throughout the world.

There is no reason for hunger to continue. I am convinced that if we work together, we have it within our power to end hunger. We, as Members of Congress, must join together and speak with one voice in the fight against hunger. Ending hunger would be the best foreign policy initiative we could possibly undertake.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, as we take this time to commemorate World Food Day and to reflect on the problem of world hunger, very few of us can help from feeling a great sense of the tragedy that hunger represents. The fact that hunger will claim the lives of millions of people throughout the world each year is truly distressing. It is easy to be overwhelmed by the magnitude of the problem, and by what seems to be our inability to ease the pain of all those who suffer. However, we have a responsibility both as legislators and as people to continue the fight against hunger with a vigor that cannot be relaxed.

While the extent of hunger throughout the world is undoubtedly a great tragedy, what seems to me to be an even greater atrocity is the fact that here, in the land of plenty, we have millions of people who also will go to bed every night hungry, and who suffer the ill effects of malnutrition. An estimated 34.4 million people live below the poverty line, and, as a result, are denied a nutritionally adequate diet. The evidence of hunger in America is pouring in as soup lines and pantry kitchens throughout the Nation report a doubling, even tripling of people seeking their assistance. Sadly, those who are seeking emergency food assistance are families with children who were once able to make it financially. Unfortunately, unemployment and rising costs of living and energy have forced many of our citizens to seek the assistance of private charities. I am touched by the effort by our courageous citizens who donate so much of their time, energy, and resources to aid the hungry. However, the message they are sending to Washington is clear: Private charities and food banks simply do not have the resources or ability to meet the needs of the rising population of hungry Americans.

Much has been said over the past 6 years about the need to reduce the Federal deficit. I wholeheartedly agree that this is a major problem and must be addressed. However, I question the wisdom in cutting back on programs that are designed to assist the hungry. A healthy population is as essential to America as is our national defense. It seems ironic to me that so much of our resources will be placed on bombs and nuclear weaponry, while many of our children will suffer from brain damage due to malnutrition. Across the street from the White House there is a park full of the homeless and hungry who live in the streets, picking through trash for their meals, and seeking shelter in subways from the cold winter nights. This scenario occurs in every city throughout the Nation. Do we not have a responsibility to these people? Are they not our brothers and sisters? I believe that our budget priorities should incorporate the basic values of human rights, which include the right to a sound and healthy diet.

Thank you.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, World Food Day gives us an opportunity to express thankfulness again for the agricultural plenty of the United States, and to renew our resolve in the campaign against the hunger afflicting the poor populations of the world.

The continuing, long-term solution for hunger in developing countries is to raise their own agricultural production to achieve food self-reliance. To this end, America and other donors have been providing assistance for self-help programs in many countries over the years.

There has been marked success in this compaign in Asia and most other parts of the Third World. The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO] 1985 World Food Report says global food and agricultural production rose by more than 4 percent in 1984 for one of the best results in the past decade. It reports production increases mainly in the United States, West Europe, and also in the larger developing countries, including China and India, were led by a stunning 8.5 percent growth in cereal output to 1,780 million tons—a new record.

The notable exception to date has been in Africa, where population has been growing at 3 percent a year but grain yields have been declining for more than a decade, causing massive malnutrition.

In short, we have done much in the anti-hunger campaign. But much remains to be done.

On this World Food Day in 1985, it seems particularly appropriate that we take encouragement over the gains—and the ameliorating of tragedies which could have been worse—over the past 12 months.

We have just been through an extraordinary and heart-rending year with the famine catastrophies of sub-Sahara Africa. A year ago at this time the attentions of affluent populations in the Western world were gripped by television scenes of starving men, women, and children in the parched highlands of Ethiopia. International experts were reporting that tens of millions of Africans were at risk of death from drought. The "gap" which needed to be filled by emergency food aid was vast and nowhere near filled by existing donor pledges. Even where emergency food shipments could be landed at ocean ports, it was feared that inland transportation bottlenecks in various places could impair distribution to some of the neediest populaces. The international community rushed to mount a massive rescue effort.

Today the experts are reporting the risk of starvation in sub-Sahara Africa is facing far fewer people than a year ago. Some officials calculate that only about one-third as many now require emergency feeding, and those are in a relatively small number of countries where emergency programs are already underway.

Indeed, from some sub-Sahara countries we are now getting reports warning against having too much emergency food aid around at harvest time—the shipments from abroad could have a price-depressing effect on produce the local farmers are trying to sell! And from much of the continent, we have word of agricultural rehabilitation that will be helped by long-term development assistance from foreign donors, rather than further emergency food aid at this time.

The FAO's latest special report on the food situation in the 21 African countries affected by emergencies speaks of improved prospects generally although exceptional food aid will continue to be needed in the 1985-86 crop year for 5 of them—Angola, Botswana, Ethiopia, Mozambique and Sudan. "Reflecting good harvests in 1985 in most of the affected countries in eastern, southern, and northern Africa and the favorable crop prospects in the Sahelian countries of West Africa, the overall food supply position for most of the 21 affected countries is expected to improve and it is back to normal in a number of them," the FAO report states.

U.S. Government analysts are currently revising significantly their assessments of last July which were issued in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's report on "World Food Needs and Availabilities, 1985." Because of improvements greater than expected, they now estimate that global food aid needs covering 69 countries will be around 9 million tons in the 1985-86 crop year, down from the 11.4 million tons they had forecast in July. For sub-Sahara Africa, they are estimating 2.7 million tons needed in the coming year, sharply less than the 4 million tons estimate in July.

As these reports show, the act of Divine Providence in returning more favorable weather to many of the afflicted countries has been the key element in the improvement.

Another major element has been the hardiness, the resourcefulness, the determination of the drought-stricken populaces themselves to survive in the face of food adversities far worse than we encounter in the West.

And credit must be given to one of the most impressive international emergency food aid efforts of recent times, which has saved untold numbers of lives.

In the 1984-85 year, donor nations shipped an estimated 11.7 million tons of cereal food aid to needy countries, the first time the 10-million-ton annual target set by the World Food Conference in 1974 was surpassed. The United States provided 7.4 million tons, 63 percent of the total. The surge in the global total was of course due to the response to the desperate situation in Africa.

The United States in fiscal 1985 shipped more than 3 million tons of food to the afflicted African countries, valued at more than $1 billion, helping to reach more than 40 million hungry people. We in the Congress ensured a massive U.S. response with passage of emergency legislation providing $812.5 million in supplemental funding.

American private and voluntary agencies have been in the vanguard of the relief effort. They merit our highest praise for their unstinting devotion to saving lives and helping rehabilitation in this emergency.

They have had enormous support from the American people. INTERACTION, the association of 105 American PVO's, has reported receiving more than $140 million in donations for African/Ethiopian relief. Funds have come from individuals, schools, churches, businesses, and other private groups. Further large amounts have come from special promotions such as Live Aid.

On this World Food Day, we know much further, sustained effort will be needed in coming years to combat hunger where it still exists around the globe. But we can look with considerable pride at what has been done so far.

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be among those who today are celebrating the fifth annual World Food Day and the 40th anniversary of the founding of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO]. I would like to commend Representatives LELAND, ROUKEMA, and GILMAN for their work on the issue of world hunger, and for organizing this special order.

Recently the press has been highlighting the plight of those who are hungry around the world. While the latest media attention focuses on the immediate crisis in Ethopia and other places in sub-Sahara Africa, the problems of world hunger and malnutrition are extremely complex, making long range solutions very difficult. Although crises such as droughts and civil wars exacerbate existing food shortages in various parts of the world, hundreds of millions of people around the world suffer from a chronic lack of sufficient food. The most vulnerable are women, infants, and children. While over one-fourth of the people in developing countries are suffering from malnutrition, hunger is also a problem for many here in the United States.

World Food Day is a perfect opportunity to point out the immediate need to get food to the hungry, as well as to discuss possible long range solutions to the problem of world hunger. I am pleased to say that several groups in my district are observing World Food Day through activities designed to highlight both the short-term and the long range facets of the world hunger problem.

Today in downtown Akron, OH, residents of the Akron-Canton area are loading over 200,000 pounds of edible soybean oil, nonfat dry milk, and soy-fortified corn meal for shipment to West Africa. This may be the largest privately funded mercy shipment of food sent to Africa from the United States to date. The event is being organized by a group of local citizens who call themselves ACT—Akron and Canton Together—for Africa, in cooperation with World Vision, a nonprofit international relief and development organization.

Most of the food to be shipped to Africa was grown in Ohio and purchased at less than wholesale rates. Both the manpower and the equipment for the loading of the food were donated. Transportation services were provided by various donors within the trucking industry, and other services were provided at reduced rates.

ACT for Africa was created last spring when a group of religious, civic, education, business, labor, and professional leaders in the Akron-Canton area decided to mobilize a local response to Africa's famine crisis. Led by Dan Cormany, associate dean of students at Malone College in Canton, the group has raised over $100,000 for relief efforts. In addition to collecting money and arranging the food shipments to Africa, the group has helped to educate the local residents about the long-term causes and solutions of the world hunger problem. I want to commend the members of ACT for Africa for their hard work and dedication to this effort.

Another group in my district is working to end hunger, but this time the hungry people are living in this country. The Akron Area Foodbanc serves hungry people in a five-county area of northeast Ohio. The Foodbanc provides assistance to over 150 food pantries and 12 soup kitchens in the region. In 1984, the Foodbanc served 153,670 meals to hungry people in the area, and it distributed 182,684 food baskets to needy families. The Foodbanc reports a 13-percent increase in requests for food assistance from 1983 to 1984. On World Food Day, the Akron Area Foodbanc will continue its work to feed the hungry who live in the Akron-Canton area. The many volunteers and workers in this organization also deserve our praise and support.

We must all feel a deep sadness that hunger remains a real problem both in our country and around the world. But we can be proud that thousands of people, in Ohio and elsewhere, are giving and working to end this tragic situation.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, today's observance of the fifth celebration of World Food Day and the 40th anniversary of the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization makes us pause in our daily affairs and reflect upon the increasing rate of hunger in this world and the pain and suffering, both physical and mental, resulting from not being able to eat or drink. By participating in this special order, I hope to join my colleagues in calling attention to the tragic plight of the hungry and the undernourished, here in America and abroad, particularly in Africa.

The sad but true fact is that the number of hungry Americans is still growing and increasing from day to day, month to month, year to year. The Federal food assistance programs are not meeting the food and nutrition needs of millions of Americans, and private relief organizations have been stretched to the limit. Recent studies confirm these alarming statistics. The Food Stamp Program is the Nation's primary assistance program, designed to serve entire families of low income people. In 1985, this program has served 20 million Americans at a cost of approximately $12 billion. Yet the number of people participating in the Food Stamp Program has declined at a large rate, and not simply because they have suddenly found the means to pay for their food out of their own pockets. Federal cutbacks, pride, social stigma, and lack of information are the major causes for the lack of participation in the program by those who are otherwise eligible for it. There appears to be an unwillingness on the part of those who need public assistance to seek it, and a societal disdain toward those who receive food stamps. This prevailing negative attitude toward the recipients of food stamps causes many individuals to hesitate to seek assistance, especially in small towns where the would-be recipients are well known.

For those who are eligible and want to take part in the Food Stamp Program, other barriers exist. Complex application procedures, inconvenient office hours and locations, tremendous delays in processing applications, stricter eligibility guidelines, and complicated paperwork requirements prevent some people from receiving the food stamps and cause those who are getting this assistance to lose it. Even those who manage to receive food stamps still suffer from shortages. In short, the Food Stamp Program, the country's major weapon against hunger and malnutrition, has not been improved or expanded in the past 4 years.

Other alarming trends in America point to the rising increase of hunger here. Fewer and fewer women are taking part in the supplemental feeding programs available to them, the WIC program, and fewer and fewer children are participating in the school breakfast and school lunch programs. Senior citizens and elderly Americans are not receiving the federally subsidized meals to which they are entitled. Private charities and religious organizations, seeking to make up for the cutbacks in Federal aid, are strapped and can no longer help the hungry and the undernourished as they once could. It is indeed a sad state of affairs that today in America, in the so-called land of plenty, the hungry and the ill-fed are not receiving the basic elements necessary for subsistence.

A similar story can be heard abroad, especially in Africa. We daily read about the disastrous effects of the hunger and the drought in Ethiopia, the Sudan, Chad, and other African nations. The United States alone has sent this year almost 2 billion metric tons of food to the African Continent, has contributed $10.5 million in emergency funding for African refugees, and the problems still endure, unabated. People are dying daily from starvation and thirst, children are suffering even now from dysentery and distended stomaches caused by malnutrition, and human beings are expiring simply because they have lost all hope for ever living on the basic levels of subsistence.

The command of "feeding the hungry and giving drink to the thirsty" harks back to pre-Biblical days. Every society has a moral and ethical obligation to help those who are suffering from hunger and drought, to give them aid in their time of need, and to make the maximum effort to help them to end their suffering and travail. In this country, we must redouble our measures to end world hunger, as we mark World Food Day. In that way, we may yet live to see the day when the human race will no longer be afflicted by this terrible condition and all Americans will be able to enjoy the fruits of our own society.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WEAVER (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of necessary absence.

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. YOUNG of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MOORE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 10 minutes, on October 17.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OBERSTAR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LUNDINE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GAYDOS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. CARPER, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 30 minutes, on October 17.

Mr. FRANK, for 60 minutes, on October 17.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes, on October 22.

Mr. OWENS, for 60 minutes, on October 23.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. GROTBERG.
Mr. GILMAN in two instances.
Mr. SAXTON.
Mr. GALLO.
Mr. LIVINGSTON.
Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. LENT in two instances.
Mr. SWINDALL.
Mr. GREEN in two instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD.
Mr. BOEHLERT.
Mr. KEMP.
Mr. LOWERY of California.
Mr. COURTER.
Ms. SNOWE.
Mr. WOLF.
Mr. EVANS of Iowa.
Ms. FIEDLER.

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

Mr. KOSTMAYER.
Mr. TORRICELLI.
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.
Mr. MARTINEZ in two instances.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. ROE.
Mr. MANTON.
Mr. RANGEL.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. BIAGGI.
Mr. FUSTER.
Mr. DOWNEY of New York.
Mr. DIXON.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. SIKORSKI.
Mr. ECKART of Ohio.
Mr. MATSUI in two instances.
Mr. KILDEE.
Mr. GARCIA.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. HUBBARD.
Mr. KOLTER in two instances.
Mr. DYMALLY.
Mr. GORDON.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. ANNUNZIO, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

S. 1349. An act to provide for the use and distribution of funds awarded in docket 363 to the Mdewakanton and Wahpekute Eastern or Mississippi Sioux before the U.S. Court of Claims and Claims Court;

S.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution designating February 1986 as "National Community College Month"; and

S.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 20, 1985, through October 26, 1985, as "National CPR Awareness Week."

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, October 17, 1985, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2137. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report that no U.S. personnel either took part or were injured in an attack presumably upon them at La Union, El Salvador, on October 10, 1985, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761(c)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2138. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting a report on 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.

2139. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Staff for Installations and Logistics, U.S. Marine Corps, transmitting a report of the Retirement Plan for Civilian Employees of the U.S. Marine Corps Exchanges, etc., for the year ending December 31, 1984, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2140. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, transmitting an update of the 1983 evaluation report on the trustee pilot program for bankruptcy administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2141. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to improve the confidential disclosure system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2142. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development and First Vice President and Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on the amount and extension of credit under the Trade Credit Insurance Program, jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Foreign Affairs.

2143. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report entitled "Financial Condition of American Agriculture" (GAO/RCED-86-09, October 10, 1985); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Agriculture.

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. CARPER (for himself, Mr. LUNDINE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HILER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. GROTBERG, and Mr. WORTLEY):

H.R. 3567. A bill to improve the quality of examinations of depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY of New York (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 3568. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to require regulated retail electric utilities to undertake reasonably prudent response activities when natural disasters cause interruptions in electric service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. ROE, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. FLORIO):

H.R. 3569. A bill to restrict the dumping of sewage sludge in the ocean site off the coast of New York and New Jersey known as the "106-Mile Ocean Waste Dump Site" to certain authorities currently authorized to dump sewage sludge in the New York Bight Apex; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SYNAR, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. GREEN):

H.R. 3570. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to reform and improve the Federal justices and judges survivors' annuities program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENT (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. SNYDER) (by request):

H.R. 3571. A bill to amend section 1110 of title 11, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3572. A bill to amend chapter 13 of title 11, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUNDINE (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. BONKER):

H.R. 3573. A bill to achieve stable and reasonable exchange rates for international currencies to strengthen the international economy and provide for international economic growth; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCEWEN:

H.R. 3574. A bill to require that employees of defense contractors be required to undergo a criminal history information check before performing work on military installations and to provide the Department of Defense the right to access to such information; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, and Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 3575. A bill to amend chapter 51 to title 18, United States Code, to impose criminal penalties, including the death penalty, for homicide in the commission of a terrorist act outside the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWINDALL:

H.R. 3576. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow deductions from gross income for contributions not in excess of $3,000 for any calendar year to an education savings account established to accumulate savings to pay the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education expenses of any individual, and for other purposes: to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. FROST, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. DELAY):

H.J. Res. 421. Joint resolution designating the month of January 1986 as "United States Savings Bonds Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SILJANDER (for himself, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KRAMER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GROTBERG, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FAZIO, Ms. FIEDLER, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 216. Concurrent resolution condemning the racism and antisemitism of Louis Farrakhan and finding his racism and divisiveness morally repugnant to the people of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. Con. Res. 217. Concurrent resolution condemning the hijacking of the *Achille Lauro* and the murder of Leon Klinghoffer and commending President Reagan and others who assisted in the apprehension of the perpetrators of such acts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H. Res. 295. Resolution urging a joint United States-Soviet effort to achieve worldwide disease immunization by 1990; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

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

271. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the State Assembly of California, relative to nuclear crisis control centers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

272. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to the deduction for State and local taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. TAYLOR introduced a bill (H.R. 3577) for the relief of Milanie C. Escobal Norman and Angela Dawn Norman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 776: Mr. LOWERY of California.

H.R. 864: Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 887: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 999: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1017: Mr. WYLIE.

H.R. 1145: Mr. BOLAND.

H.R. 1207: Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. SHARP, Mr. CHAPPIE, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H.R. 1316: Mr. MCCAIN.

H.R. 1318: Mr. TORRICELLI and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1338: Mr. KINDNESS.

H.R. 1353: Mr. GROTBERG.

H.R. 1393: Mr. EVANS of Illinois.

H.R. 1479: Mr. WORTLEY and Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1584: Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1674: Mr. HAWKINS.

H.R. 1769: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FROST, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 1875: Mr. MANTON, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. ANTHONY, and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 2080: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. MCCAIN.

H.R. 2205: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 2580: Mr. SAVAGE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ATKINS, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2588: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. FISH, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. WEISS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MACK, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. COBEY, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. CHAPPELL.

H.R. 2659: Mr. GREGG.

H.R. 2741: Mr. SUNIA and Mr. DEWINE.

H.R. 2768: Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2782: Mr. CONTE, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. YATRON.

H.R. 2833: Mr. WILLIAMS and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2834: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 2863: Mr. FORD of Tennessee and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 2876: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SEIBERLING, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BARNES, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BEILENSON, and Mr. COELHO.

H.R. 2943: Mr. SHELBY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SWINDALL, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 2954: Mr. COBEY, Mr. RALPH M. HALL, Mr. MURPHY Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. CHAPPIE.

H.R. 3042: Mr. EDGAR and Mr. SEIBERLING.

H.R. 3059: Mr. EVANS of Illinois, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 3064: Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.R. 3087: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. YATES, Mr. FISH, Mr. VENTO, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FOWLER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 3131: Mr. BEDELL, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DYSON, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3132: Mr. DURBIN Mr. SUNIA, and Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 3147: Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3190: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. FLORIO.

H.R. 3260: Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. BEDELL, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3263: Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 3326: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. TALLON, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 3328: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. KINDNESS, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. JONES of Tennessee.

H.R. 3339: Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. NELSON of Florida.

H.R. 3344: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SABO, Mrs. BURTON of California, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. MITCHELL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. SUNIA.

H.R. 3346: Mr. CRANE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.

H.R. 3357: Mr. BOULTER.

H.R. 3371: Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. KOLBE, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3372: Mr. MCKINNEY and Mr. CARPER.

H.R. 3420: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 3436: Mr. WOLF and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 3444: Mr. JONES of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3448: Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 3511: Mr. LUNGREN and Mr. KINDNESS.

H.R. 3512: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PRICE, Mr. FROST, Mr. DANIEL, and Mr. WORTLEY.

H.R. 3515: Mr. DANIEL.

H.R. 3521: Mr. LEATH of Texas.

HJ. Res. 127: Mr. RODINO, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. JONES of Oklahoma, Mr. GALLO, Mr. ADDABBO, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.J. Res. 245: Mr. DANIEL, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HATCHER, and Mr. SUNIA.

H.J. Res. 381: Mr. EDGAR.

H.J. Res. 416: Mr. PACKARD.

H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. MANTON.

H. Con. Res. 117: Mr. DANIEL and Mr. MONSON.

H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. PARRIS, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. ERDREICH, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H. Con. Res. 210: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. MANTON, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut.

H. Res. 76: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. DAUB, and Ms. MIKULSKI.

H. Res. 105: Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 194: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. SISISKY.

H. Res. 219: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. HEFTEL of Hawaii, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. RICHARDSON, and Mr. WEAVER.

H. Res. 245: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. FISH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HOYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. OLIN, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SUNIA, Mr. TALLON, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri.

H. Res. 270: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FISH, Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. LELAND, and Mr. HOYER.

H. Res. 271: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, and Mr. CARNEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 3520: Mr. WOLF.

AMENDMENTS

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

H.R. 3500

By Mr. UDALL:

—Page 412, line 19, through page 420, line 23, strike out sections 5101 through 5104 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 5101. DISTRIBUTION OF SECTION 8(g) ACCOUNT.

(a) Any and all rights under section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(g)) with respect to bonuses and rents received before the date of enactment of this Act are hereby extinguished. In lieu of such rights, and in accordance with the provisions of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall, from the separate account in the United States Treasury established under section 8(g)(4), pay—

(1) $376,916,681 to the State of Texas;

(2) $492,576.427 to the State of Louisiana;

(3) $374,035,443 to the State of California;

(4) $56,255,324 to the State of Alaska;

(5) $63,932,966 to the State of Alabama;

(6) $14,910,958 to the State of Mississippi; and

(7) $27,706 to the State of Florida;

plus interest from April 1, 1985, to the date of enactment of this Act at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury. All funds attributable to bonuses and rents remaining in such account after payment is made in accordance with this section shall be credited to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

(b) The acceptance of payment under this section shall satisfy and release any and all claims against the United States arising under, or related to, section 8(g) of the

Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act with respect to bonuses and rents.

and renumber subsequent sections accordingly, and

Page 427, line 17 through page 437, line 7, strike out all of sections 6401 through 6406 and renumber subsequent sections accordingly.

H.R. 3327

By Mr. BROWN of California:

—Page 3, line 17, insert ": *Provided further*, That none of such funds may be used for anti-satellite system facilities at Langley Air Force Base" after "therefor".

—Page 3, line 9, strike out "$1,600,040,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,585,140,000".

SENATE—*Wednesday, October 16, 1985*

(Legislative day of Tuesday, October 15, 1985)

The Senate met at 8 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable ALAN K. SIMPSON, a Senator from the State of Wyoming.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Father in Heaven, as the Senate Page School is being examined this week for continuing accreditation, we acknowledge with praise to Thee our gratitude for those dedicated men and women who so admirably bear responsibility for its affairs. We thank Thee for Leo L. Balducci, Jerry Ainsfield, Gwenellen Corley-Bowman, Zachary Jeffers, and Blanche Williams, who, with tender loving care, under difficult circumstances, provide quality education for those young men and women who provide such faithful service to the Senators. Guide the accreditation team as they evaluate the school, and bless abundantly the committed faculty as they pursue their incalculable contribution to the Senate. In the name of Him Who is truth. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 16, 1985.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ALAN K. SIMPSON, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SIMPSON thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would be delighted to handle this any way that the acting majority leader wants to handle it.

What I can do is to suggest the absence of a quorum and preside briefly while the acting majority leader delivers whatever statement he would like to deliver. I can reserve his time until later in the day, or whatever he wishes at his preference.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would indicate that we have another Senator who will assume the chair very shortly.

And the Senator from Wisconsin may wish to proceed at this time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank my good friend.

Mr. President, if at any time the Chair would prefer to have the Senator desist temporarily while someone else takes the floor so that he can deliver his statement, I would be delighted to do that.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

WILL THE REAGAN-GORBACHEV MEETING ADVANCE ARMS CONTROL?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, what real prospect is there that the on-coming summit conference at Geneva will advance arms control? Next month the Reagan-Gorbachev meeting takes place. The No. 1 issue on the agenda must be the superpowers' nuclear arms race. That November meeting will mark the first time in 5 years that the top leaders of the two great nuclear giants have met. Both march to the meeting armed to the nuclear teeth. Think of it. The American Academy of Science, America's most prestigious scientific organization, has found that the Soviet Union's nuclear arsenal is right now so destructive that if only 1 percent of its power reached American cities, between 36 and 56 million of our citizens would die immediately and many more would suffer terminal illness. American cities would lie in ruins. That is 1 percent, 1 percent, Mr. President, of the Soviet nuclear arsenal could cause that devastation. Fires far more devastating than any human beings have ever suffered would ravage what was left of our civilization. And how about the damage the United States would wreak on Russia? An American counterattack, again even with a tiny fraction of the American arsenal, would impose a corresponding devastation in Russian cities. Doubt it? If you do, consider this. Without firing a single one of our powerful land-based missiles, without dropping even one nuclear bomb from the greatest force of long-range nuclear armed bombers in the world, but using only a single one of our great nuclear armed submarines, this country with that one submarine could utterly devastate the Soviet Union. That one single lone American Trident submarine could as it moved about the world's oceans obliterate every major city in the Soviet Union.

Even this does not tell the most forboding part of the story. Terrible as is the present destructive nuclear power of the two great nuclear giants, unless we stop the arms race now, the next 10 or 15 years will enormously increase even the present awesome power of nuclear destruction. Here is why. Both Russian and American scientific weapons laboratories are feverishly at work on new weapons. For example, the United States is pursuing an antimatter bomb that will, when perfected, have a destructive power per pound more than 100 times greater than our most potent fusion or fission bomb. Any such American development would be swiftly followed as usual by a corresponding Soviet nuclear weapon breakthrough. Because these new antimatter bombs would be light and small, they would be very cheap to deliver, made to order for the scores of countries that cannot afford the cost of the present nuclear warheads that require immensely expensive submarines, bombers, and missiles to carry them.

Do you get the insane picture? The super powers careening along toward a world in which a single, unstable megalomaniac in any of a number of countries will literally be able to light the torch that can set the entire world on fire.

So what do we do? The answer is arms control. What is the first step? Simple: Stop the nuclear weapons tests on which effective research absolutely depends. And now on the verge of the Reagan-Gorbachev summit what is the prospect for a superpower arms control agreement that will stop the arms race? The answer is virtually nil. President Reagan has flatly refused to consider such a cessation of nuclear arms testing. So here we sit in the most dangerous situation in all human history. The Catholic bishops

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

were exactly right when they said that this is the first generation since Genesis with the power to destroy mankind forever. Unfortunately, there is only one player for the United States in arms control negotiations. It is the President. The rest of us can talk, can plead, can beg, but we cannot act. How about President Reagan? Will he press for an end to the arms race in this crucial summit meeting? What do you think? This President is the only American President since the dawn of the nuclear age who has opposed every single arms control initiative or nuclear weapons agreement with the Soviet Union. He and he alone will decide whether to reverse that lifelong opposition next month. Will he? Don't count on it.

THE AMERICAN DEBT IS FAR BIGGER THAN MOST OF US REALIZE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, all of us are aware that this Federal Government plunges deeper and deeper into debt every year. All of us know that our constituents are so concerned about this Federal debt that they tell us when we go back to our States that the Federal deficit and the national debt have become our prime national problem. All of us know that the Federal Government's debt will, within a few months, exceed $2 trillion. This does, indeed, constitute a grim problem for our country. In fact, Mr. President, most of us have underestimated the seriousness of the problem. Sure the Federal debt is bad news but the problem gets worse, much worse. Here is why: How do we finance this debt or any debt? We finance it out of savings. For every borrower—and the Government is now the big-boy borrower—there has to be a saver who lends his savings to the borrower. This is where the problem comes in. If the savings of the American people were growing in tandem with the borrowing of the Government, the Government would still be a mess but the country as a whole would be able to handle it. So how about the savings of the American people? Prepare for a jolt. Savings as a percentage of income in this country has just dropped to a record low of 2½ percent of income. This is far below the typical 5 or 6 percent of income that has on the average characterized American savings. That 2½ percent savings rate is especially pitiful compared to the Japanese savings rate of about 20 percent of income.

It gets still worse. In July, the latest month for which we have figures, another facet of the American debt was dramatized. The installment debt of the American people rose to an all-time high of 18.7 percent of after-tax income. That means the American people are breaking all records in rushing to get in hock in their buying cars, refrigerators, and other big items. Now, of course, installment debt, is sharply exceeded by mortgage debt and mortgage debt is also very high. All this is just the personal side of the debt picture. In addition, American corporations are more heavily in debt than either the Federal Government or American individuals.

So what does all this mean? The Federal Government is now in hock to the tune of more than $1.8 trillion. Individual Americans today owe well in excess of $2 trillion. American corporations are on the cuff for about $3 trillion. All of this debt is rising rapidly. In total, it is now probably well in excess of $7 trillion. Meanwhile, the savings of the American people, from which these mammoth sums must be borrowed, has fallen to a record low in relation to income of only 2½ percent. So where is the money coming from?

The answer is that we are funding our borrowing from two sources. Neither source will serve the national interest in the long run. First, we have now just eliminated our favorable balance of foreign investment, that is the net debt owed by foreigners to Americans that had endured for more than 60 years. Ever since World War I, in about 1916, this country has been a lender to the rest of the world. But no more. Over past years, we built a huge investment abroad that brought billions of dollars in dividends and interest payments to this country. But not today. Today, we owe more to foreigners than they owe to us. Every month that foreign debt increases. Our huge spending, public and private, in excess of savings, guarantees that this adverse situation will continue. Net borrowing from abroad, briefly and in times of emergency or back when America was a struggling, developing country, made sense. Today, with America boasting the biggest, most prosperous economy in the world by far, net borrowing from abroad makes no sense.

The second source of funding for America's improvident borrowing is even worse. This country is slipping into the habit of spending more and more and refusing to raise the taxes to pay for that spending. Our corporations and citizens are also building huge burdens of debt. Neither our savings nor foreign lending are providing enough at a convenient rate of interest so the Federal Reserve in effect is printing the money to make up the difference. Do you challenge that statement? Well, then consider the fact that, in the first 6 months of this year, the gross national product grew only a little faster than 1 percent in real terms—that is fully allowing for inflation. But the money supply grew in that period by more than 10 percent, or literally 10 times as fast. That, Mr. President, is printing money at its worst, 10 times as fast as our economy is growing. In effect, the Government printed money to make up the difference between what we were spending and what we had available from the savings of American and foreign lenders.

What is so bad about that? What is so bad, Mr. President, is that printing money is in the short run a lot less painful than cutting spending or raising taxes. But in the long run, printing money paves the sure way to double-digit and eventually triple-digit inflation. Just ask any old codger who lived in Germany 65 years ago when printing money after World War I gave Germany the worst inflation in the world's history. Or ask any Argentinian today where printing money to pay for 25 percent of their Federal Government's expenditure has given Argentina a literally 1,000-percent inflation rate.

So what do we do? What we should do will be painful and very unpopular. We should do everything that makes our constituents unhappy. That means we cut popular spending programs, all of them. It means raise taxes on everybody. It means following a monetary policy that will raise interest rates so savers will find a bigger reward for savings and borrowers will suffer a bigger penalty for borrowing. If that sounds like a prescription for how to lose the next election, it is. It also happens to be a prescription for how to put this country slowly and painfully back on its feet.

KLAUS BARBIE TRIAL TO BE LIMITED IN SCOPE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Klaus Barbie, more appropriately known as the Butcher of Lyon, is expected to be tried by French prosecutors before the end of this year.

Barbie has received wide attention since he was expelled from Bolivia in 1983 and brought back to France to stand trial. His capture has helped keep the memory of Hitler's final solution at the forefront of the world's conscience.

The Butcher of Lyon's legacy of terror involved a ruthless campaign to exterminate Jews and stamp out the French resistance. He sought the domination of the French through tyrannical rule, sending thousands of Jews to their deaths at Auschwitz, torturing others, and murdering France's greatest resistance hero, Jean Moulin.

But now he has returned to France—this time not as a conqueror, but as a figure of history about to be held accountable for his pathetic, deranged past. His trial has been narrowed in scope because of the statute of limitations but remains a universal declaration against the actions of his past. He will not be charged in the death of Jean Moulin; he will not be charged in

the deaths and tortures of thousands of underground leaders; but he will be charged for crimes against humanity, including genocide and racial persecution.

Mr. President, the statute of limitations narrows the scope of Barbie's trial, but does not limit the degree to which we can speak out against Barbie and his contemporaries. But we must do even more than this. We cannot be satisfied by bringing yesterday's perpetrators of genocide to justice, but must act to assure punishment of today's and prevent those of tomorrow from rising to power. There are many practical problems to achieving total elimination of genocidal turmoil, but we can state this as a goal we are eager to strive toward. Let us have the foresight to act now, so that we will not need to search through the world's jungles to find the criminals in the years ahead. We have waited long enough. I urge you to ratify the genocide treaty.

MYTH OF THE DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, to declare that the fairness doctrine is, in fact, fair is to believe in mythology. In reality, the fairness doctrine is anything but fair.

The fairness doctrine of the Federal Communications Commission requires that broadcasters afford reasonable opportunities for the presentation of contrasting viewpoints on controversial issues of public importance.

What is wrong with that? Plenty. Here are just some of the reasons why the fairness doctrine is not fair and not right.

First, the fairness doctrine is an unconstitutional governmental control on our free press. It violates the first amendment's guarantee of freedom of the press.

Second, the kind of governmental regulation imposed by the fairness doctrine is unnecessary. Newspapers, operating without government control, have improved vastly in fairness, objectivity, accuracy, and relevance over the years. Broadcasters deserve that same opportunity to be free.

Third, denying broadcasters their first amendment rights is self-defeating. The fairness doctrine does not stimulate the free expression of diverse ideas. Rather, it promotes the "sameness" of ideas. Stations avoid the airing of controversial issues because they fear a challenge to their license renewal or expensive litigation resulting from a fairness complaint.

Fourth, governmental controls like the fairness doctrine are dangerous. Letting the Government be the final arbiter of "fairness" confers immense power. This is especially true when that same government decides on the granting of broadcast licenses.

Finally, those who favor continuing governmental regulation of the broadcasting media rely on an argument that is fast becoming obsolete: The so-called scarcity/rationale. In almost every city in America—regardless of size—there are more television signals available than daily newspapers. If radio stations are counted, as they must be, general audience broadcasting stations far outnumber general circulation newspapers. Moreover, economic pressures make it nearly impossible to establish a daily newspaper in a community where one already exists.

Freedom of the press is for the benefit of all Americans. If television and radio, the most popular disseminators of news and opinion, continue to be tied down by governmental controls like the fairness doctrine, the people of our Nation will continue to be the losers.

As far as this Senator is concerned, these arguments make it crystal clear that it is a myth to call the fairness doctrine "fair."

RESERVATION OF LEADERSHIP TIME

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may reserve the time of both leaders until later in the day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 8:45 a.m., with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each.

PRESIDENT DWIGHT EISENHOWER'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I would like to call attention to the fact that while we celebrated Columbus Day 2 days ago, another significant moment was passing: the birthday of Dwight Eisenhower. On October 14, 1890, Ike was born in Denison, TX. Thus began the life and career of one of the more forward-looking men of the 20th century and one of the most astute military leaders of his time.

After graduating from West Point in 1915 and marrying Mamie Doud in 1916, Dwight Eisenhower began a slow rise to an impressive, if not phenomenal, career. Eisenhower made his first notable mark as a distinguished aide to General MacArthur in the Philippines, but returned to the United States in 1939 to become chief of staff of the 3d Army. Soon thereafter, he gained recognition and distinction for his talents; most notably, he drew the attention of Gen. George C. Marshall, U.S. Chief of Staff. Then, when World War II broke out, he became assistant chief to the War Plans Division of the Army General Staff, and in May 1942, he became Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe.

In the position of Supreme Commander, Ike's qualities were fully tested. In this time of leadership crisis for the free world, he remained tactful and unwavering; a unifier of both armies and egos, including both Winston Churchill and Charles de Gaulle—a monumental task in itself. Eisenhower's understated resolve and determination to succeed in the face of interallied rivalries were essential. These qualities allowed him to move the Allied Forces toward the 1944 invasion of Europe despite strong reluctance on the part of the British. The invasion of Europe was key to the defeat of Hitler and the restoration of peace and hope to the world.

Ike retired from military service in 1948, and served briefly as president of Columbia University. In 1950, he returned to public service when President Harry Truman asked him to become the first commander of a new organization: the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO. However, his return to Europe was a shortlived one, for he returned to the United States in 1952 to run for the Republican nomination and to become the 34th President of the United States.

Eisenhower's calm resolve served him well as President. He neither postured nor pontificated for narrow partisan ends. He served the national interest well. Ike will be remembered for many things, but his straightforward concerns about the need for arms control and the danger to the American democratic system inherent in the rise of a single-minded, military-industrial complex rank among his major contributions as President.

On April 4, 1956, in a personal letter to publisher Richard Simon, the President wrote movingly of the need to control nuclear weapons. His words are even more meaningful today than almost three decades ago, especially in light of the upcoming November summit meeting between President Reagan and Premier Gorbachev.

> When we get to the point, as we one day will, that both sides know that in any outbreak of general hostilities, regardless of the element of surprise, destruction will be both reciprocal and complete, possibly we will have sense enough to meet at the conference table with the understanding that the era of armaments has ended and the human race must conform its actions to this truth or die.

Six years later, in his "farewell" speech to the Nation, the President clearly spelled out the conflict between a free society and one in which the military-industrial establishment ruled unchecked.

It is well to remember his words as we remember the anniversary of this 95th birthday.

[The] conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every State house, every office of the Federal Government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources, and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society. In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. . . . Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Let us rededicate ourselves as a people and as a nation to President Eisenhower's foresight, wisdom, and leadership.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, pursuant to the provisions of rule VI of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent from the Senate on the 17th, 18th, 21st, and 22d of this month.

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

JOSEPH LEONARD GOLDSTEIN

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my esteemed colleagues the great contributions made to science by Joseph Leonard Goldstein, a South Carolina native and recipient of the 1985 Nobel Prize in medicine.

Dr. Goldstein, the son of Isadore and Fannie Goldstein, was born in Sumter and grew up in Kingstree, SC. He attended Kingstree Grammar School and Kingstree High School, where he was valedictorian in his graduating class of 1958. Certainly Mr. Goldstein's parents are to be congratulated for the fine job of parenting they have done. And Mr. Goldstein's public school teachers in Kingstree should be proud as well, for the excellent educational foundation they provided him to build upon. Mr. Goldstein was valedictorian again when he graduated from Washington and Lee University in Virginia, and upon graduation from the University of Texas Medical School in Dallas, he was the recipient of the prestigious Ho Din Medical Award.

After graduating from medical school, Dr. Goldstein was a resident in medicine at Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston, a clinical associate at NIH, and a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Washington in Seattle. In 1972, he returned to the University of Texas Medical School as a faculty member and opened the university's department of genetics.

Dr. Goldstein won the Nobel Prize with his colleague and fellow molecular geneticist, Michael S. Brown. According to the Nobel Assembly at Stokholm's Karolinska Institute, their research "revolutionized our knowledge" of the role of cholesterol in heart disease and pointed the way toward practical means of prevention and treatment.

Dr. Goldstein's research is considered of utmost significance in the prevention and treatment of coronary artery disease and heart attacks—the No. 1 killer in the United States.

In addition to receiving the Nobel Prize, Dr. Goldstein has been the recipient of numerous other awards in his distinguished career. Among them are the Heinrich-Wieland Prize in 1974; the Pfizer Award in enzyme chemistry from the American Chemical Society in 1976; the Passano Award from Johns Hopkins University in 1978; the Gairdner Foundation Award in 1981; the award in biology and medical sciences from the New York Academy of Sciences in 1981; the Lita Annenberg Hazen Award in 1982; and the award for excellence in science and medicine from the South Carolina Drug Science Foundation in 1984.

I thank my colleagues for joining me in congratulating Dr. Goldstein on his impressive contributions to science and medicine and the knowledge of man.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. S. HENRY EDMUNDS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this body the significant contributions to historic preservation, as well as the other considerable life achievements, of Mrs. S. Henry Edmunds, one of Charleston's finest daughters.

Mrs. Edmunds, director of the Historic Charleston Foundation, retired this summer after 38 years of nurturing historic preservation in Charleston. She joined the foundation in 1947 and became director in 1955. Under her leadership, the foundation instituted its reproduction shop, started the festival of houses tours, and established two house museums to support preservation in the city. In 1958, Mrs. Edmunds developed the foundation's revolving preservation fund to purchase endangered houses and sell them to buyers who agree to restore and maintain their architectural integrity.

For the Historic Charleston Foundation's leadership in restoration in Charleston, Mrs. Edmunds was awarded the Louise DuPont Crowninshield Award, the highest honor of the National Trust. She is also a recipient of the Department of Interior's Conservation Service Award and has been honored with recognition from the Association of Charleston Realtors, the Historic Savannah Foundation, the Preservation Society of Charleston, the American Institute of Architects, and the Rotary Club, which gave her its "Service Above Self" Award this year.

Mrs. Edmunds' record of public service does not stop with the enormous contributions she has made to Charleston's historic preservation. She also serves as chairman of the Drayton Hall Council, as a trustee of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation (Monticello), and as a director of the Spoleto Festival USA. She is a former member of the President's Advisory Council for Historic Preservation. And she is a current member of the National Trust, the American Museum Association, and the American Association of State and Local History.

I wish to congratulate Mrs. Edmunds today on her many accomplishments and express my hope that she will continue to contribute her enormous talents and knowledge in the field of historic preservation to the city of Charleston and the Nation.

TEXTILES: INDUSTRY IN CRISIS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, with today's edition, the Washington Post completes a most enlightening and comprehensive three part series written by Rudolph A. Pyatt, Jr., describing the serious problems facing the Nation's textile and apparel industry. As one who has spent a great deal of his public career making the case for this important industry, I commend the newspaper for the thoroughness of the articles and urge my colleagues to take the time to read it. In the event that any missed the series due to the long holiday weekend, Mr. President, I will, at the appropriate time, ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the articles be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

With the introduction of the Textile and Apparel Trade Enforcement Act of 1985 last March, many in this body have sought to bring a solution to the tide of textile and apparel imports that threaten to destroy the domestic industry before it has the opportunity to realign itself and regain a competitive position in the world market. What we are seeking is enforcement of present bilateral agreements that have been agreed to between us and our competitors under the aegis of the multifiber arrangements. While our competitors have toed the line and maintained enforcement of the bilat-

erals we have done just the opposite and consequently the unfair trade that has resulted has seriously weakened the industry, and, if continued at the same pace, will consume it entirely within 5 years. Many will, no doubt, argue that the high dollar is the culprit here, and that with that burden and the uncompetitive posture of the textile and apparel industry in general, it is no wonder that it is going out of business. Nothing could be further from the truth. True, overvaluation of the dollar has an impact, but if we were to lower the deficit and reduce the value of the dollar, a very significant problem of unfair trade practices would still exist and still threaten the industry. Mr. Pyatt points this out in his series and gives specific examples. The textile industry does not want subsidies, or quotas, or protection. What we want and need is enforcement of the laws on the books. The industry can compete and is trying to compete. The $7.91 billion invested by the industry from 1980 to 1984, and the $2 billion to be invested for this year and next, is testimoney to that fact. Put another way, and quoting the economist Robert Kuttner, the textile "industry has reinvested more than 80 percent of its retained earnings in modernization, and its impressive productivity growth has been exceeded only by the microelectronics industry." Clearly the commitment is there and has been made. Without, however, similar commitment by our Government to enforce the trade laws, we will not have a textile industry to be concerned about in a few short years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles by Mr. Pyatt be printed in the RECORD.

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

FACTORY'S SHUTDOWN TEARS FABRIC OF SMALL COMPANY TOWN

(By Rudolph A. Pyatt, Jr.)

Signs posted at the town limits of this small rural community in South Carolina's rolling Piedmont hills proclaim it as one of the state's "Great Towns."

The award was made by the governor in recognition of local efforts to attract industry to rural areas. More important, however, economic profiles of towns receiving the award are used by the state to help business prospects identify possible relocation sites.

Ware Shoals' profile shows that it has a skilled work force, an abundant water supply, and adequate waste-treatment facility, and nearly 1 million square feet of manufacturing space under one roof. There is also access to rail and major highways, as well as to airports in nearby Greenville and Greenwood.

Those are the legacies of the Riegel Textile Corp., which built Ware Shoals and ran it for nearly 80 years.

But last November, Riegel closed down its mill here, the town's only industry, and now there are other, less appealing legacies as well: Severe unemployment. Mortgage foreclosures. Outmigration. Empty stores. An eroding tax base.

On the banks of the Saluda River and tucked away in the corners of three counties. Ware Shoals is only 17 miles north of the bustling county seat of Greenwood. Nonetheless, it has thrived in near isolation for most of the 20th century as Riegel's company town.

Now the company's name is visible only on parts of the mammoth green-and-gray brick textile mill and a truck depot at the edge of town. But the mark of Riegel remains deeply imprinted here.

Green and white frame bungalows, built by Riegel for its employes around the turn of the century, stand as mute reminders of a paternalistic' era. Spotless, tree-lined streets radiating from the former mill are uncommonly free of children.

This enclave around the mill has become a haven for retired Riegel employes like 78-year-old Butler (Buck) Koon, who spends hours fetching "the best fishing worms in the world" from a catalpa tree at the edge of his front yard.

Elsewhere evidence of Ware Shoals' decline is plain. Empty stores and shuttered buildings dominate North Greenwood Avenue, a moribund commercial strip that has lost at least 60 percent of its former businesses. In residential areas away from the center of town, boarded-up windows and doors on brick ramblers identify young families, former Riegel workers, who were unable to find other jobs and could not continue mortgage payments on their homes.

"The parental effect was very evident in that Riegel built everything and supplied everything and just took care of all the people in the town," Mayor Manly Ballentine recalled. "It was a very good setup, and if the people needed a job, Riegel needed people to work. So they had a mutual agreement, and it worked out real fine for a long time."

The relationship ended with devastating suddenness and consequences for 900 Riegel employes last November when the company, squeezed by the massive influx of imported textile products, closed its Ware Shoals mill. Riegel had laid off more than 800 workers at the same mill in 1982.

Riegel manufactures a variety of products for apparel, industrial uses and home furnishings in plants in the Carolinas, Georgia, and Virginia. The Ware Shoals plant produced fabrics for consumer items but it was also a major supplier of finished cloth to the military. Since closing the Ware Shoals plant, Riegel has farmed out some of the work that was done here while dropping other lines of business altogether.

In a statement explaining the decision to close the Ware Shoals plant, Riegel blamed the surge of textile imports for a sharp decline in the company's output and earnings. Officials of the privately owned company have declined to discuss the possible long-term effects of the plant's closing on the residents of Ware Shoals.

Nearly half of those workers are still unemployed. The despair of Ware Shoals' unemployed and the optimism of its officials are the essence of a town trying to cope with an economic disaster. Individual profiles of Ware Shoals' 2,350 residents provide a different picture from the "Great Towns" economic profile in the state's industrial development office.

COPING WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

For Thomas and Rhoda Brooks, life after Riegel is operating a vegetable stand from the back of a pickup truck in the shade of an abandoned service station across from City Hall.

"I try to sell this produce in the spring and summer 'cause people got to eat," said Brooks, an unemployed construction worker.

Rhoda Brooks lost her job in the early round of layoffs at Riegel and suffered the same fate at three other textile mills in this part of the state. The experience hasn't embittered her, she says, but she confesses that being unemployed "has hurt terrible. It's discouraging a lot."

She and her husband do "pretty good" selling vegetables when they can get enough to operate the produce stand, which doubles as the town's unofficial center for the exchange of information about job possibilities.

"It's helping to buy gas," said Rhoda Brooks. "We've not making that much, but sometimes somebody will come along and say, 'Well, you ought to go to so-and-so and put your application in.' "

The search for work "is discouraging a lot," she added. "You got to have money to move someplace else, and you've got to have money to go and hunt for a job. You can't take a $66 [weekly unemployment compensation] check and go huntin' everywhere for work."

There are few businesses in Ware Shoals, so there are few jobs to be had here.

The mill, which employed as many as 5,000 at the peak of its manufacturing operations in the 1950s and '60s, attracted workers from miles away. Variety stores, consumer finance offices, service stations, and clothing and furniture stores that were open when Riegel began cutting its work force stand empty today.

"We've got two grocery stores uptown, two drugstores, a couple of filling stations, one cafe and a couple of beer joints. That's about it now," Thomas Brooks said.

About three miles west, James Williams pulls up to a small neighborhood convenience store and hurries inside to escape the oppressive late summer heat. He has been unemployed since Riegel pulled out. This was the last week for which he would be eligible for unemployment conpensation.

Williams has managed to keep creditors at bay, but now he is threatened with foreclosure on his home. "I just about got it paid for. I got three more years on it."

Time ran out several months ago for other less fortunate Riegel employes. Padlocked and boarded-up houses in the Pine Hill subdivision are grim reminders of foreclosures.

Sitting in the living room of her home in the community of modest brick and frame houses, Mary E. Norman told of her brother's determined—but futile—bid to keep his house, which sits empty across the street.

"He lived on social services and food stamps, and my momma and daddy helped him, but he had to give the house up. About nine or 10 houses [in Pine Hills] are empty, and I'm just hanging on," she said.

She added that she works at a textile plant in Greenwood but "it's not looking too good there, either. People are really hurting."

"You can't find a job around here," complained Todd Cullen, a friend of Norman's.

Cullen, 51, had hoped to get a job at Ware Shoals Printing and Dye Co., which occupies a section in the Riegel mill that it purchased earlier this year. But "things don't look too good there, either," he said.

LOOKING FOR WORK

The employment outlook is especially bleak for Cullen and dozens of former Riegel employes who are age 50 and older.

Other big textile companies with plants in this region of the state—J. P. Stevens Co. and Milliken & Co.—also are cutting back in the face of import pressures. The same is true in other sections of a broad textile manufacturing belt that extends into nearly North Carolina. The two states are at the heart of the textile industry's operations in the South.

The North Carolina Employment Security Commission reported there were 14,465 unemployed textile workers receiving unemployment insurance at the beginning of August. Unemployment among textile workers in North Carolina is 6.5 percent, followed by 6.1 percent in the apparel industry—the highest rates among all employment categories.

South Carolina's textile industry employs 29,000 fewer workers than it did as recently as 1981.

Meanwhile, other industries haven't shown much interest in hiring and retaining older unemployed textile workers. Many workers in that category have decided to retire rather than move and start over.

Complete unemployment figures for Ware Shoals are unavailable, but Mayor Ballentine estimates that at least 400 of the last 900 employes to be laid off by Riegel are still without jobs. The other 500 either have taken early retirement or have gone to work in other areas, he said.

"Our population is made up of a lot of senior citizens, and with our situation as it is, a lot of young people are moving to find jobs and end up not coming back."

Ballentine, who was elected mayor the day after Riegel announced its decision to close the mill, recalled there were "an awful lot of problems to overcome."

Sitting at a picnic table in a park outside the town hall, Ballentine bemoaned the fact that Ware Shoals' business section has "dried up."

A COMMON PATTERN

The story of what happened in Ware Shoals is fairly typical of what has occurred in many communities where textile manufacturers have closed plants over the past four years. Invariably, the closing of a plant is followed by an exodus of small businesses and a virtual collapse of local economies.

"Our last clothing store went out of business about three months ago," Ballentine said. "It hurts considerably in that our people end up going out of town to buy and spend their money. We lose from the standpoint of jobs as well as business licenses and that kind of thing."

The loss of Riegel not only wiped out the lion's share of business license taxes but took away more than 50 percent of Ware Shoals' property taxes that the textile manufacturer contributed to the town treasury.

"If you just wipe out that total tax dollar that Riegel was putting in, you're talking about reducing services by 30 to 50 percent," Ballentine calculated.

Glancing at the huge multi-story brick mill towering behind the town hall, Ballentine underscored the magnitude of the community's loss: "Riegel built this town. They started in 1906 and built these houses [near the mill] and provided everything a person needed for survival: the company store, the power, the streets, everything."

So far, Ware Shoals has managed to maintain services without raising taxes, but Ballentine anticipates "a bigger pinch" next year.

"We've got more empty houses in Ware Shoals than I've ever seen," said Marion P. Carnell, Democratic representative to the state General Assembly and owner of the Ware Shoals Piggly Wiggly supermarket. "I'm losing a lot of my younger customers. They're moving out of town. We've been left with a lot of senior citizens. We had about 7,000 people in our trading area. It's down to about 6,000 now."

While Carnell has no intention of moving—business at his supermarket is down about 8 percent from a year ago—most buildings along the commercial strip have been abandoned. "We've lost about 14 businesses in the last two or three years," Carnell estimated.

SHAKY OPTIMISM

Still, Ballentine is optimistic about Ware Shoals' ability to rebound. Town officials have hired an economic development specialist to bring in new industry and have joined Greenwood County in developing a broader business attraction program.

In the meantime, Ballentine hopes to buy time and "break even" by selling water from the water works, inherited from Riegel, to residents and to the Ware Shoals Printing and Dye Co. The printing and dye company bought the mill from Riegel but utilizes only part of the manufacturing facility, hoping to rent space to other businesses.

Marvin Crawford, owner of one of two drugstores in town, shares Ballentine's optimism, though he believes it will take several years to resolve many of Ware Shoals' problems.

As chairman of the town's nonprofit development corporation, Crawford took the lead in persuading a small shoe manufacturer to locate in Ware Shoals. The plant will employ about 50 persons initially.

"If we can get five small industries that will employ at least 100 persons each, with the diversification, then more people would actually be working for longer periods of time than they were with the textile industry," said Crawford, who once served as chairman of the Greenwood County Council.

"Even though we won't have an employer the size of Riegel, hopefully we'll be able to wake people up to the fact that we will have to diversify our economic base in Ware Shoals. I think we will be better off as a town than we were just depending on Riegel as the sole employer here.

"I think, in retrospect, as we look back, hopefully in five years, [the closing of Riegel] will be a blessing in disguise," Crawford added. "We just have to hitch up our belts and get after it."

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 13, 1985]

PROTEST OVER IMPORTS CHANGING COURSE OF U.S. TRADE POLICY

(By Rudolph A. Pyatt, Jr.)

Like giant pieces of fabric woven into the economy, the American textile and clothing industries spread far and wide, into nearly every state of the Union.

Cotton farmers and ginners; textile plants spinning miles of natural and man-made fibers into fabric; factories turning out clothing and home furnishings as well as fabrics for automobile tires, electronic circuit boards and countless other products—all are part of a $45 billion industry that accounts for one of every eight manufacturing jobs in the United States.

From that vast constituency has come a cry of anguish and protest that is helping to change the course of American trade policy.

"We're in a war, and we're going to fight like hell. We're not going to give up," said Ellison S. McKissick Jr., president of the American Textile Manufacturing Institute.

The American textile industry is reeling under a tide of imports that threatens it with ruin.

Shipments of fabrics and clothes from abroad doubled between 1976 and 1984, with most of the increase coming in the past two years. Imports took nearly 23 percent of U.S. textile market last year, double the 1979 level, and imported clothes captured an even larger share—33 percent, compared with 22 percent in 1979.

Nearly 50 textile plants have been closed this year and at least 20 others have imposed permanent layoffs. More than 10,000 textile workers have been laid off so far this year and the industry's unemployment rate stands at 13 percent, compared with a national rate of 7 percent.

The industry has won wide support in Congress for legislation that would drastically limit this huge surge of imports.

The textile bill, backed by executives and labor representatives of both the textile and apparel industries, has become the first major test in a political firestorm over America's declining position in world trade. With nearly 300 pieces of trade legislation pending in Congress, the passage of the textile bill could spark a stampede by various constituent groups to win approval of single-issue trade measures, many lawmakers say.

This in turn could touch off a trade war, with unforeseeable consequences for the world economy.

President Reagan has vowed to veto the textile bill—passed by the House last Thursday, 262 to 159—while promising much tougher action against unfair trade by foreign countries.

"If our legislative effort fails and our government is determined to continue the same policies that it has adopted over the last four years, you're going to see a demise of our industry," warned McKissick of the ATMI, the industry's Washington-based trade group.

The problems of the U.S. textile industry epitomize America's trade quandary.

In the industry's eyes, the problem is unfair trade—a boom in imports since 1980 that violates an international agreement signed by the United States and other major textile producers. The industry is penalized as well by economic factors beyond its control—particularly low wages abroad and the high value of the dollar, which effectively cuts import prices while boosting prices of American exports.

Critics of the textile bill call it the worst form of protectionist legislation. The House version would cut textile imports by up to 40 percent, denying American consumers access to foreign clothes and cloth that are often much cheaper than competing American goods. To save jobs of textile and apparel workers, the legislation would prop up non-competitive parts of the industry—a wasteful, inefficient bargain for consumers, say the critics, who are led by the nation's retail industry.

Is the issue fair trade or protectionism? Would imports lead to retaliation by foreign countries or force open the door to a fairer, more open trading environment? Is this the first step toward a raising of barriers to trade around the world?

Those are crucial questions on which the current debate on textile trade legislation will turn.

There is no one factor that is clearly responsible for the problems of the U.S. tex-

tile and apparel industries, and thus no one solution to them. But scholars, economists, government trade specialists and industry officials point to these in particular:

Imports produced by low-cost labor. The huge disparity in wages paid here and abroad gives a distinct cost advantage to foreign producers, according to industry and government officials. Wages received by apparel workers in Taiwan, Hong Kong, Korea and China, for example, average one-fifth to one-tenth of those paid to their counterparts in the United States, industry and government studies show, U.S. textile workers are paid between $6 and $8 an hour.

Although the dramatic rise in imports has been attributed mainly to increased production in the Far East, the United States is also being targeted producers in an increasing number of developing countries in other parts of the world where labor costs are low.

Subsidies by foreign governments to their manufacturers: Commerce Department officials here say that subsidies pose a major problem and that the practice is fairly sophisticated. It is "almost impossible under our current law to prove subsidy activities in centrally planned economies" where governments are integrally involved in manufacturing, says Walter A. Lenahan, deputy assistant secretary of commerce for textile trade.

Protectionism abroad: While the textile trade bill pending in Congress is being widely attacked as a protectionist measure, American made products are systematically barred by the governments of many foreign competitors.

Fraud: U.S. Customs officials say fraud compounds the textile import problem. Practices range from false labeling to smuggling to transshipment of products from one country to another to circumvent quotas.

The dollar: The huge increase in textile imports, which have grown by 20 percent per year since 1980, corresponds with the soaring increase in the value of the dollar Textile imports actually declined between 1972 and 1980, when the dollar's value was relatively low.

But attributing the imports problem mainly to the dollar misses the mark, say textile industry leaders. The same factors—protectionism, cheap labor, subsidized foreign production, fraud and expansionist trade policies of nations with central economies—were at work before the rise in the dollar and will be when it drops, their officials say. An expanding number of less-developed countries capable of supplying textiles has sharpened the competition for the U.S. market, Commerce Department studies show.

"One of the basic problems of our domestic textile industry is that it is basically excluded from major markets where I think they could be competitive," Lenahan noted. "Our ability to ship to Korea is almost nil, despite the fact that Korea ships over $1 billion a year in textiles and apparel, plus our ability to ship to Taiwan as well, even though they ship $2 billion in textiles. The Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, India, Pakistan—major supplier after major supplier effectively excludes us from their markets.

"If we could have an equal footing in those markets I think we could compete both domestically and internationally."

But textile industry officials express doubts about their competitiveness both here and abroad.

"You simply can't compete with a government that is absolutely dedicated to keeping its people working for 16 to 18 cents an hour," complained James H. Martin Jr., vice chairman of Ti-Caro Inc., a Gastonia, N.C., textile company. "We've seen the pattern in the destruction of American jobs and we're not just whistling in the graveyard. If this thing continues, we'll have segments of this industry that will be totally, absolutely forever gone."

"You can't entirely overcome [the wage disadvantage]," Lenahan acknowledged. "I don't think anyone should fool themselves. At the capital-intensive end of the industry, I can see the wage differential being overcome. It gets more difficult in apparel because of labor intensity."

The import explosion over the past decade has been fueled primarily by the so-called Big Five—Hong Kong, Taiwan, Korea, Japan and China. Average annual growth in textiles and apparel from Hong Kong and Japan declined slightly during the period but import trends tracked by international trade specialists in the Commerce Department show a rapid growth in volume shipped by Taiwan and Korea. China also became a major supplier of textiles and apparel to this country, increasing its shipments from 1.7 million square yard equivalents in 1976, to 268 million SYE in 1984.

While the United States has absorbed an estimated 95 percent of the increase in world exports from developing countries, the growth rate for the total U.S. apparel market over the past 10 years has been only 1 percent. Thus while textile shipments have been a key source economic growth for these countries, the results have been disastrous for domestic American producers.

In the meantime, imports from the European Community—an economic union of 10 nations—increased at an average annual rate almost 7 percent faster than those from Hong Kong. Taken together, the EC-10 would constitute the second-largest supplier—after Taiwan—of textile products to the United States, according to the Commerce Department.

Ostensibly, the textile trade bill would ensure an orderly flow of imports by establishing global quotas. Supporters of the bill say it is intended to strengthen existing provisions of the Multi-Fiber Arrangement (MFA), which went into effect in 1974 and which was extended in 1981 for five more years.

The MFA, to which the United States and most major textile-producing countries are parties, provides for the orderly growth in textile and apparel imports through bilateral agreements or unilateral controls. But it hasn't worked that way.

The textile industry is comprised mostly of family owned or small privately controlled companies. Unable to compete against the flood of imports, several have either been forced to declare bankruptcy or are on the brink of collapse.

Although the industry is generally thought to be concentrated mainly in the South, it is, perhaps, more a national industry than most major manufacturing sectors. Textile plants are located in at least 42 states. Forty-five states have apparel plants and 48 produce raw products such as cotton and wool or man-made fibers.

The industry generates a gross national product in excess of $48 billion, compared with $51 billion for the auto industry, $43.1 billion for primary metals and $31.6 billion for petroleum refining.

The import damage extends beyond the smaller companies. Textile manufacturing giants are also at risk. At Milliken & Co., the industry's third-largest manufacturer, for example, employment is down 25 percent after the company was forced to close 11 of its plants in the Carolinas and Georgia the past couple of years.

J. P. Stevens, meanwhile, in an action stemming directly from the impact of imports, has decided to sell off its finished apparel fabrics business. Chairman Whitney Stevens said the company will concentrate on its home furnishings business and industrial products to ensure a better return on the company's investment.

Stevens, one of only a few publicly held textile manufacturing companies, attributed a $4.8 million loss in the second quarter to a major restructuring, which included the closings of three plants. The closings led to the layoff of nearly 1,100 Stevens workers, bringing the total to more than 7,000 since 1980. The big New York-based manufacturer has closed 17 plants since 1980, and plans to close at least two more by the end of this year.

"There was a time when you used to go to a managers' meeting to see how high your profits were," mused Paul J. Poston, a Stevens plant manager in Piedmont, S.C. "Now you go to count your losses. It's gotten to the point where [managers] call the meetings the blood bank now."

SUBSIDIES TO FOREIGN FIRMS SOPHISTICATED, ILLUSIVE

When a U.S. textile company goes up against a foreign competitor chances are the competitor isn't just another company. More likely, the competitor will have the full weight of its government on its side, American textile industry officials have charged repeatedly in recent years.

If the foreign competitors were simply companies, "a case could be made that the American firms were simply not up to the challenge and have not earned the right to ask for relief," the American Textile Manufacturers Institute contends.

It is one of the sticking points in the current debate over special trade legislation for the textile/apparel industry.

There can never be free trade as long as foreign textile companies receive preferential loans, grants, tax breaks and other subsidies from their governments in support of centrally planned economies, say U.S. textile industry spokesmen.

Trade experts describe subsidies as government assistance given to exporters to promote shipment of goods. Such trade practices are illegal unless it can be proved that imports do not harm an industry of a country receiving the goods.

The ATMI has filed at least 17 cases since 1981, alleging unfair trade practices involving the use of foreign subsidies. In cases where subsidies were provided, penalty duties were applied. Nevertheless, many foreign manufacturers continue to receive subsidies, provoking stronger allegations in this country of unfair competition from abroad.

Commerce Department officials concede that subsidies are a bigger problem than fraud, but they add that the violations are very sophisticated and probably haven't been studied adequately.

Centrally planned economies are substantial shippers of textiles and apparel to the United States, but it is "almost impossible under our current law to prove subsidy activities in those countries," said Walter A. Lenahan, deputy assistant secretary of commerce for textile trade. Lenahan said subsi-

dies are "an area to which we ought to devote more attention."

The ATMI says it knows that some countries try to lure textile companies with the promise of rebates to manufacturers, exchange rate subsidies, special low-rate government financing and government payments.

"Our lawyers estimate that if we had pursued all of the cases we filed [alleging the use of illegal subsidies], it would have cost us $50 million," said Carlos Moore, the ATMI's executive vice president.

Among those cases, said Moore, the ATMI alleged that:

Peru paid subsidies to companies if they produced goods in Lima and offered bigger grants if products were manufactured outside the city in more economically depressed areas.

China offered an exchange-rate subsidy. "If you earned dollars for exporting, you got a higher exchange rate when you converted the dollars" to Chinese currency, Moore explained.

Indonesia, Turkey, Thailand and Argentina provided financing for textile and apparel manufacturers in those countries at preferential rates.

The ATMI's success in showing the existence of subsidies "acted as a deterrent," Moore said, but proving it now has become an expensive and time-consuming process.

Before 1979, it was only necessary to show that subsidies were being paid and the amount. The United States, however, later agreed to accept another criterion for proof: that the import of certain products cause injury to an industry. Thus, a country is subject to a so-called injury test if they are found to be using subsidies to enhance their competitive positions in the global marketplace.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 15, 1985]

LITTLE CONSENSUS ON NATURE OF CHANGE

(By Rudolph A. Pyatt, Jr.)

The U.S. textile industry, reeling from a decade-long explosion of imports, must undergo a massive restructuring to continue as a viable competitor in global markets, according to economists and researchers who have studied the industry at length.

But there is little consensus in the industry on what the nature of this transformation should be, or whether it is even possible.

For the time being, the industry is counting heavily on the passage of a bill in Congress that ostensibly would create a more favorable competitive environment by limiting imports and halting unfair trade practices.

Trade and manufacturing experts admit that reducing the levels of fabric and apparel imports is only a partial solution to a much broader problem. But it would buy the textile industry some breathing room at least, its advocates say. They contend that, without the respite, within five years there won't be an industry to restructure.

These experts say that textile and apparel producers must begin planning now to:

Diversify their companies to achieve growth in areas where foreign competitors aren't strong.

Develop more specialized product lines and market segments.

Make greater use of advanced technology.

Consolidate through mergers.

Develop stronger markets for exports.

Textile and apparel manufacturers must "assess where their combination of management talent and relatively high productivity can be the differential between foreign labor costs," said Walter A. Lenahan, deputy assistant secretary of Commerce for textile trade.

Intensive lobbying by the industry for a special textile trade bill notwithstanding, few among even the staunchest advocates of government intervention really believe that a new trade policy or new trade legislation will lessen competition among the world's fabric and apparel producers.

A special trade bill "doesn't guarantee that we will prosper and survive, only that we have a fair chance," said Ellison S. McKissick Jr., president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute.

At the moment, the U.S. textile and apparel industries obviously are losing ground fast. They have lost more than 300,000 jobs and have closed more than 200 plants in the past decade. At the same time, the imports surge has increased at an average annual rate of 18 percent since 1980. Last year, in fact, textile imports were up 32 percent, totaling $19 billion. Increases in imports have far outpaced the expansion in U.S. consumption of textiles, according to the Commerce Department. More than one-third of the U.S. market for clothes and fabric for clothes has been taken over by imports.

There are few indications, however, that the industry is ready to implement comprehensive long-range planning and marketing strategies that would make it more competitive. It is a very scattered industry, dominated by small, family-owned companies, making it difficult to amass the capital for major technology research or to obtain the clout to enlist the retail industry in its cause.

Technology is often cited as holding the most promise, but many in the industry say they feel that they have squeezed most of the juice from that apple. Indeed, new technology has made the industry far more efficient than other large manufacturing sectors of the American economy, the American Textile Manufacturers Institute (ATMI) maintains. Productivity and quality in manufacturing domestic textile fabrics is unsurpassed by foreign competitors, the group says.

Textile manufacturers have invested more than $1 billion annually in new plants and equipment over the past two decades. Virtually every major aspect of the manufacturing process that converts naturally or semi-automated. Sophisticated machinery in most plants today weaves yarn into fabric twice as fast as the industry could 10 years ago. Extensive use of computers has speeded up the manufacturing process while increasing efficiency and quality.

"We run at about 95 percent efficiency, and I don't think you can do any better without using a computer," said Rudolph Owens, manager at an Alice Manufacturing Co. plant in Easley, S.C.

"Our company knows of no machine we can buy to improve quality and productivity," said Roger Milliken, chairman of Milliken & Co.

Even traditionally labor-intensive clothing makers are using computerized equipment to create designs, cut patterns and knit garments.

Further opportunities for apparel firms to take advantage of technological improvements are limited, according to a study by the Commerce Department. Fashion changes often require frequent adjustments of equipment and technique, giving an advantage to labor-intensive producers, the study continued. What's more, the smaller size of many firms and the scarcity of funds make development of new equipment difficult.

Still, there have been breakthroughs that could revolutionize key segments of the domestic apparel industry, enabling it to speed up production and assure retailers faster turnaround time between orders and shipments.

An example of this new technology is a machine that was developed in a cooperative program called $(TC)^2$. The project, which was developed to produce flexible automated systems for apparel manufacturers, is funded and directed by a consortium of textile and apparel manufacturers, suppliers to the industries, organized labor and the Department of Commerce.

The joint venture, with Draper Laboratory of Cambridge, Mass., as developer, has produced a revolutionary machine capable of automatically assembling and stitching together pieces of a garment. The new machine is being tested in factories following successful laboratory tests last year.

Further technological breakthroughs are necessary, however, if the textile/apparel industry is to remain competitive, studies indicate. Indeed, the key to the future of the U.S. industry lies in its movement into a "new age of technology," according to North Carolina State University officials. Thus, the university last year proposed development of a National Center for Manufacturing Technology in Apparel, Textiles and Fibers. It envisions the center as a hub for development of new technologies that would enhance the competitive posture of the textile/apparel industry.

The apparel industry is so segmented that no single company can afford a major research effort "even approaching the level needed to solve the current and foreseeable problems," North Carolina State officials said in making the proposal last year. The textile industry is similar. Most of the 5,000 or so companies are small businesses.

Attempts to close the trade gap through the use of new technology face one other difficulty: No U.S. company builds textile machinery. American manufacturers relinquished the market to Europeans 20 years ago, thus forcing U.S. textile firms to import basic equipment or buy it from foreign-owned plants in this country.

Europeans improved on American machinery and became dominant in the market, according to Peter R. Philipp, a young German executive with PSP Marketing Inc., a textile machinery distributor in Charlotte, N.C. In fact, he said, foreign textile machinery builders played a key role in building up the textile production abroad that has caused the problem here. First Europeans, and then Japanese machine manufacturers, expanded their markets by subsidizing sales to developing countries, granting them low-interest, long-term credit terms.

The combination of advanced low-cost machinery and low labor costs has made developing countries formidable competitors.

To overcome that competitive edge, U.S. textile and apparel companies "must use the American genius for innovation, efficiency, reliable service, styling and promotion," according to the American Textile Manufacturers Institute.

While not advocating that U.S. manufacturers relinquish their remaining share of the clothing market, some analysts suggest that they seek a broader market for non-apparel products. At the same time, textile manufacturers are being urged to segment their markets, or specialize in the manufac-

ture of products that are less import-sensitive.

With the apparel market shrunken by import saturation, most of the bigger textile companies with research capabilities have begun concentrating on new fibers and fabrics that foreign competitors find difficult to duplicate.

There is a large and growing market, for example, in several industrial areas, observed Jeffrey S. Arpan, professor of international business and director of the Center for Industry Policy and Strategy at the University of South Carolina. But there are market niches also in apparel and home furnishings, Arpan emphasized. What's more, he said, U.S. firms can capture a bigger market share in the manufacture of textile products that foreign competitors find too bulky and costly to ship.

Moreover, said Arpan, domestic manufacturers should put greater emphasis on apparel products tailored to U.S. fashion tastes. Palm Beach, for example, has developed a special market in men's wear, which "hasn't been duplicated" by foreign competitors, he pointed out.

Levi Strauss enjoys a similar position in the market. "Levi Strauss has had tremendous success" despite fierce competition from foreign manufacturers of jeans, Arpan pointed out. Foreign-made jeans enjoyed early success among U.S. consumers but lost considerable appeal eventually "because they didn't fit and didn't hold up." Thus, if U.S. manufacturers concentrate more on marketing, newer products and durability, they can remain competitive in the apparel area, Arpan said.

Even with improved technology and products, a major hurdle for the textile and apparel industries is persuading retailers to increase their purchases from domestic suppliers. Joseph P. O'Neill, chief operating officer of the American Retail Federation, concedes there are built-in advantages to retailers who buy apparel from domestic sources and that long lead times and other factors involved in buying imports present some drawbacks. Nonetheless, import penetration is far less than textile and apparel manufacturers claim, according to O'Neill, who also is a spokesman for the Retail Industry Trade Action Coalition (RITAC).

RITAC opposes special textile trade legislation, contending that import restrictions would prove too costly for consumers and that thousands of retail jobs would be lost.

Textile industry officials charge, on the other hand, that U.S. retailers oppose limits on imports because sales of imported apparel products guarantee higher profit margins.

"As everyone knows, imports are marked up 300 to 400 percent and are sold at prices equal to or, in some cases, higher than, similar domestically produced goods," McKissick charged. "What we're talking about here is not higher costs to the consumer but reduced profits for importers."

But O'Neill said that to suggest retailers are guilty of price-gouging by selling imports at inflated prices as "ludicrous."

Such sharp differences between the retail sector and textile and apparel manufacturers appear to stand in the way of developing cooperative programs to improve their relative competitive positions.

"One of the industry's greatest challenges will be to gain consumer support for the domestic textile industry," said Jack Krol, vice president in charge of the textile fibers division at E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., a major producer of man-made fibers. "We need to help consumers understand the long-term implications of the import situation and its relevance to their own lives."

Beyond that, a key question is whether the U.S. textile industry will be in a position to compete in domestic and world markets in the coming decade and beyond.

A University of South Carolina study recommends, among other things, that textile manufacturers initiate joint technology and marketing research programs with suppliers and customers. "Closer cooperation among firms in the major segments of the U.S. textile complex would prove mutually beneficial, particularly in the research and development and marketing research areas where the U.S. firms could reap the greatest returns in international competition," the study's authors conclude.

In the meantime, the industry "lacks a strong export orientation and has failed to develop needed skills in international management and international markets vital for the 1980s," they added.

On the other hand, there are indications that some major U.S. textile manufacturers may be prepared to shift their product emphasis for foreign as well as domestic markets. This is especially true in the case of apparel fabrics, where the influx of imports has had its most devastating impact.

J. P. Stevens & Co., for example, announced this past summer that it plans to divest its apparel fabrics divisions and devote more of its resources to the company's home furnishings and industrial segments, where new applications in the use of textiles are creating suostantial growth opportunities.

Some industry studies suggest, however, that U.S. manufacturers should adopt a comprehensive marketing strategy aimed at deeper penetration of foreign markets. The key to establishing niches here and abroad, however, probably lies in stepped-up research to produce new products that surpass those of foreign producers in quality and appeal, industry sources acknowledge.

Yet another avenue for U.S. textile manufacturers appears to lie in diversification, which permits growth in areas where foreign producers are not strong. For example, American Enka Co., a subsidiary of a Netherlands company, has expanded its man-made-textile-fiber business in the United States by producing a nylon matting for reinforcement in construction projects.

Under any scenario, competition in the textile and apparel industries will increase and lead to further contraction, as smaller companies wilt under the pressure of competition, analysts predict.

"I don't think we will ever see an increase in employment and the number of [textile] plants in this country," Arpan said. "After decades of protectionism, the [U.S.] textile industry is reeling under the pressure of international competition."

If the industry is to survive as a viable competitor, "We've got to do a better job; manufacturers, cutters, sewers . . ." McKissick said. "It's a matter of the American people doing a better job."

THE PLIGHT OF SOVIET JEWRY

Mr. TRIBLE. Mr. President, I rise today to take part in the Congressional Call to Conscience for Soviet Jewry, and to call attention to the brave efforts of one particular Jewish family.

The United States and other Western nations must always remain vigilant with respect to the repression of Jews by the U.S.S.R. But our vigilance takes on an added sense of urgency when a meeting between the heads of our respective Governments is imminent. The Soviet-American summit is only weeks away, and it is at this meeting that the Soviet leadership must be told that America regards the religious freedoms and emigration rights of Soviet Jews as a matter of the highest importance.

I am proud to serve in a body that cares about these fundamental freedoms. At the request of the majority leader, all 100 Senators recently signed a letter to President Reagan in behalf of those Jews who are persecuted by the Soviet regime. This appeal and others like it could not have come at a better time.

The situation facing all Jews in the Soviet Union is worsening. Emigration remains at abysmally low levels, and persecution and anti-Semitic propaganda are on the rise.

The cumulative impact of such oppression on Soviet Jews is immeasurable. When the leaders of the faith are imprisoned, and when children are denied religious instruction, the future of Judaism in the U.S.S.R. is jeopardized.

The impact of such official repression on individual families is also abhorrent. Several days ago, I had the opportunity to talk with a young Jewish woman who was fortunate enough to emigrate from the Soviet Union 11 years ago. Anna Rosnovski is a brave and gifted woman, who now travels the world with the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra performing concerts to benefit Soviet Jews.

But Anna's sister, Helena Keiss-Kuna, has not been as fortunate. Helena applied to emigrate from the Soviet Union at about the same time as her sister. But Helena's request was turned down, and like so many refuseniks, she has been refused employment ever since her attempt to leave the U.S.S.R.

Helena's husband was refused emigration rights at the same time. Though he has since been able to find odd jobs, his wages are not nearly enough for himself, Helena, and their son.

Every day, Anna Rosnovski labors to free her sister and family from the Soviet Union. During our meeting, Anna delivered a plea that I would like to share with my colleagues. It is an eloquent statement that reminds us of the difficulties faced by all Jews in the Soviet Union. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Anna's letter be reprinted in the RECORD at this time.

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

AN URGENT APPEAL FOR HELP

I appeal for help to all, who feel the suffering of others!

My sister Helena Keiss-Kuna, her husband George Kuna, and her son Andrew are the sole members of our family remaining in U.S.S.R. My sister and I applied approximately the same time for exit-visas, but my sister's request had been refused. Consequently to her application, she lost her work and is unemployed since 1975. Her husband Ingenieur, like her, earns a feable living, as truckdriver. Her son Andrew, a brilliant student in mathematics, has to go to the army in one and half year. If this would happen, hope for "Alyah" must be given up for several years. Life for the family should become a very sad perspective in U.S.S.R., because of their wish for "Alyah".

I came to Israel in 1974 with my husband and daughter. I am a violinist, member of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra. My husband Dr. Rosnovski is the physician of the national soccer team. I was obliged to leave U.S.S.R. without my violin; a thing which had tragic consequences for my family. My father (former concertmaster of the Leningrad Philharmonic Orch.) followed us to Israel alone; my mother tried to send me my violin and had been arrested and imprisoned. Shortly after, she was send to a closed psychiatric hospital to "treatment". There my mother has really became ill, and suffered irreversible damages. After the intervention of international authoritys in psychiatry, she was released and send to Israel. She lives now in a psychiatric hospital, near Tel-Aviv.

My father and mother, both are very aged and ill. Their only wish in life is to see their daughter and the reunion of the family.

It is a first rate humanitarian act to help my sister and her family to arrive to Israel.

ANNA ROSNOVSKI,
Israel, Tel-Aviv, Ben-Gurion Blvd. 56.
Tel: (03) 228-514.

My sister's address is: U.S.S.R., Leningrad, ul. Plehanova 26-27 kw.48. Tel: 212-3160. Elena Keiss-Kuna.

WASHBURN-NORLANDS CENTER

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article from the Christian Science Monitor concerning the Washburn-Norlands Center in Livermore, ME.

When the glare and glitter of the 20th century become too corrosive, a visit to the Washburn-Norlands Center provides a welcome dose of 19th century reality and simplicity. The authenticity of the center helps attract more than 25,000 visitors each year who want more than a tourist's-eye view of how life was 100 years ago.

The article does an excellent job of portraying the many charms of the Washburn-Norlands Center, and I ask unanimous consent that the article be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

LIVING HISTORY

(By Cynthia B. Marquand)

LIVERMORE, ME.—I remember just last winter when we hauled 50-pound blocks up from the lake to the horse-drawn pung while the wind whipped a chill through the February air, and out in the barn a calf was trying to be born. Now, with the breath of summer gone, it's harvest time. The icehouse is only half-full from summer's use. Apple pies steam to a cool in the kitchen while we line the storage shelves with minced meat and pickles. The soil is laid to rest, and potatoes, carrots, and turnips nestle in barrels in the musty confines of the root cellar, ready to sustain the long winter lull.

Although this could be an entry from a farmer's journal in the 1870s, it's actually an account of a city-dweller's country respite in the 1980s. The passage describes a bucolic farm site enriched by woodlands and fields, perched atop a wind-swept hill in Livermore, Maine. Here, visitors can forsake microwaves and hot tubs, erase the pall of nuclear war, and for $160 immerse themselves in a weekend of the 19th century.

Weekend "live-ins" are a small portion of the nearly 25,000 adults and children who visit the Washburn-Norlands Living History Center each year. Teachers can come here to get recertification credit; students can get college credit. Writers come seeking insights into post-Civil War history. Peace Corps hopefuls come to learn about primitive farming techniques. Computer salesmen and bank tellers venture here for a back-to-nature reprieve. But few escape the Norlands without glimpsing something of the innate values of 1870 Maine farm life—hard work, personal responsibility, and close family ties.

The setting is reminiscent of a 19th-century novel, with spinning wheel, wooden butter churn, soap savers, cornhusk mattresses, and kerosene lanterns. Volunteers bustle about in post-Civil War dress, portraying characters who lived in the area during that time. They speak the lingo, and feign ignorance of a world beyond the 1870s.

The five-building estate, including a church and library, is on the original site. It once housed the prominent Washburn family—renowned for its sons, who became congressmen, governors, and influential businessmen.

CHANGING SEASONS, CHANGING TASKS

Ulysses S. Grant is President. The war has just ended. Our week-end live-in group enters a time warp for three days to assume the identities of the Pray and Water families. A stroll through the cemetery at dusk reveals family gravestones, and for the next few days we scour stained and faded journals for facts about our new characters.

The historical setting is presented as closely "as they or anybody else can portray," says Terry Sharer, former secretary-treasurer of the Association for Living Historical Farms and Agricultural Museums at the Smithsonian Institution. "Our association has about 700 members. . . . None offer the program like they have at Norlands, where you assume a historical identity for 72 hours."

Indeed, the days following are spent in the nitty-gritties of farm chores—mucking stalls, collecting eggs, tilling the soil, harvesting crops, feeding pigs and sheep, grinding corn into meal, and familiarizing participants with the nuances of 1870 rural life. Come Monday morning, participants take up quill pens and slates, sit in double seats, and do arithmetic problems in their heads, reciting the answers to the satisfaction of Eunice, the stern schoolmarm.

Changing seasons prompt changing tasks. October is harvesttime, with a gushing supply of freshly squeezed cider to quench the thirst after a day's hard labor. March is maple syrup time; April brings horse and oxen out of the barn and into the fields for the tilling.

Robert Hjort, a bread salesman in New Sharon, Maine, attended the July live-in with his wife, Anita. "We spent three or four hours on our hands and knees picking potato bugs off potatoes," he says. "It gets you away from the idea of picking up a bag of potatoes at the supermarket and bringing it home.

"I loved the idea that you can go back to 1870, and everything since that time is forgotten—no phones, no TV, no radio. . . . I'd split wood before at my own house and had my own private garden, but I'd never worked with oxen, milked a cow, or for that matter, baked a pie."

RUGGED FAMILIES

Much is authentic at Washburn-Norlands. Participants forgo showers, use a three-holer in the barn, and bed down for the night on sloping, cornhusk mattresses. The Washburns were inveterate journal keepers, so meals are concocted from actual menus found in the records.

Yet there are minor flaws in the program's historical representation. The most obvious incongruency is when men and women switch gender roles on Saturday and Sunday to experience a wider variety of farm chores. The house is not the original, but was rebuilt in the 1920s after a fire, and the cookstove doesn't suit the era. But unless one scours for them, exceptions to 1870 are hard to find.

Farm demands of the era fostered strong family ties and dependencies. Children had scant schooling and were bound to the farm as laborers, while male and female roles were rigidly structured. "You get the distinct impression that, in the past, the family rather than the individual was the basic building block of society," says Mr. Sharer. "Today, the individual seems much more the building block of society than a long time ago, when we thought society was built on rugged individualism. But it's my opinion that it was built more on rugged families."

These values, as much as the rigors of farm life, are what the Norlands conveys. "Any museum, including Norlands, is a kind of church," Sharer adds. "They exist to give everlasting life to some esteemed value, a permanence to the values associated with a life style that doesn't exist anymore."

SUNDAY MORNING BREAKFAST

In this day and age, "lots of families only get one meal a day together," says Glenda Richards, a volunteer who plays the role of the warm, sprightly, marginally literate Emiline Hilton. Here, she says, "we say grace before every meal, and that kind of thing."

The epitome of family and community togetherness comes during the Sunday morning breakfast hour. The table is laden with food—blue-trimmed pitchers brimming with fresh milk, pancakes piled high, newly churned butter, and the sweet fruit of the March workers' labor—maple syrup. We're served substantial portions of food, but nothing is wasted. Roles are switched, and the men now dart about in gingham aprons and floppy caps, pancake flippers fanning the air.

A handful of neighbors stop in, and each character maintains his or her role to the tee. Rubin Wing appears from the poorhouse with customary ragged beard and disheveled work overalls to exchange a meal for a day's labor. Miz. Lovejoy, a pauper, hobbles in begging and mumbling about her lot in life. Brother Otis Holmes Johnson

joins in with an austere presence, and later gives a tedious, yet authentic, afternoon sermon "mercifully short, relative to how it really was," he says with a mischievous twinkle.

James Bliven, a biologist from Georgia, plays Israel Martel, a French Canadian was a hired hand for the Washburns. "In 1870, the census shows Israel as 25 years old; he was my age and came down here [from Canada] with some other fellow to work. The farms in Canada were drying up. He played the accordion and he lived in the farmer's cottage. He was a real girl chaser, and went on trips out of town to chase girls."

The encounters are meant to teach something about the past, and the roles are based on real people. The atmosphere is inviting, bubbling with conversation. Billy Gammons, a former teacher who came up with the idea for Washburn-Norlands back in 1972, says responses from live-in participants range from "I feel so close to these people—it makes me realize I'm cheating my own family" to "I hadn't prayed since I was a kid until I came here."

For some, the experience at Washburn-Norlands is so genuine that by the end of the weekend, they balk when it comes time to return home. A car passing by looks oddly out of place. The simplicity of the 1870s must be left behind. "If I had my choice, if I could get away with it, I'd sell my house and go back and live there," Mr. Hjort says. "I would gladly work there for nothing."

THE DEATH OF ALEX ODEH

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I rise today to express my horror at the shocking attack which took the life of Alex Odeh, the west coast regional director of the Arab-American Anti-Discrimination Committee, and wounded seven others in Santa Ana late last week. Like all acts of terrorism, this action does nothing to advance any cause. It simply escalates violence, pain, and destruction.

Alex Odeh was, by all accounts, a gentle man who spoke passionately for his ideals. Many Americans disagreed with his ideals, particularly his defense of the Palestine Liberation Organization and acts it has committed and sponsored. But no political disagreement can justify this kind of murderous attack particularly in a nation founded on democracy and freedom. We cannot tolerate such terrorist violence in our country. The perpetrators of this act of terrorism must be brought to justice.

I wish to extend my heartfelt condolences to Mr. Odeh's family and friends.

PHYSICIANS GROUP WINS NOBEL PRIZE

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, one of the greatest contributions individual citizens can make in our society is to apply their professional skills to the signal challenges of our time. Very often this is how new insight is brought to bear on old problems.

Thus, it was with great joy that I learned of the award of this year's Nobel Peace Prize to the organization of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. Initiated by Dr. Bernard Lown of Boston and cofounded by Dr. Yevgeny I. Chazov of Moscow, this group has performed a marvelous service. They have successfully taken esoteric discussions of nuclear targeting doctrine out of the realm of chess playing military strategists and into the real world. They have helped us to comprehend what the use of even a fraction of our nuclear weapons would actually mean for you, for me, for our children, our land, our water. They have helped more than any general or tactician to translate into clear and stark terms the utter catastrophe nuclear war would bring.

In so doing, the doctors' group has helped to increase the pressure for mutual, verifiable United States-Soviet arms reductions. In particular, the physicians' group has focussed its efforts on a mutual testing halt, an essential interim step if arms reductions negotiations are not—as in the past—to be outpaced by the deployment of new arms.

I offer this group my heartfelt congratulations and add my hope that our mutual efforts to achieve meaningful arms reductions can finally bear fruit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from Saturday's New York Times on the Nobel Peace Prize Award be included in the RECORD.

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

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE GIVEN TO DOCTORS OPPOSED TO WAR

(By Fox Butterfield)

BOSTON, Oct. 11.—The 1985 Nobel Peace Prize was awarded today to the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, a five-year-old Boston-based group that was jointly founded by American and Soviet doctors.

The physicians group has a membership of 135,000 people in 41 countries. One of its co-founders, Dr. Yevgeny I. Chazov, has been the personal physician of the top Soviet leadership and a member of the Communist Party Central Committee since 1982. He has also been a Deputy Minister of Health since 1968.

After learning of the award today, Dr. Bernard Lown, the American co-founder of the group, immediately urged President Reagan to stop all nuclear testing.

STOP ALL NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

Speaking in Geneva with Dr. Chazov, Dr. Lown said their group was pleased that Moscow began a five-month moratorium on nuclear tests last August and suggested President Reagan could now halt the nuclear arms race "with one stroke of the pen."

"We physicians have a medical prescription" for how to avoid a nuclear holocaust, said Dr. Lown, a professor of cardiology at the Harvard School of Public Health. "Stop all nuclear explosions."

"Now the Americans have a wonderful opportunity and I hope my country takes that initiative and makes nuclear testing stop forever," Dr. Lown told a press conference in Geneva where he and Dr. Chazov had gone for a fifth anniversary meeting of the group.

GROUP CREATED AN AWARENESS

In August, Mikhail S. Gorbachev announced that the Soviet Union was halting all of its nuclear tests until the end of the year and invited the United States to follow suit. American officials declined, characterizing the offer as disingenuous because, they said, the Russians had just completed a round of tests. Officials also said that in the absence of absolute verification, tests are needed for maintaining a viable nuclear arsenal.

The Norwegian Nobel Committee, in announcing the choice of the physicians group, said it had "performed a considerable service to mankind by spreading authoritative information and by creating an awareness of the catastrophic consequences of atomic warfare."

Egil Aarvik, the chairman of the prize committee, linked the decision to the United States-Soviet arms talks in Geneva. "If this award has any message, it is for the two superpowers to come up with results of their negotiations," he told journalists this morning.

It was only the second Nobel Peace prize that involved a Soviet citizen, the earlier one having been given to Andre Sakharov, the dissident physicist and human rights activist, in 1975. At the time, the Soviet press branded the award to Mr. Sakharov a "prize for anti-Sovietism" and forbade him to go to Oslo to collect it.

By contrast, the Soviet press reported the award to the doctors group today less than two hours after it was announced in Oslo, suggesting official pleasure in Moscow that Dr. Chazov had been honored.

Two years ago when Lech Walesa, the leader of the banned Polish trade union Solidarity, was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, the Russian press did not immediately report it but later denounced Mr. Walesa as a moneygrubbing, foul-mouthed demagogue.

99 NOMINEES FOR PRIZE

The award of the prize last year to Desmond Tutu, the South African Anglican bishop and anti-apatheid campaigner, also received little attention in the Soviet media.

The Norwegian prize committee does not make public the reasons for its choices, and in fact, does not even keep a record of its deliberations, according to a Norwegian source close to the committee. This year it had to pick from a record list of 99 nominees that included President Reagan and Elie Wiesel, the chronicler of the holocaust.

The source said the choice of the physicians group was "a safe one." "You don't get too much criticism for choosing a group, there is no personality you can argue about," he explained.

The selection of the physicians organization was something of a surprise, he added, because they were not well-known in Norway.

Dr. Lown, a distinguished cardiologist who developed several machines and drugs to prevent sudden death by heart attacks, said today he hoped the award would mean greater publicity for the International Physicians group.

Dr. Lown has said he first became interested in the nuclear war issue in 1959 after he heard a talk in England by Sir Philip

John Noel Baker, who had just won the Nobel Peace prize himself, on the danger of atomic conflict. On his return to Boston Dr. Lown called together a group of eight doctors in his living room, out of which grew a group called Physicians for Social Responsibility and a special issue of the New England Journal of Medicine devoted to the medical effects of nuclear war. The articles in that issue are still considered one the best sources of information on the consequences of a nuclear war.

Mr. Lown's group lost its momentum in the late 1960's and 1970's, overwhelming by other causes like the Civil Rights movement and the Vietnam war. But in 1979 he decided to try to resurrect it with two younger men, Eric Chivian, a psychiatrist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who was interested in children's fear of nuclear war, and James Muller, an assistant professor of cardiology at the Harvard Medical School who had studied in Russia.

Dr. Lown then arranged the 1980 meeting in Geneva with Dr. Chazov, whom he had met earlier when he was invited to give lectures in Moscow on his medical research.

The group's first international conference, held near Washington in 1981, coincided with the beginning of a new wave of national concern about nuclear war and attracted widespread attention because doctors had not previously been so openly involved in the peace movement.

Although the group's leaders insist they have tried to keep a balanced approach, not tilting toward either Moscow or Washington, there was criticism of the group's naïveté in 1982 when Dr. Muller appeared with Dr. Chazov on an hourlong television program shown across the Soviet Union on the danger of nuclear war. Mr. Muller stressed at the time that the action showed a new willingness by Moscow to seriously debate the nuclear threat.

PROPAGANDA ASPECT DENIED

At a press conference today in Boston, Dr. Muller rejected suggestions that the doctors group has become a propaganda agent for the Soviet Union. "We are a medical organization," he said. "We look at nuclear weapons and what they do to an individual and a country. If the Soviet Government wants to endorse our position, we're pleased," he added, referring to the group's call for a moratorium on all nuclear explosions.

At the news conference, Dr. John O. Pastore, the group's secretary, said it had 28,000 members in the United States, with 60,000 in the Soviet Union. "Physicians in both the Soviet Union and the United States will be very pumped up and proud of receiving this," he said. "What their governments do with this is their business."

The physicians group has proved that doctors around the world agree "that a nuclear war must not be fought and cannot be won," Dr. Pastore said. "Modern medicine will have nothing to offer the victims of a nuclear conflict."

In addition to advocating a ban on nuclear explosions, the group has also called for a verifiable freeze on the development and deployment of all nuclear weapons and a declaration of no-first-use by the world's nuclear powers.

The Nobel Peace Prize carries an award of about $225,000, which will be presented in December.

IRRIGATION WATER MANAGEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, published in the September 1985 issue of the National Geographic magazine is a picture of two men examining a tape used to measure the depth of water in an irrigation field. Their concern is one that could potentially effect all Americans as it involves the depletion of our most valuable and precious commodity.

The caption beneath the print points dramatically to the seriousness of the situation and I quote—

Tale of the tape gets grimmer each year, particularly in the dry regions of western Kansas where irrigation depends mainly on the groundwater of the Ogallala Aquifer. At Colby, Agricultural Engineer Freddie Lamm holds a 300 foot steel tape read by Ground Water Management Chief Wayne Bossert. Some officials estimate that the aquifer will remain in irrigation source for only another 20 to 30 years unless steps are taken to increase conservation.

A HELPFUL STUDY

Mr. President, for this very reason, Servi-Tech Inc., a Kansas based crop consulting firm and the world's largest crop consulting organization employing 125 professional argronomists, has conducted a survey using "on the farm" techniques and found that water savings by sprinkler irrigation ranged from 33 percent to 70 percent of that used by flooding. This is the type of information needed in our efforts to conserve our most precious natural resource—water. Mr. President, I ask that this document be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and made available to all Americans.

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

INTRODUCTION

Servi-Tech Incorporated is the largest crop consulting organization in the United States. This year our 125 professional agronomists will advise farmers in Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado and Nebraska on irrigation water management. These Crop Specialists work intimately with farmers providing guidance and recommendations on nearly every facet of farming. This year they will help farmers farm more efficiently on 750,000 acres with the goal of making each farm operation more profitable.

THE PROBLEM

Farmers are not efficiently utilizing the rapidly declining groundwater reserves of the western Great Plains, particularly the Ogallala aquifer. Economics dictate continued use of relatively wasteful methods of conventional flood irrigation. More efficient methods of irrigating are readily available but the cost on conversion is prohibitive in the current farm economy.

If the present rate of groundwater level decline continues, the economic well-being of farmers and their communities will be further threatened as will the viability of our nation as a food producer and exporter.

OUR POSITION

We have found that flood irrigators often use two or three times the amount of water necessary to supply a crop. Even the most efficient will use 25 percent more water by flooding than with sprinklers. In this document five case studies are reviewed. They compare water use by farmers with land that is both flood and sprinkler irrigated or contrast usage from records before and after conversion to sprinklers. Water savings by sprinkler irrigation ranged from 33 percent to 70 percent of that used by flooding.

Our projections show that at least 772,200 acre/feet (1 acre foot equals 325,848 gallons) of groundwater could be saved annually in southwestern Kansas alone if sprinklers were installed on all irrigated acreage. In addition to sprinklers, there are other water conserving technologies such as special tillage implements, surge valves and trickle irrigation which can be employed in the effort to conserve our groundwater reserves. To succeed, these technologies must become easier for farmers to purchase.

GROUNDWATER

The primary source of groundwater to the western Great Plains is the Ogallala aquifer. For the last thirty years it has been a reliable source of irrigation water but has recently been severely depleted in some areas. This has caused concern in the agriculturally based communities of the region. Depletion date projections run from 20 to 60 years at present usage rates depending on the depth of the aquifer in a particular location. Unfortunately, in many areas it is being depleted about ten times faster than it is replenished by rainfall and streamflow.

In an effort to inform the public of the tremendous water savings available through current technology, our Research Division produced this document. We have drawn upon the findings of Kansas Groundwater Management District No. 3, which covers southwestern Kansas and the records and experiences of our staff located within that district. The district contains 1.8 million irrigated acres and uses 3.6 million acre/feet of water annually, most of which comes from the Ogallala aquifer.

We have compared the conventional flood irrigation method with the most common water conserving method—center pivot sprinkler irrigation. There are other water conserving methods, such as surge and trickle irrigation, but they are not commonly used at this time and we have few records of their efficacy.

DEFINITION AND CONTRAST OF PRIMARY IRRIGATION METHODS

The two irrigation methods most commonly used are flood and sprinkler. Flood irrigation is the predominant method used in most of the areas where we work. Sprinklers are most popular where furrow irrigation is not feasible because the ground is too hilly or too sandy.

Water for flood irrigation is pumped into ditches or pipe. Ditches are earthen or concrete lined and convey water to the field areas to be irrigated. They are dammed just beyond the area to be irrigated and siphon tubes convey water from the ditch into furrows between plant rows or flat areas between border dikes. The pipelines used are made of plastic or light metal and have small adjustable openings, called gates, which are located along the pipe at common furrow spacing distances.

Center pivot sprinklers are used most extensively in the region which we serve. However, there are a few sprinkler systems which move laterally across fields. Center pivot systems are fed by an underground

pipeline emanating from a pump. The systems consist of pipeline mounted on a frame work and wheels. They are propelled by electric motors or hydraulic pressure. They usually cover a circular area, while some can make a square pattern if specially equipped.

Both methods have their advantages and disadvantages which are contrasted below.

FLOOD IRRIGATION

Pros:

(1) The system is simple to operate as there are few moving parts or mechanical devices.

(2) Pumping costs are lower than sprinkler because little pressure is needed.

(3) The method is adaptable to almost any field shape with reasonable slope.

(4) The capital investment is generally lower than sprinkler unless extensive land levelling is needed.

Cons:

(1) This method ultimately uses more water for same crop than sprinkler. In some cases more water is used for one irrigation than is used by a sprinkler in an entire growing season.

(2) Excessive water application leaches plant nutrients like nitrate out of plant root zones cutting fertilizer use efficiency and threatening domestic wells with pollutants.

(3) Water distribution is poorer than sprinkler because of unequal watering depth form top to bottom of field and lateral soaking varies widely with soil type, slope and number of applications.

(4) More time is required to water than by sprinkler.

(5) It is less versatile than sprinkler.

(6) It is labor intensive as gates or siphon tubes must be set by hand. Pipe is carried to field location. Furrows must be made and cared for which requires extra tillage.

(7) Not adaptable to hilly or very sandy ground. Land levelling is usually necessary.

CENTER PIVOT SPRINKLER IRRIGATION

Pros:

(1) It requires little manual labor, as it is self propelled and controlled at a central location. System only needs to be checked once or twice daily.

(2) System can irrigate fields with undulating topography or having a variety of soil types.

(3) Irrigator has control of water application rates and greater flexibility in timing irrigation.

(4) System applies water uniformly across field.

(5) No special tillage is needed with this method. It works well on no-till fields.

(6) Uses less water than flood methods.

Cons:

(1) The initial capital investment for a sprinkler system is high. The cost for the average 130 acre system is about $30,000 and is normally depreciated over ten years.

(2) Pumping costs are higher due to the need for higher water pressure.

(3) Mechanical breakdowns occur and usually require technical expertise in making repairs.

(4) Center pivot systems do not usually utilize whole fields. The attachments that water the field corners are often not cost effective.

(5) Water use efficiency can be cut by wind and runoff if the system is not properly adjusted to field conditions.

OUR FINDINGS

We have long been aware that more water is used by flood than sprinkler irrigation. Our Crop Specialists keep weekly records of their watering recommendations and can closely estimate the amount of water applied to specific fields by knowing field size, well capacity and length of watering time. The most accurate method of determining water use is by metering at the well head. Farmers rarely installed meters in the past but new well permits now require meter installation.

In order to assess the difference in water application rate between sprinkler and flood irrigation we checked the records of some of our specialists in southwestern Kansas where our company has the most experience. They were asked to compare rates of water application of fields that had been converted from flood to sprinkler or to compare water use for the same crop on adjacent fields of similar soil type. In all cases flood used more water to produce the same crop.

Five case studies are reported here. They are all from southwestern Kansas where climatic conditions are generally hot and dry during summer. Annual rainfall ranges from 15 to 20 inches. All of the farms mentioned are located within Kansas Groundwater Management District #3 which is the largest district in Kansas.

Case 1.—Daryl Puckett farm near Ulysses, Kansas, Crop Specialist, Tom Koranek.

Daryl Puckett farms two 100 acre parcels of ground that are near one another, one is sprinkler irrigated and the other flood irrigated. Either field has very little slope, less than one percent, and the soils are a silt loam. In fall 1984 he planted winter wheat on both parcels.

We pre-irrigated the ground before planting to ensure adequate moisture for seed germination. In order to get water across the dry flood field he applied about 9 acre/inches per acre. To pre-irrigate with the sprinkler he applied 1.5 acre/inches. The problem encountered on this first irrigation was that the water was soaked up by the dry soil at the top end of the field to a much greater depth than was necessary. The water did not run to the lower end of the field until the top was saturated causing excessive water use. To finish out the crop on the flood field another 6 acre/inches was applied. This brought the total to 15 acre/inches per acre on the flood field. The sprinkler irrigated field also used another 6 acre/inches after pre-irrigation which brought the total to 7.5 acre/inches per acre used on that field.

Flood irrigation on winter wheat fields uses considerably more water than is necessary for top production. This is largely because of pre-irrigation of very dry soils. The crop depletes all moisture before it is harvested in late June or early July and little rainfall comes during July or August to replenish the soil moisture before planting in September.

In this case we found the farmer used 15 acre/inches water per acre with flood irrigation and 7.5 acre/inches with sprinkler irrigation. Therefore 50 percent less water was used by sprinkler to produce a winter wheat crop. Puckett also noted that his yields were better on the sprinkler field.

Case 2.—Larry Winger farm near Minneola, Kansas Crop Specialists, Rolan Stukenholtz.

Larry Winger converted a field from flood to sprinkler irrigation. He cited an example of when he has grown two crops per year on the field, winter wheat and grain sorghum. The field has more slope than is ideal for flood irrigation and he used two wells together which made the total capacity 650 gallons per minute.

Before converting to a sprinkler, he could only irrigate 70 acres of the field and applied over 30 acre/inches per acre to produce the double crop. His problem was excessive slope which caused water to move too quickly through certain parts of the field. In order to get the water to soak deeply enough on the steep parts he was forced to overwater the rest of the field.

The sprinkler increased his efficiency enough to allow him to water 130 acres with the same two wells. He now applies approximately 20 acre/inches to grow a double crop. The water savings is at least 33 percent and he also reports better yields due to even water distribution.

Case 3.—Robert Newell from near Dodge City, Kansas Crop Specialist, Russell French.

Robert Newell has five similar fields of silt loam soil, two of which are 160 acre flood and three are 130 acre sprinkler irrigated parcels. Specialist Russell French reported that Newell uses about 35 acre/inches of water per acre to produce corn on the flood fields and 20 acre/inches on the sprinkler irrigated fields.

The problem that Newell faces is getting the flood water to soak laterally across the furrows. The water tends to run through steeper parts of the field too fast to penetrate the soil. To get top production from the flood fields he must irrigate more frequently and apply more than is needed by the crop. Consequently, Newell uses about 40 percent less water on his sprinkler irrigated fields to grow a corn crop.

Case 4.—Bill Polkinghorn farm near Dodge City, Kansas Crop Specialist, Randall Brady.

There are two fields which are very level and lie on the flood plain of the Arkansas River east of Dodge City. The flood field has been leveled according to specifications set forth by the Soil Conservation Service for border dike flood irrigation. Polkinghorn grew winter wheat on both fields during the 1984-85 season.

He used 20 acre/inches of water per acre on the flood field versus 6 acre/inches with the sprinkler. Specialist Randall Brady reported that most of the water was consumed in the fall flood irrigation. Only 6 acre/inches of the total 20 were used in spring watering. Planting was delayed on the flood ground until rainfall made it possible in late fall. In the meantime the sprinkler ground was planted and sufficient growth was made to use it for cattle pasture in late fall and early spring. The sprinkler provided Polkinghorn with versatility and a timing advantage over flooding. Besides getting a crop that yielded 20 percent more grain and useful cattle pasture, he used 70 percent less water with sprinkler irrigation.

Case 5.—Dana Lupton farm near Montezuma, Kansas Crop Specialist—Stan Schield.

Lupton converted this field from flood to sprinkler irrigation. The well capacity is 600 gallons per minute. Before installing the sprinkler he could only irrigate 80 acres of grain sorghum on this parcel of land. His main problem was poor water infiltration primarily due to soil compaction. Now due to increased water use efficiency he is able to grow 120 acres of grain sorghum with this well.

Prior to the sprinkler he applied over 18 acre/inches of water per acre to produce grain sorghum and now he only applies about 12 acre/inches. This is a water savings of 33 percent.

CONCLUSIONS

These case histories are but a sampling of the many situations which our people have dealt with. Accurate records are difficult to ascertain on this subject because farmers generally have not kept good records of water use. The weekly records and trained observations of our field staff are probably the best record of any agricultural practices in our service area.

Tom Koranek, Servi-Tech Western Regional Manager, is responsible for some 260,000 acres in western Kansas, western Oklahoma, the Texas Panhandle and southeastern Colorado. He provided some guidelines from his experience for Table 1 which outlines the water needs of important crops in his region and the amounts typically applied by irrigation methods.

Water needs of crops grown in Servi-Tech Western Region contrasted with average application rates in acre/inches per acre for sprinkler and flood irrigation methods.

TABLE 1

Crop:	Total water needs	Average sprinkler	Average flood
Corn	26	20	35
Grain sorghum	20	12	20
Winter wheat	18	12	18
Alfalfa	28	26	36

Koranek pointed out that most of the excessive water use from flood irrigation comes at the first irrigation. He noted that the main problem stems from over-application at the head of the field and under-application at the bottom. In the case of over-application, leachable soil nutrients, like nitrate, are lost from the crop root zone and may eventually contaminate drinking water supplies.

Based on these case studies we can project a large potential water savings in southwestern Kansas by conservatively estimating with the lowest example of 33 percent less water used by sprinkler irrigators. Koranek estimates that 35 percent of the 1.8 million acres in Groundwater Management District No. 3 are sprinkler irrigated and the remaining 65 percent are flood. If 3.6 million acre/feet per year are being extracted from the ground then 772,200 acre/feet per year could be saved by conversion to sprinklers alone.

By encouraging improvement of efficiency on existing sprinkler systems even greater water savings could be realized.

There are also tillage implements such as row dammers and inter-row rippers which increase water infiltration and virtually eliminate runoff.

These water savings projections if extrapolated to the entire Ogallala aquifer would be enormous. Unfortunately, they will never occur if water conserving irrigation equipment remains unaffordable.

THE PEACE CORPS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President. 25 years ago, John F. Kennedy first envisioned a "Peace Corps" during an impromptu speech on the steps of the student union at the University of Michigan. The following year, President Kennedy made that vision a reality by issuing an Executive order establishing this new, independent Agency to help promote peace and friendship throughout the world. Congress subsequently passed the Peace Corps Act, giving the Agency the permanence of statute. Since then, more than 11,000 American volunteers have joined the Peace Corps, including the 6,000 currently working on grassroots, self-help projects in 61 nations around the world.

A PROUD SYMBOL OF AMERICA'S COMMITMENT

The world has changed dramatically over the past quarter of a century. Throughout its existence, however, the Peace Corps has remained constant as a proud symbol of our Nation's commitment to helping people help themselves. In a single month, Peace Corps volunteers touch the lives of over 1 million people. These selfless, dedicated men and woman feed malnourished children, irrigate deserts, plant forests and crops, and build hospitals, schools, and bridges.

Just as importantly, Peace Corps volunteers build bridges between people. When they become members of local villages, they not only share their skills and knowledge—they share themselves. They offer people of other nations a chances to learn about Americans—and they, in turn, come back home with an intimated knowledge of other lands and cultures—knowledge which they share with their families and friends.

A VITALLY NEEDED AGENCY

Twenty-five years ago, Peace Corps was a great idea. Today, it is a vital link in our relations with developing nations, an integral part of efforts to promote world peace, and the source of a vast reservoir of international good will. In a time of dwindling global resources, scarce energy, international tensions, and troubled economies. Peace Corps is needed more than ever before. I urge all my colleagues to join me in wishing the Agency a happy birthday and many happy returns. We stand proud of the thousands of Peace Corps volunteers who, over the past 25 years, have sacrificed and donated their time, knowledge, and skills to helping those who are less fortunate around the world.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNDERSTANDING DIPLOMATIC RAGES

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, in my State of Illinois, we have an exceedingly interesting man, and a great writer for the Chicago Tribune, by the name of Mike Royko. I have been in his company many times. I have read his articles for years. I can honestly represent to the Senate that this man is neither a liberal nor a conservative. He is not a Republican or a Democrat. He is simply a person who profoundly understands the thinking process, the attitudes, the beliefs, the dreams, the hopes, and the aspirations of middle-class America.

He wrote an article yesterday which I would like to read, along with some citations of pertinent Federal statutes that I think might excite some thought process here in Washington.

The article appeared in the Chicago Tribune of October 15, by Mike Royko, and is entitled "Understanding Diplomatic Rages." This is what Mr. Royko says:

UNDERSTANDING DIPLOMATIC RAGES

I think the average American has difficulty understanding high-level diplomatic relations. And there's a good reason for this. Most Americans have common sense and see things in simple but practical terms.

In contrast, many of the people who engage in big-time diplomacy often sound like they're nuts.

There can be no better example of this than the hysterical indignation of President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt.

He's demanding that President Reagan apologize to him. And not just to him personally. He wants Reagan to apologize to his entire country—every man, woman and child. I'm not sure if the apology is supposed to cover camels too.

He's in a terrible snit because our fighter planes intercepted one of his country's airliners and forced it to land in Italy so the fleeing boat hijackers could be arrested.

He says that if he doesn't get an apology, our countries might not be close pals for very long.

And he's not alone. It appears that just about everybody in Egypt feels that way. News stories are filled with accounts of gnashing of teeth and tearing of hair by Egyptians who feel their national honor has been stomped on like a helpless bug.

Mubarak is so upset that he says he has even refused to read a friendly, conciliatory letter that Reagan sent him. If it's not a groveling apology, he doesn't want to be bothered.

That's what I mean about the strange workings of the diplomatic mind.

For the last few days, most Americans thought that we were the ones who were supposed to be mad at Egypt.

And with good cause. It was to Egypt that the four young terrorists finally surrendered after they struck a great blow for their cause by putting a couple of bullets into an elderly, crippled American and tossing him and his wheelchair over the side of a ship.

In our simple-minded way, we thought that people who hijack ships, terrorize the innocent and murder the helpless ought to be brought to justice.

But what did Mubarak do? He said, gosh, he didn't know anybody had been murdered. And by the time he did know, it was too late. He had already let the murderers out of his country. To show what a compassionate guy he really is, though, he said that if

he had known about the murder, he'd have never let them get away.

Right there, you have to wonder what kind of stiff the guy is. The least you would expect is that he'd wait for a head count on the ship before he sends the killers on their way.

But it turns out that what Mubarak did was far worse than being dumb.

Even while the terrorists were still in his country, he knew the murder had been committed. People in his government have admitted it.

So he flat-out lied to us and let the killers sneak out of his country anyway. The reason he lied is that he doesn't want the PLO or any other Palestinian terrorists mad at him.

Let us be charitable for a moment. Let us take the position that it's a tendency of most people to look out for their own hides. And that's what Mubarak was doing.

Fine. As the old saying goes: The Lord can't stand a coward. But he doesn't think much of fools either.

But after he gave shelter to known murderers and provided the known murderers with a plane to fly them to safety, he seems astonished that we wouldn't go along with his self-serving game.

When we saw the chance, we did exactly what we should have done. We intercepted the plane, persuaded it to land and saw that the killers were pinched. It wasn't really any different than cop cars chasing down crooks trying to make a getaway. They don't always have time to get a warrant or a legal opinion.

Now, any self-respecting lying coward would know what to do when caught in his lies and cowardice. He should have the decency to shut his mouth, maybe look sheepish and lie low until it blows over.

But what has Mubarak done? He's howling that we are terrorists for forcing down the plane carrying the murdering terrorists. He's claiming that by catching him in his lies and doing something about it, we have insulted and betrayed him and his entire country.

If that makes sense to Mubarak, maybe he's been out in the Egyptian sun too often without a hat.

Despite the intensity of Mubarak's indignation, I've noticed that he hasn't said a word about rejecting the $2 billion a year in welfare that his country gets from us, without which the Egyptians couldn't survive.

I guess there are some limits to a fellow's nationalistic pride.

That, Mr. President, is an article by a man who understands the thoughts of middle America.

Now, Mr. President, I want to read two pertinent statutes concerning this subject matter. I say to my colleagues who may read this later that the full citations are as follows: The first is United States Code, title 22, section 286e-11, which provides:

ASSISTANCE BY FUND TO ANY COUNTRY HARBORING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISTS

The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the Executive Director of the United States to the International Monetary Fund to work in opposition to any extension of financial or technical assistance by the Supplemental Financing Facility or by any other agency or facility of such Fund to any country the government of which—

(1) permits entry into the territory of such country to any person who has committed an act of international terrorism, including any act of aircraft hijacking, or otherwise supports, encourages, or harbors such person; or

(2) fails to take appropriate measures to prevent any such person from committing any such act outside the territory of such country.

The other section, and an even stronger one, in the United States Code is title 22, section 2371, which reads as follows:

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES WHICH GRANT SANCTUARY TO INTERNATIONAL TERRORISTS; PERIOD OF INELIGIBILITY; NATIONAL SECURITY EXCEPTION; REPORT BY PRESIDENT

(a) Except where the President finds national security to require otherwise, the President shall terminate all assistance under this chapter to any government which aids or abets, by granting sanctuary from prosecution to, any individual or group which has committed an act of international terrorism and the President may not thereafter furnish assistance to such government until the end of the one year period beginning on the date of such termination, except that if during its period of ineligiblity for assistance under this section such government aids or abets, by granting sanctuary from prosecution to, any other individual or group which has committed an act of international terrorism, such government's period of ineligiblity shall be extended for an additional year for each such individual or group.

(b) If the President finds that national security justifies a continuation of assistance to any government described in subsection (a) of this section, he shall report such finding to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

So, Mr. President, that is what Mike Royko says, that is what the Federal statutes say, and I just wish to say this in conclusion:

How much aid did we authorize for Egypt?

For fiscal year 1986 here is what is authorized but not yet appropriated for Egypt. A total of—this is astounding—$2,339,118,000, broken down as follows: $1.3 billion in foreign military sales, all in forgiven loans; $815 million in economic support funds, all in grant form; $2 million for the international military education training program; $213 million under Public Law 480, title I, whereby commodities are given to the Egyptian Government; and $9.118 million in Public Law 480, title II, whereby aid is given to private voluntary organizations to be distributed directly to the Egyptian people.

I want to add, Mr. President, that Egypt is the second-largest bilateral aid recipient in the U.S. Foreign Aid Program.

Mr. President, I say only in conclusion that Illinoisans, and I think Americans generally, and certainly this Senator from Illinois, agree completely with Mike Royko.

I thank the President.

THANKS TO SENATORS GRAMM, RUDMAN, AND HOLLINGS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, this morning I found myself opening the Senate, then in the Chair, but not here. It was like a one-acrobat troupe at the big top.

Therefore, I did not get an opportunity to even briefly thank three very persistent and dedicated men who performed a remarkable service for us in the last few days, and they are Senators GRAMM, RUDMAN, and HOLLINGS. They proved indeed that they are a very dogged, patient, and persistent trio.

I always get a great bang out of the comments that we in the Senate and in Congress could take care of all these vexing budgetary things if we would but use our willpower and self-discipline to attack the deficit.

That will never happen because we have marvelous people sitting in our offices all day long who want money out of the Federal Treasury, and if they do not want money out of the Federal Treasury then they want a tax credit, a tax break, a guarantee, or whatever it may be.

So here we are and we are much like drug abusers in a sense. Our opiate is green in color. It is called money. We cannot say no. That is impossible for us.

So these three Senators have taken the accursed substance from our palsied hands, since we cannot do it ourselves. We have proven that beautifully.

Now the President and Congress will do it if this measure comes to pass and these limits must then be set.

I just want to say that these three fine Senators have pushed us on that course. We owe them a great deal.

It is a very interesting trio, the former NCAA champion boxer from Syracuse, Mr. RUDMAN; the bright economics professor from Texas, Mr. GRAMM; and the man who took his message of fiscal soundness to the American people as a Presidential candidate, which is quite a risk to take in this place, Mr. HOLLINGS; and they are all very long on courage and spirit.

I compliment them. The conference has started. There are some excellent conferees from this Senate from both parties. We should be proud of them. We wish them strength and courage.

I think something very good for America will come out of it all. Thank you.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH WEEK

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, since 1946, the National School Lunch Program has helped make it possible for America's schoolchildren to be served nutritious lunches. I rise today to express my appreciation and support for

51-059 O-86-20 (Pt. 20)

this program on the observance of this week, October 13-19, 1985, as National School Lunch Week.

The National School Lunch Program is the cornerstone of our child nutrition efforts. The record will show that this program has assisted schools in providing minimum daily nutritional requirements to millions of schoolchildren since its inception.

On an average school day in fiscal year 1984, an estimated 23.5 million children participated in the School Lunch Program, compared to 23.2 million children in fiscal year 1983.

Not only is the National School Lunch Program the oldest of our national child nutrition programs, it is the largest. Eligible school and institutions include public schools of high school grades or under, nonprofit private schools of high school grades or under whose average yearly tuition does not exceed $1,500 per student, and nonprofit child care institutions such as orphanages, homes for retarded children, and temporary shelters for runaways.

It is important to note that the National School Lunch Act of 1946 was adopted with the intent of providing all schoolchildren with access to a lunch program. On a matching basis and according to a need formula, we have uniform national guidelines that provide for free, reduced price, and paid meals for our schoolchildren.

While the Federal Government has taken the lead in providing financial assistance for school lunches, States also play a vital role. States are required to contribute as much as 30 percent of the total amount of Federal funds provided for all general assistance and for the three categories of lunch assistance.

In fiscal year 1984, the School Lunch Program served 1.8 billion paid lunches, 248 million reduced price lunches, and 1.7 billion free lunches.

Mr. President, the performance of our educational system has been the subject of much critical review. As the result of widespread concern, there has been a renewed commitment to education, ranging from legislative efforts to enhance educational opportunities, to action at the local level. In that regard, it certainly seems worth remembering that a good nutritional diet is essential if we are to keep our Nation's children healthy and attentive in the classroom.

The National School Lunch Program has proven to be an efficient and effective way to guarantee that the schoolchildren of this country have the benefit of a sound nutrition program. I commend those who are charged with the responsibility of carrying out this effort and I want to reaffirm my support for it.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

(Later the following occurred:)

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet past the hour of 10 a.m. on Wednesday, October 16, 1985, solely for the purpose of reporting the nomination of Anthony G. Sousa, to be reappointed as an FERC Commissioner.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

I personally do not have any objection. But I am constrained to object on behalf of others at least for now. Maybe it can be withdrawn later in the day. But at least for now I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, I appreciate the indulgence of the Senator from Mississippi for allowing us to break into the discussion at this point. I do not want to burden that unduly. I appreciate the comments made by the Senator from West Virginia, the distinguished Democratic leader. I understand the responsibilities of the leader to represent people who may have an objection for whatever reason. But I take this occasion to indicate why it is important, why I made this request, and went to the point of making the request even though I knew that the distinguished Democratic leader would be compelled to object.

Mr. Sousa is a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. That is a five-member board. They are down to three members sitting. Mr. Sousa's appointment is a reappointment. His term expires on Sunday. Following Sunday, FERC does not have a quorum. Even if we get one other nomination cleared and acted on, there is a substantial question as to whether or not that other commissioner could then immediately on next Monday start voting on matters which have been heard before the Commission where they have taken testimony over weeks or months of time, and whether or not the Commission could act with a quorum based upon a Commissioner who had not been a party to the proceedings upon which he would then be ruling.

There is a reason for some sense of urgency with respect to the reappointment of Mr. Sousa. And I would hope that we do find a way in which that can be cleared so that we can act upon Mr. Sousa yet this week, and not run into that situation starting on Monday when the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission would be totally incapable of acting. It is not just large issues that come before that Commission. There are literally thousands of small license applications under PURPA rules, under the Small Hydro Act, and a whole list of different actions that they have to take that are underway and have been underway for months. A lot of people, a lot of the small investors, have a great deal riding upon the ability of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to act in a timely manner. FERC is having a tremendous difficulty dealing with that backlog even without the interruption or without being shorthanded.

So I hope indeed whoever it is who finds it necessary to object today will perhaps find it possible to withhold that objection, or that somehow we will be able to accommodate the fact that the Senate comes in at an unusually early hour which then disrupts the scheduled planning and the scheduled actions of committees. Somehow we have to arrive at an accommodation by which committees which find it necessary to act can hold those necessary meetings even though the Senate at the same time finds it necessary to come in at an unusually early hour.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia, the distinguished Democratic leader for the comments he has made. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for allowing us to make this request and remarks at this time.

(Conclusion of late proceedings.)

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1986

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3037) making appropriations for agriculture, rural development, and related agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, we turn now to the agricultural appropriations bill which we had on the floor yesterday. There was an opportunity on yesterday to consider a few amendments. We resolved some issues which were raised by Senators. We hope today to complete action on this bill. The majority leader has indicated that we need to complete action on this and other appropriations bills. We need to turn to the consideration of the reconciliation bill and other matters that require the action of the Senate.

I hope that Senators will be cooperative today and assist us in completing the bill by presenting their amendments in a timely fashion. I had un-

derstood that the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, was interested in presenting an amendment and that he was here on the floor prepared to do that earlier today. I hope that his amendment could be considered now or any other amendment that could be presented now. We are here. We are open for business and ready to discuss any suggested changes in the bill that Senators choose to bring up at this time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 778

(Purpose: To strike out provisions crediting user fees to the Food and Drug Adminstration)

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] proposes an amendment numbered 778.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 57, beginning with the colon in line 12, strike out through "expended" in line 15.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, this amendment simply stated calls for a deletion from the bill of the provisions with respect to user fees for drug applications to the Food and Drug Administration. This is a matter which occupied some attention at the full committee markup and at that time an amendment was offered by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], which would have prohibited the imposition of any program of user fees. A substitute amendment was adopted by the full committee. It is our thought that the best approach on this issue would be to have this matter proceed to conference without any lanuguage entered on the Senate side. Senator LAUTENBERG has agreed to that according to information provided to me, and I have discussed this matter with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Senator COCHRAN of Mississippi. It is our thought that this would be the best approach at this time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania brings to the attention of the Senate a suggested change in this bill which I think is a good one to make. We were confronted in our markup in the Appropriations Committee with a suggestion first, I think, raised by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] about writing in a provision that would prohibit the Food and Drug Administration from implementing regulations imposing user fees on the approval process where drugs are certified to be in compliance with FDA regulations. Of course, this committee does not have jurisdiction over the legislation that is said to give the FDA the power and authority to implement user fee regulations. We simply appropriate funds to permit the Food and Drug Administration to carry out its duties and responsibilities. We do not purport to write in our appropriations bills their authorities, such as the authority to impose user fees. So the Senator does make a very good point; since the bill as it now is drafted contains language that does restrict and impose conditions on the imposition of user fees, it is not appropriate and should be deleted.

In the markup, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] wanted to have language included in the bill which would in effect prohibit user fees from being imposed. While this Senator argued against that amendment in the markup session, it appeared that a consensus existed for some kind of language to be included and so it was agreed in the full committee that there would be some language in the bill on that subject. But I think, since we have all had a chance to look at it and realize that the House has language on this subject in its bill, it may be better for the Senate not to try to solve this problem with language in its appropriations bill and try to work out some solution to the problem if we can during conference; if not, leave to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, the committee of legislative jurisdiction, the task of deciding whether or not congressional action is needed in this area.

I have a letter from Senator ORRIN HATCH, chairman of the committee, which is also signed by Senator KENNEDY, the ranking minority member, on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have included in the RECORD at this point a copy of that letter.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, October 3, 1985.

Senator THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing as Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources to request that you delete from H.R. 3037, the Agricultural, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 1986, that provision in Title V confirming by implication the Food and Drug Administration's announced plan to impose user fees for the approval of pharmaceutical applications.

As you are aware, federal policy under 31 U.S.C. Sec. 9701, the user fee authority for federal agencies, is that such fees should not be charged for governmental services which benefit the general public. The FDA's proposed levying of user fees in the pharmaceutical approval process, which insures the marketing of safe and effective drugs, raises doubts that this policy is being followed.

We very much share your desire that additional funds be made available to the FDA to improve and shorten the drug approval process. However, the imposition of user fees, even if a portion of them is to be devoted to this purpose, is an unusual step which we feel should be subjected to Labor and Human Resources Committee oversight.

Therefore, we request that you delete the referenced language from the FY 1986 appropriations bill, and that you support instead language prohibiting the use of appropriated funds for any program of FDA user charges for the processing of pharmaceutical applications. A stay of the FDA program in this manner would give the authorizing committee the opportunity to thoroughly review the matter in the context of normal committee deliberations.

We welcome your consideration of this request and, of course, would be glad to discuss it further with you.

Sincerely yours,

ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman.
EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
Ranking Minority Member.

Mr. COCHRAN. We also, however, have received a communication from the administration on this subject. The Secretary of Health and Human Services, Margaret Heckler, has written to me as chairman of the subcommittee expressing hope that the authority of the Food and Drug Administration to impose user fees be protected and that the Congress not attempt to prohibit the imposition of user fees by this agency.

To complete the record, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Secretary Heckler's letter be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
Washington, DC, October 1, 1985.

Hon. THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. COCHRAN: The Administration strongly endorses language adopted during Senate Appropriations Committee consideration of H.R. 3037, FY 1986 agriculture appropriations, which would permit the Food and Drug Administration appropriation to be credited initially with up to $5 million from user fees. This is language which was

proposed in the President's budget, and we urge you to reject any attempt on the floor to delete the provision from H.R. 3037 or to amend the bill to prohibit the FDA from crediting to its appropriation user fee collections.

As you are aware, the FDA has proposed regulations to implement user fees for new drug applications filed by both domestic and foreign pharmaceutical companies. While the agency's activities protect consumers, industry clearly receives marketing benefits from regulations as well. The regulations proposed by the FDA are being developed under the authority of the user Charge Act (32 U.S.C. 9701). The resources obtained through the charges will be used to enhance productivity and thus accelerate the New Drug Review process.

Accordingly, it is our belief that implementation of the user fee regulations at the Food and Drug Administration will benefit the public and will aid in our efforts to reduce the deficit. We are hopeful the Senate will reject any attempts to modify the language adopted by the Appropriations Committee.

Sincerely,

MARGARET M. HECKLER,
Secretary.

Mr. COCHRAN. With the statement of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and the indication that he has discussed this matter with the Senator from New Jersey, who is also interested in the matter, I am prepared to recommend to the Senate that we accept the amendment, and I congratulate the Senator for bringing this to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRIBLE). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have had an opportunity to discuss this with the minority staff and it is my understanding the minority has no objection to the amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his statement and for yielding to me to present this brief amendment.

I would just like to add a word or two on the underlying facts relating to the fact that there is some $94 million spent a year in developing new chemical entities and obtaining FDA approval for marketing of such new products. This research is vital for saving lives and working against illnesses and disease.

There is a real concern that certification user fees will be a regulatory cost requirement imposed in addition to these expenditures which would discourage this kind of research.

It is also a fact that there is no other industry which pays the Federal Government any such fee as part of fulfilling the regulatory process; and since this is a tax on innovation that directly benefits mankind, it seems to me inappropriate that the fees be imposed.

By deleting this language from the Senate bill, I concur with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that the best process is to leave it to conference. The House already has language.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to indicate that I too am concerned about the proposal being forwarded by the Food and Drug Administration to impose user fees on the drug approval process.

Last year, Congress enacted a compromise bill providing the brand-name pharmaceutical companies with greater patent protection for more recently introduced brand-name drugs. In exchange for this added protection, generic drug companies were provided with simplified and expedited drug approval procedures.

Now, the FDA is proposing to upset this delicate arrangement by instituting "user fees" for evaluating drug approval applications. Because generic drug companies are small—compared to the multinational brand-name pharmaceutical companies—in most cases they would be unable to introduce new generics because they would be unable to pay the relatively large application fees. This would completely undermine the important legislation we enacted last year.

Mr. President, for these reasons I support the amendment being offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] and hope the House language, prohibiting the imposition of user fees, is adopted in conference.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I want to indicate my support for the amendment to delete the crediting of Food and Drug Administration user fee revenues.

FDA has published in the Federal Register a notice of a proposed rulemaking to initiate a program of user fees. The comment period on this proposal ends on November 4.

During Appropriations Committee consideration of this bill, I proposed that the FDA should be prohibited from moving ahead with its user fee proposal. A provision banning these user fees was included in the bill passed by the House of Representatives. Instead of a prohibition on user fees, the Senate Appropriations Committee decided to earmark a portion of any user fee imposed for FDA. Although I support an increase in resources available to FDA for improvements in the drug approval process, I do not believe that the Senate committee's approach is a satisfactory means of resolving this issue. This is a complicated issue and should be reviewed by the Labor and Human Resources Committee.

I support the deletion of the earmarking of user fee revenues from the fiscal year 1986 agriculture appropriations bill. I hope that the conference committee, which will work out the differences between the House and Senate versions of this bill, will accept the House position to block the imposition of FDA user fees. The committees with oversight responsibility for the FDA need to look carefully at the implications of user fees before they are imposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 778) was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPECTER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer, but I should like to make a preliminary statement.

The amendment I am offering developed out of the action we took last week on the debt limit bill. Last week, the Senate took a far-reaching step and made a number of changes in the Congressional Budget Act, with one purpose in mind, and that is to reduce the staggering deficits.

In view of that amendment to the debt limit bill, we face an entirely new budget ball game.

Are deficits that dangerous? To answer that question, Mr. President, talk to any farmer.

The Federal Government is borrowing more than two-thirds of all the new savings in the country. That borrowing drives up interest rates, and the farmer pays the bill. He must borrov to plant a crop; he must borrow to buy essential equipment; he must borrow to buy feed; he must borrow to pay taxes; he must borrow to pay insurance. American farmers move on credit, and the price of credit is the interest rate. Thanks to the Federal deficit, that interest rate is killing the farmer.

Hold on to your hats, because the worst is yet to come. Not only is the Federal Government absorbing most of this country's savings, but also, we are borrowing from foreign sources. This foreign borrowing means that foreigners sell their currencies to buy the dollar. They sell the pound, the mark, the lira, the yen, the Canadian dollar. All those drop in value. The American dollar goes up. Who does this hurt? Answer: the farmer, because the farmer is our big exporter. He must sell his soybeans and wheat and corn abroad in order to live.

So an overvalued dollar means that American cotton or wheat or soybeans cost more in comparison to their foreign-grown counterparts. We sell less; they sell more; and the farmer's income takes a beating.

So, how do farmers benefit when we start to bring the deficit under control? Their interest costs go down. They sell more overseas. The price they get goes up. Why? Because the dollar will drop in value. If economists can agree on anything, it is that the one way to bring down the value of the dollar, and keep it down, is to reduce the deficit. By that one action, reducing the deficit, Congress would do more to help the Nation's farmers than any other single action we could take.

So, let us start to cut the deficit now and, in the process, make some progress for the Nation's farmers.

The problem for the Nation's farmers, in addition to the high-valued dollar, is overproduction.

Unfortunately, what we provide in the bill before us—and as we have provided year after year in the 28 years I have been here—is programs that help the farmers produce more. Those programs have a good motive, and the individual farmer who is assisted feels it; but, overall, farmers suffer.

Flood control, pest eradication—those are good programs. But if we cut down moderately those programs—and that constitutes a significant part of this bill, a very big part of the bill—what will happen with modest cutbacks? The farmer will produce less, and that is precisely what our farmers must do. They are drowning in their surplus production. They are producing too much. The Department of Agriculture, highly competent people, go out to help the farmers produce more and more. The more they produce, the more they suffer.

Mr. President, this money we appropriate comes from the general revenues of the United States. It is not a self-contained trust fund. I believe that farmers would not want to be exempt from cuts. They recognize the dangers posed by $200 billion deficits and the benefits from reducing those deficits.

Mr. President, I am going to make a prediction. Talk to any farmer. Ask them whether they thought the Department of Agriculture could operate next week with 4 percent less money, if other Federal departments were going to face the same type of cuts. I believe that not only would they say, "Yes;" I believe they would ask, "What took you so long to get to it?"

In that answer, I believe they would be joined by virtually every citizen of this country. Once again, they are ahead of us. When I go back to Wisconsin, what do I hear? "A $2 trillion national debt—you've got to be kidding. A $200 billion deficit—get it down." Should we wait until next year? No. Start now. We should have started yesterday.

Farmers have an instinctive feeling that these deficits are going to eat away at our economy until little is left. They do not feel comfortable with the idea of the United States becoming a large debtor country. They may not understand the fine points of economics, but they know that we are going to have to pay a heavy price down the road for these deficits. And they are right.

We should not wait until next year to make a start at cutting deficits. Who knows what will happen next year? Let us start now. By making these cuts in new obligational authority, we will be making our job next year a lot easier. Like most Federal departments, the Department of Agriculture takes some time to spend the money we appropriate. Each account spends out at a different rate. But if we cut $1.1 billion in new obligational authority for fiscal year 1986, we will save somewhere in the neighborhood of $200 million—not a great deal—in outlays for Department of Agriculture spending down the road in 1987 and subsequent years, most of it in 1987.

We have set ourselves a target deficit of $144 billion or $151 billion if you add the statistical adjustment for next year. Unless we start the process now, we will be faced with a Herculean task next year. In fact, cutting outlays of perhaps $40 billion next year could provide to be all but impossible unless we start cutting budget authority this year and not wait until next year.

AMENDMENT NO. 779

(Purpose: To reduce amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by 4 percent)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 3037, the agriculture, rural development, and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1986 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] proposes an amendment numbered 779.

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount of budget authority appropriated, or otherwise made available, by this Act for each appropriation account shall be reduced by 4 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my amendment is straightforward. It speaks for itself:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the amount of budget authority appropriated, or otherwise made available, by this act for each appropriation account shall be reduced by 4 percent.

Mr. President, this amendment, and I will repeat it, would provide for a 4-percent cut in each appropriation account that is before us.

Through this amendment, I am proposing an across-the-board cut of 4 percent as I say in each and every account in this bill. Enactment of this amendment into law would mean that the agriculture appropriations bill that we approve would approximate—in budget authority—the President's budget for fiscal year 1986.

I understand they are now willing to sign off on the bill that is before us, but I think we should go back to their initial budget in view of the action we took just last week.

The amount of budget authority in the bill, as reported to the Senate, is $24,848,619,000. This exceeds the President's budget by $1,011,642,000.

Again, the purpose of my amendment is to cut this bill—leaving no account untouched—down to the level originally set forth in President Reagan's fiscal year 1986 budget proposals.

Mr. President, there was a popular song during the Great Depression entitled, "Brother, Can you Spare a Dime?" My amendment is much more modest than that. It simply asks, Uncle Sam, can you spare a mere 4 cents out of every $1 in the USDA budget for fiscal year 1986? I think the answer to that one should be: Brother, you bet I can—and I hope a majority of my colleagues agree with me.

And believe me, there is plenty to work on in each account. Where should we start? Administrative costs would be an ideal place. Mr. President, let me give you some examples of what I have in mind.

The Office of the Secretary of Agriculture has 92 full-time employees. The bill before us proposes to spend better than $2,500 for each and every employee in that small office for travel. Surely, the Secretary can cut more than 4 percent from this.

The Advisory Committees provided for in the bill before us have a combined travel budget of about $497,000 out of a total budget of $1.3 million, or nearly 40 percent for travel. Is there anyone who doubts that this cannot be cut by much more than 4 percent?

USDA's Office of Governmental and Public Affairs has a staff of 150. If vacancies are not filled for 1 year in the Office of Governmental and Public Affairs this Office alone would save around $200,000. A cut greatly exceeding 4 percent is certainly within reason.

These are but a few examples of the kinds of cuts I have in mind.

What else does my amendment do? Mr. President, it gets us started down the responsibility road. It is not clear what the conference will do with the limitations on the deficit the Senate put into the debt limit bill. But, clearly, limitations are sure to be a fact of life.

And now is the time to get moving on the budget cuts. Do we have to increase taxes? This Senator believes the answer to that question is, very probably yes. But more taxes cannot

begin to do the job alone. We must cut spending sharply.

My amendment helps us face the realities of life with tough limitations on overall spending. To quote that well-known television ad, "You can pay me now or you can pay me later." Mr. President, I would paraphrase that slightly, in this way: "You can pay me now or you can pay me a lot more later."

Acceptance of my amendment means that we begin paying now and thereby avoid paying a lot more later. And by later, I have in mind next year, when some kind of sequestering process will begin.

Let us get started now. That is what my amendment enables us to do.

And there is one other key point, Mr. President. My amendment enables us to go forward under the banner of congressional priorities. As I have made clear, my amendment would cut—across the board—4 percent in budget authority from each appropriation account in this bill. We are, in other words, dealing with our own priorities, those debated and agreed upon by our Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee.

So in some cases, Mr. President, we would be below the President; in some cases we would be above the President; but they are the priorities established by the Senate and the Senate's committee, not the priorities established by the President.

Doesn't this preserve congressional involvement and prerogatives in a positive and constructive way? I think so. The approach embodied in my amendment keeps Congress in the ball game and lets us call the shots.

Mr. President, this amendment is the first step. I expect to work with other Senators to offer a series of amendments to every appropriations bill that comes before the Senate in the next few weeks. In those bills where the President's recommendations are low we will propose to proceed on the same principle embodied in this amendment. That is, we will preserve the Senate committee priorities but at the President's recommended overall level for the agencies in the bill. Where the President's recommendations are higher as in the proposed military spending and foreign aid, we will still retain the Senate committee priorities but propose an amendment at the lower of the Senate proposal, the House proposal, or possibly the 1985 actual level.

Mr. President, this amendment represents the right medicine at the right time. Let us not wait for the patient to get sicker and then have to call the doctor from the White House down the street to operate. Let us do the job ourselves. Let us fill our own prescription and do it now.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLOP). The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I have a great deal of respect for my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and I share his view that we need to give effect to the rhetoric that we all engage in about reducing the deficit. We need to do something about the deficit, not just talk about it. So I respect what he is trying to do, and that is to force the Senate to make reductions on the spending side of the ledger, so that we can bring this budget closer in balance, that we can change the habit that Congress has had for many years to overspend.

So, I feel as though I am one of those in the Senate who is sympathetic to the effort that he is making, and I share many of the thoughts and beliefs that he has about the serious consequences of runaway spending and the fact that we are going to cause more economic difficulties by having and running up these budget deficits. We need to change that approach. We need to do a better job of controlling spending.

Having said that, though, I do have to disagree with the proposal that he makes today on this bill, and I do so not because I object to the effort to reduce the cost of Government programs. We are all trying to find ways to cut back on the spending side. This committee, as a matter of fact, has already gone through all of the accounts that are funded in the bill in an effort to identify those which could sustain reductions without jeopardizing those who depend and benefit from the programs.

We have, I think, made some unpopular political decisions in doing that. As an example, we have made a decision to recommend, and this decision has been sustained by the full committee, a 40-percent reduction in the funding of the rural housing programs that are administered by the Farmers Home Administration, and that is no fun politically. It really is not, because there are a lot of unmet housing needs out there in the countryside. A lot of people live in houses that are not adequate. I suggest that in my States we have a more serious problem in this area than any other State in the Union per capita, as a percentage of our total population.

So, it pains me personally to be here on the floor of the Senate today managing a bill which contains a reduction of that kind on the spending side. But it is that kind of change that we are recommending to the Senate today, and in absence of the Senator's suggested 4-percent across-the-board cut, we are making some substantial reductions in the spending that is under the jurisdiction of this committee. What would happen then, if we agreed now to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, if we would impose an additional 4-percent cut on that program, which has already sustained a 40-percent reduction.

So I disagree with the across-the-board nature of the reduction and the fact that it is a large across-the-board cut, a 4-percent cut, because it will do an inordinately large amount of damage to some of these accounts which have already sustained big cuts. In particular, Mr. President, I think of the brucellosis account under the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service. This is an infection in cattle that we are trying to eradicate. We have embarked upon a 5-year program to eradicate this dreaded infection. It costs money. It has a devastating economic impact on those in the cattle industry. It escalates the cost of food to the consumer.

We are trying to ensure that this program is carried on in an effective way, but we have had to reduce the funding from the House level by about $10 million, only because of budget constraints. So this is another example of an account, if you then impose another 4 percent cut on the Brucellosis Program, you have set that program back to the point where I do not think you can achieve eradication in 5 years, as the Department of Agriculture is trying to do. What you would have on your hands then is an effort that would be ineffective. We would be spending money, but it would not be enough to do the job, and we would just see this problem continue unabated then for a year, 2, 3, or 4 more years. Who knows.

But the fact is that if we are going to make cuts, if we are going to make changes on the spending side, I think we need to be selective. We need to look at the individual accounts, because they are not all alike.

In this bill, for instance, we have the nutrition programs. You can just put your pencil to paper and figure it up. If you put a 4-percent cut on the Women, Infants, and Children Feeding Program, what you would do, in effect, you would actually reduce the number of people who could be served by this program by 120,000. So what you are saying to 120,000 poor women, infants, or children, who are not able to provide for their own nutritional needs without assistance from the Government, is that they are off the program, and they are on their own.

We have decided to recommend to the Senate, as a committee, that this program be funded at a level that would provide nutrition assistance to the same number of persons who were served during fiscal year 1985. We are trying to maintain the same caseload.

That is level funding, in effect. We are freezing that program. We are not increasing that program. What we are trying to do is just maintain the current level of service. And we are doing that in all these nutrition programs. We can afford that under the budget resolution passed by the Congress.

To accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, you would actually be reducing the number of those to be served by these nutrition programs, and you are talking about hundreds of thousands of poor citizens who benefit from the Child Nutrition Program, from the Women, Infants and Children Program, the Food Stamp Program, and to the Commodity Supplemental Food Program where commodities are donated to the elderly. These are the people who need help the most, and we are treating them just the same as we are treating beneficiaries of other programs in this bill.

I think if we are going to make substantial reductions in spending, which this committee says it already has—I contend we already have made substantial reductions—then it should be done on a case-by-case basis, an account-by-account basis.

Another program, Mr. President, which would come under the knife for a bigger cut now, after having already sustained large budget reductions, is the Special Milk Program. The Special Milk Program was originally designed, as everybody knows, to encourage the consumption of fluid whole milk by children in schools and summer camps. The authority for that program is the Child Nutrition Act. This week we are celebrating School Lunch Week, October 13 through 18. I made some remarks earlier in the day on that subject. I know the Senator from Wisconsin has supported this and other programs, as well. But adopting his amendment would cut the Special Milk Program by 4 percent, and it is already down from $17,600,000 in 1985 to $11,500,000 this year. We have already made a reduction of $6 million.

I can remember, whenever this bill would come to the floor, Senators, and Congressmen, too, in the other body when I served there, would offer amendments to increase the appropriation. It was a tough vote not to vote to increase it. I think I used to vote to increase that appropriation, because it is a good program. I think it serves a very important need, and it has been a contributor to the improved health of schoolchildren all over the country.

This is another example, though, of a program that has already been cut. And to just come in, without concentrating the effort to identify waste or fraud, ineffective programs or programs that are not working and should be modified or should be reduced, in terms of their level of funding, just to make an across-the-board 4-percent cut would be, I think, injurious to those programs that already have sustained large reductions.

We are confronted today in the agriculture sector with a crisis in the farm credit area. We have tried as a committee to analyze what can be done in terms of support for the Farmers Home Administration credit program to make it more sensitive, to ensure that there are enough personnel in county offices to handle applications for loans, to monitor the caseload, to try to do a better job, really, of helping the farmers who are in distress and who need credit assistance and cannot get credit from traditional lending sources. And what do we see? In my State, we have a RIF going on right now, a reduction in force, in the county Farmers Home Administration offices because of budget constraints. At a time when the problem is getting worse, the number of farmers who are turning to the Farmers Home Administration for loans is getting higher. We have tried to analyze that account, that program, to see how much money is needed for salaries and expenses.

Mr. President, we looked at the amount of money included in the bill of the other body for salaries and expenses of the Farmers Home Administration, and found that in our judgment it would be inadequate to meet current needs—needs that are reflected in more borrowers coming to the Farmers Home Administration because of inability to get adequate credit elsewhere from traditional sources.

The House of Representatives has in its bill, we think, less money than is really going to be needed to provide for the number of personnel needed to handle the loan portfolio of the Farmers Home Administration for this coming fiscal year. So we have provided an increase of $38 million over the other body's recommended level to fund personnel which are required to manage the portfolio which now exceeds $60 billion. If we agree with the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, the Senate would be imposing a 4-percent reduction in this critical area, an area of critical need, at a time when more personnel are needed, not less; when we have a bigger job to do, not a smaller one. I urge the Senate to agree that it would be inappropriate to impose a 4-percent reduction in the Farmers Home Administration account where we are trying to provide assistance in the farm credit crisis. These are the farmers who are the most distressed, who are the least able to deal with the problems of low commodity prices, imbalance in the value of the dollar which causes us to have difficulty exporting our products now overseas, lower land costs, land values which make it difficult to obtain the credit that is needed to continue to operate many of the farms in the country today.

So what I am trying to do, Mr. President, is to illustrate that there are some accounts funded in this bill that are very sensitive to further reductions. Some have already sustained substantial cuts in the levels of funding for next year. I have mentioned a few of those. Others are in particular need of additional funding next year, because of changes in circumstances, but what the Senator seeks to do is to treat all of them just alike, all of the accounts in this bill just alike, whether they have sustained cuts or not, whether the programs are important and needed, whether they are critical to the survival of certain citizens in this country, whether it is a nutrition program or assistance program that provides credit to continue operating a farm, or providing jobs.

I will make one additional point, Mr. President. That is that this bill is within the section 302(b) allocation under the Budget Act, and therefore it is consistent with the previously passed budget resolution agreed upon by Senate-House conferees earlier this year. We are bringing to the floor of the Senate today a bill that reflects the concern of the Senate for budget restraint, for spending restraint. We bring to the floor a bill that has been shaped through discussion at hearings, through subcommittee markup, where Senators who are on this subcommittee carefully have reviewed all of the accounts, the needs, reviewed the guidelines and targets set in the budget resolution and have decided that these are the levels of funding that are supported by the evidence at hearings, by the facts as they exist today that meet our obligations under the budget resolution.

So we hope the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin. This bill is not over budget. It represents restraint. It is sensitive to the needs of those who are served by the programs funded in this bill. So I urge the Senate to reject the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in response to my good friend from Mississippi, the chairman of the subcommittee and the manager of the bill, there is nobody in the Senate on either side of the aisle for whom I have more admiration and respect than the Senator from Mississippi. He has done a marvelous job in our Appropriations Committee. He has again and again spoken out on the floor in behalf of the farmer very eloquently in terms I could warmly support. I think he spoke the truth when he said the subcommittee has made some painful and some useful cuts in the ag-

ricultural bill before us, as well as some necessary increases.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I do think that if we are going to cut we have to cut and we cannot make exceptions. We cannot say, "Well, we have to cut housing or we are going to cut military, we are going to cut foreign aid but we are not going to cut the farmers."

As I say, the farmers are the ones who will benefit more than anybody else if we can straighten out this budget deficit. All of us recognize that. The interest cost is a huge cost for the farmer. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is that sales overseas are being slaughtered, killed, by the bloated dollar which is the result of our deficit.

Now, Mr. President, let me answer the distinguished Senator from Mississippi one for one.

On page 36 of the committee report, brucellosis is discussed and the Senator from Mississippi points out that my amendment would make a 4-percent cut which would be very painful.

The fact is that the committee went 6 percent over the President's budget, roughly 6 percent of the brucellosis account. My amendment would still be over the President's budget.

With all due respect for Members of the Senate, the true expertise has to be in the Department of Agriculture. Sometimes they are wrong, but on matters that are technical affecting brucellosis and these other areas, they have the personnel; they devote their whole life to this; they have fine people down there. They recommended that we get along on an amount of money that is substantially less than what I propose in my amendment, and a great deal less, of course, than what the committee recommended.

Now, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi also raises the Women, Infants and Children Nutrition Program, a program which is a very good program. I support that program and almost every other Member of the Senate supports it. It is a good program. But, again, on page 97 of the report, the figures that are given there show that we are $30 million over the President in my amendment, after my amendment is adopted. It is not as much over as the committee is, but well over what the President has proposed.

The Senator from Mississippi also mentioned the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. The Commodity Supplemental Food Program is another program which the committee greatly increased. They increased it from less than $25 million in 1985 to $37 million, about a 50-percent increase in 1 year.

The experience of all of us in the Senate shows that by and large if you make that kind of increase in 1 year it is too much. My amendment would simply cut slightly the committee recommendation from $37 million down to $35.5 million. It is still far, far, far above what we did in 1985, and a big increase as the committee recommends. So it would be a modest cut.

Mr. President, I do not think there is anybody in the Senate who can speak about cutting milk programs or dairy programs with greater pain than the Senator from Wisconsin. I realize that special milk is something that helps our State, not only from the standpoint of helping our children but helping our farmers. We are the No. 1 dairy State in the country. We produce a large proportion of all dairy products produced in this country, depending on whose statistics you take, about 20 or 25 percent of all that is produced. It is the very heart of our farm program.

But I think we can recognize, as pointed out on page 97, that this reduction that we propose is a reduction which is in a large program. I wish I could exempt my State, but I do not think I can do so without discrediting this amendment. I think we can justify spending more for special milk. But when we have the kind of deficit we have, we have to make sacrifices.

On page 60 of the report, the Senator from Mississippi discussed farm credit. He pointed out that the Farm Credit Administration is going to have to manage a $60 billion portfolio. Of course, it is not $60 billion that has to be reduced or is going to be reduced or anything like it. We have to reduce the personnel necessary to handle that enormous amount of money, that credit, and it takes a number of people to do that, a very large number.

What we are doing here is to make a modest 4 percent reduction.

Mr. President, President Reagan has often spoken out about how important it is for us to get the private sector involved. I have had some experience in my State with farm disasters and other areas where we have called on the banks to provide volunteer expert assistance. The banks have always responded and responded very well. It seems to me that to the extent it is necessary to call on the private sector for volunteer help in this area that is so crucial, and particularly because bankers are so concerned in the farm areas because they by and large are agricultural banks, it seems to me we can put far more emphasis on bringing the volunteer help into this area and recognize that we can handle the problem of people who work for the Farm Credit Administration being called upon to work harder, put in longer hours. As I say, the cut that I am making here is not a cut in the credit available to the farmers or the procedures that would be available to them.

I cannot resist pointing out that as far as farm credit is concerned, what the farmers need is lower interest rates, more available credit. The way to get that is to get the deficit under control. There is nothing that would help farm credit more than to cut the deficit and we cannot make an exception of farm credit or WIC or any other programs, in the judgment of this Senator. We have to cut everybody equally and fairly.

I would like to point out, Mr. President, one more item with respect to farm credit. The President recommended $244 million for Farmers Home Administration. The committee recommended $398 million. That is an enormous increase for salaries and expenses. That is an increase of 50 percent.

What my amendment would do would provide $382 million or a very large increase, very nearly 50 percent—in fact, more than 50 percent—over what the President recommended. As we all know, as I have said, the Department of Agriculture makes these recommendations to the President and represents the top expertise in our Government. They have thousands of people who specialize in this, who do nothing else. They have good judgment. The committee is going far more than 50 percent over what they recommend and what the President recommends. So my proposal would cut back slightly from $398 to $382 million, compared to the President's recommendation of $144 million. It still leaves plenty.

In summary, Mr. President, I have great respect for my friend from Mississippi, but I must say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin still makes it possible for the Department of Agriculture to function and to function effectively but to play its part in holding down the deficit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am going to vote to table the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. A 4-percent across-the-board cut in the agriculture appropriations bill has an obvious appeal in our present fiscal situation but it is bad budgetary policy.

I would be last to deny that there are programs in this bill that might be further reduced. Anyone familiar with my record knows that I am a strong critic of current agriculture policy.

Far too many of our farm programs make use of outdated, excessive, and poorly targeted subsidies. The results have been disastrous—inflated consumer prices combined with plummeting farm income and growing concentration of farmownership. So there is plenty of room for further reform and economy in our farm programs.

The problem is that an across-the-board cut does not really address these issues. This amendment does not apply just to programs that need to be reformed or curtailed; it applies liter-

ally across the board. Like the rain, the 4-percent reduction would fall on the just and the unjust alike. True, it would cut some farm subsidies by 4 percent, but it would also cut funds for Soil Conservation, School Lunches, Women, Infants, and Children's Nutrition, Food Stamps, Food for Peace, and other important programs.

Finally, Mr. President, I believe the Appropriations Committee has done a responsible job in drafting this legislation. The bill is within the Agriculture Subcommittees' allocation under the budget resolution. It is $12,471,135,000 below the fiscal year 1985 levels; it is $8,363,653,000 below the administration's request; and it is $8,272,282,000 below the House allowance. So I think the committee has produced a pretty tight bill, on the whole. If further reductions are, indeed required, the place to make them is in the committees—not on the floor with an across the board meat cleaver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I rise in support of the committee report. I believe it is well done and treats all areas fairly. I have heard the opposition speak and I have followed the arguments quite carefully.

I do not think it is necessary that we have to cut everything equally. I think there are programs that are good and there are some programs that are less good.

For example, if the Senator comes on the floor with an amendment to cut foreign aid by 8 percent, I will support him. But I am not going to be on the floor to support a cut of 4 percent for children's milk. So you cannot treat all these areas the same.

First of all, I would like to associate myself with all the points raised by my chairman, but I would like to add a few others.

Conservation, which is the lifeblood of this Nation, has already been cut $25 million. Another 4-percent cut would reduce that even more. A 4-percent cut would cut another $32 million from conservation programs.

A 4-percent cut would cut $16 million from salaries and expenses in the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. President, there is trouble in the Farm Belt, real, genuine trouble. It has been reported that up to one-third of the farmers today are not creditworthy. That means they cannot borrow money. So, to meet the problem, to meet what is going on out there, we have to have personnel to service these loans. This is absolutely necessary. When we talk about cutting programs, we are cutting the very heart of this country—we are cutting women, children, poor farmers. These are the areas that should be increased, not decreased.

I am going along with the bill, but my preference, if I had it, would be to increase some of these items. If the able Senator from Wisconsin wants to put out a bill on this floor to cut foreign aid 8 percent, not 4 percent, I will join him. But we cannot treat everybody alike. These are people programs we are dealing with here today. I think it would be unjust, unfair, and unreasonable to cut it any further than we have.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, could the Senator withhold that suggestion?

Mr. HELMS. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I understand there are Senators who are not available at this time. They are at a function which is occurring in Washington. They will not be back in the Chamber for at least 15 more minutes, maybe somewhat longer.

It is the intention of this manager to move to lay on the table the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin at the appropriate time. I do not want to cut off anybody who wishes to speak on it. May I suggest, though, that if there are no Senators on the floor at this time who wish to speak on the amendment, we lay it aside for a time and proceed with the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS]?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do hope that when the Senator from Mississippi moves to table my amendment, he will get the yeas and nays or permit me to ask for them, because I do want a rollcall vote on it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I have no problem with that. At the time I move to table the Senator's amendment, I shall move to get the yeas and nays or the Senator from Wisconsin may do so.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin be temporarily laid aside in order to consider the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 780

(Purpose: To reduce the amounts of moneys authorized to be loaned from the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund and the Rural Development Insurance Fund and to redirect those moneys in accordance with the authorizations contained in the farm bill, S. 1714, as reported by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and to reduce the appropriations for the food stamp program to conform to the budget authority levels for that program as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for recognizing me and, of course, I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

(Mr. KASTEN assumed the chair.)

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, yesterday, on this floor, a bit of an anomaly occurred when this Senator felt obliged to call attention to the fact that, according to our check of the figures, this appropriations bill exceeds the amount of funds authorized in the 1985 farm bill reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. The anomaly occurs because the procedure in the Senate with respect to this appropriations bill is a little bit out of whack.

As all Senators know, the usual procedure is for an authorization bill to be considered by the Senate and then the appropriations bill but, because of the long, protracted hearings, markup, and consideration of the 1985 farm bill, it was reported fairly late. We did the best we could to expedite it, but there were some Senators on the Agriculture Committee who wanted to discuss various items at some length.

I might add, Mr. President, that the farm bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture contains 22 titles and some 2,500 or 2,600 provisions, so it is an enormous piece of legislation involving the proposed spending of an enormous amount of money.

In any case, Mr. President, during a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi yesterday on this floor, I pointed out that the agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal 1986 proposes to spend $1.8 billion more than authorized by the farm bill reported by the Agriculture Committee. This excess spending is in two major areas, the credit program of the Farmers Home Administration and food stamps.

I might add parenthetically, Mr. President, that this Senator is chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. He is doing his best to expedite hearings and therefore consideration of credit legislation. We have been delayed two or three times because those who possess far more information of a statistical, arithmetical nature than I possess—that is to say, the officials of the credit system itself—have pleaded that they need more time to get their act together so that they will be well informed when they appear before our committee. So we are moving along on credit legislation as best we can and I anticipate the hearings will begin in the next couple of weeks.

As for the two areas—the Farmers Home Administration and food stamps—to which I referred earlier, these areas are especially critical from a budget perspective because they are also included in title I of the reconciliation bill. Failure to address this problem by bringing agricultural appropriations in line with the recommenda-

tion of the authorizing committee will begin what amounts to a hemorrhage in the budget and reconciliation process that will not reflect what we have just voted in the Senate to do; that is, to proceed to balance the Federal budget.

I listened with great interest and admiration to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin a moment ago when he said that farmers have more at stake in deficit reduction than perhaps any other segment of our society, because they are the ones who are victimized by the high interest rate, which will not and cannot come down until some fiscal sanity is found in this place where we work, the U.S. Senate. I just had a private conversation with Senator PROXMIRE, and I made the observation that the best farm bill that we could write around this place need not have the words "farm" or "agriculture" or "commodities" or anything else in it: Just get that deficit down. That would benefit the farmers of America far more than any Band-aid approach that we undertake with a farm bill or with an appropriation bill. The heaviest burden that many farmers are carrying is the high rate of interest they are having to pay.

Mr. President, we all remember last week, when the Senate passed the debt limit bill containing major provisions to strengthen the congressional budget process. The Senator from North Carolina has often been called "Senator No" because, since the day I arrived in this town in January 1973, I have been urging, promoting, and fighting for a balanced Federal budget. I do not mention that as any "I told you so" philosophy; I am just saying it is a fact. Finally, last week, amidst great debate and some confusion, the Senate did approve the so-called Gramm-Rudman-Hollings package, which I cosponsored. And here we are, the following week; we see the first horse out of the gate, so to speak; and what color is that horse wearing?

We have an appropriations bill that not only busts the budget but undermines the reconciliation process and adds, as I said earlier, $1.8 billion to the cost of a farm bill that is already $8.9 billion more than the budget resolution.

So what goes on, Mr. President? With all due respect to my distinguished colleagues, and I do respect them, my good friend from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, is not a budget buster. Let me make that clear. He has concerns. He has his own concepts of how to approach the farm problems, and he may very well be right.

The point I am making, Mr. President, is that unless we are faithful to what we did last week with respect to deficit reduction, and certainly unless we are faithful to appropriating no more money than is authorized by the relevant committee, then we are headed for the cliff and we are not going to solve anybody's problem. Senator COCHRAN serves ably on the Senate Agriculture Committee. Frankly, I do not know what I would do without him. He possesses a wisdom and a persuasiveness that is rare. So the amendment I shall propose shortly certainly is not directed at Senator COCHRAN nor at Senator BURDICK. It is simply pleading for what I believe to be common sense in the performance of our duties and responsibilities as Senators.

Now, we all go home and we talk about the deficit as too big we say we have to cut spending, we have to hold the line, and everybody cheers and we bask in the praise of our constituents. Then we come right back up here and here comes a proposal to bust the budget $1.8 billion over what is proposed in the authorization bill reported by the Agriculture Committee.

True enough, that authorization bill has not been considered by the Senate, but it is about the only yardstick I know from which to start, and hopefully there will be consideration of the farm bill in the next week or two. We were supposed to start this very day, but we have been racing the Senate's activities at a snail's pace all year long and we have not gotten to it. But we will get to it.

Mr. President, unfortunately, this year our process of consideration of legislation, as I said earlier, has been turned around. The Agriculture Committee was not able to report a farm bill until September, long after the May 15 deadline for authorization legislation. However, the committee did take specific steps that are reflected in a number of bipartisan votes to make specific corrections to both the credit programs of the Farmers Home Administration and the Food Stamp Program. These policy decisions, particularly the action on credit, are rooted in agreements contained in the budget resolution as well as in the farm bill.

In fact, to be quite honest, the original Senate budget resolution assumed that we would spend even less on Farmers Home Administration credit programs than we actually proposed to spend in the farm bill.

Now, Senator COCHRAN pointed out yesterday, as I recall—and I totally agreed with him—that there are no problems with spending in the agriculture appropriations bill as it relates to the instructions given to the Appropriations Committee. As far as I know, they met all the budget tests required of them by the Senate. However, the budget process was not constructed to deal with and does not envision the process of considering appropriations bills before consideration of authorization bills. That is the point I made at the outset, and that is the anomaly to which I referred in my opening remarks.

Now, the amendment I shall offer shortly is intended to ensure that the food stamp and credit appropriation remains within the level estimated by the CBO to reflect legislative changes approved by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry in S. 1714, which is the number of the farm bill, and in S. 1730, the 1985 reconciliation bill.

Now, Mr. President, unless the appropriation is established at $11.725 billion for food stamps, the appropriation bill will exceed the level provided for in the 1985 reconciliation and farm bills. Exceeding the budget authority for the Food Stamp Program will obliterate savings achieved by the Agriculture Committee to meet our reconciliation instructions, when in fact the committee did meet the mark established for us.

Now, the bill from the Senate Appropriations Committee like the House bill does not include any savings attributable to reforms passed by the Senate Agriculture Committee.

Additionally, the appropriations bill is based on administration rather than CBO budget projections resulting in a further increase in food stamp spending. These two factors account for the $166,570,000 by which the appropriations bill exceeds the budget authority assumed in the farm bill and the reconciliation bill. There are many budgetary inventions around this place, but one budgetary factor all Senators are aware of, or should be, is that when money is appropriated it may be spent. It probably will be. If all of this appropriation is spent, it will exeed the spending approved in the authorization bill reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee—the farm bill, in other words.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Agriculture Committee in adopting authorization levels for the agricultural credit programs carefully considered the anticipated needs of our farmers. After substantial debate in committee, the committee provided $4 billion annually for farm borrowers under the Farm Operating and Farm Ownership Loan Programs. This amount is about $800 million over the appropriated levels for fiscal year 1985.

Now, I recognize, Mr. President, that the amount actually obligated for farm operating and farm ownership loans in fiscal year 1985 exceeded this amount. But the fact remains that it is essential that we bring this agency back to fiscal responsibility, and the action taken by the Agriculture Committee in the authorization level does precisely that.

The Agriculture Committee, as I stated, provided $4 billion annually for insured and guaranteed loans for the Farm Operating and Farm Ownership

Loan Programs. The appropriation level for these two programs total $5,272 million which is $1,272 million over the authorization limit set by the Agriculture Committee.

In addition, the Agriculture Committee provided no authorization for several programs that are funded in this appropriation bill. The Soil and Water Programs, Indian Land Acquisition, and Soil Conservation Loan Programs have total spending under this bill of $48 million.

The action by the Agriculture Committee in the credit title of the farm bill was to target our spending to those programs deemed most critical.

It was felt that these programs, in this time of fiscal belt-tightening, could no longer be justified, in light of the crucial need of farmers for production credit.

That is why, Mr. President, this Senator considers it essential that the spending limitations imposed by the Agriculture Committee on the programs I have just discussed be maintained in the appropriations bill. Otherwise, the horse is out of the barn, and our hopes of having some degree of unanimity in deficit reduction, as the saying used to be, "went thataway."

Our committee, in its deliberations, was especially mindful of the difficult financial situation facing many farm producers, and we believe that our spending priorities reflect this.

However, I have stated many times, both this morning and on countless occasions previously, that what farmers need most is lower interest rates. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that this can be accomplished only through substantial reductions in Federal spending. That is the reason why I have reached the conclusion that it is necessary that we hold the line on all essential programs, and certainly on those that are nonessential.

So, that is the purpose of the amendment which I will send to the desk in a moment. I do so, I repeat, with the highest respect for my friend from Mississippi, who, along with the Senator from North Carolina, finds himself in this anomalous position. If further appropriations are needed, the administration may make an additional request in 1986. However, following the procedures of the Senate, as we should, I believe that we should not approve a higher amount at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a table printed in the RECORD.

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

COMPARISON OF CERTAIN RECOMMENDATIONS IN AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS WITH BUDGET AUTHORITY PROVIDED IN THE FARM BILL

	Budget authority in pending farm bill	Recommendation by Appropriations Committee	Amount over farm bill budget authority
Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund			
Farm operating loans (insured)		3,000.0	
Farm ownership loans (insured)		250.0	
Subtotal	2,000.0	3,250.0	1,250.0
Farm operating loans (guaranteed)		1,772.0	
Farm ownership loans (guaranteed)		250.0	
Subtotal	2,000.0	2,022.0	22.0
Soil and water (insured)	.0	22.0	22.0
Soil and water (guaranteed)	.0	6.0	6.0
Indian land acquisition	.0	4.0	4.0
Soil conservation loans	.0	16.0	16.0
Subtotal	.0	48.0	48.0
Total—ACIF	4,000.0	5,320.0	1,320.0
Rural Development Insurance Fund			
Water and waste disposal loans	75.0	340.0	265.0
Community facility loans	0.0	75.0	75.0
Total—RDIF	75.0	415.0	340.0
Food stamps and Puerto Rico	12,550.0	12,716.6	166.6
Grand total	16,625.0	18,451.6	1,826.6

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] proposes an amendment numbered 780.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 32, line 9, strike out "real" and all that follows through "shall be guaranteed loans; and" on line 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"real estate and operating loans in an amount equal to $4,000,000,000; $2,000,000,000 of which shall be for insured loans and $2,000,000,000 for guaranteed loans. Not less than $260,000,000 of the monies authorized for insured loans shall be for farms ownership purposes and not less than $260,000,000 of the monies authorized for loan guarantees shall be for guarantees of farm ownership loans. The Secretary may transfer not more than 25 per centum of the amounts authorized for guaranteed loans to the amounts authorized for insured loans. In addition, the Secretary is authorized to make".

On page 33, line 5, strike out "$340,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000,000".

On page 33, line 6, strike out ", $100,000,000" and all that follows through line 7 and insert in lieu thereof "for the production and distribution of ethanol in rural areas, $150,000,000".

On page 33, strike out lines 14 through 18.

On page 51, line 24, strike out "$11,891,570,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,725,000,000".

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I have the honor of serving on both the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, which is chaired by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. I have the greatest respect and admiration for him as chairman of our Agriculture Committee. I have enjoyed serving on that committee and can say that I appreciate the effort that has gone into the development of a farm bill this year by the Senate Agriculture Committee, under the leadership of Senator HELMS.

He is a strong leader, a fine chairman, and has led us in the development of the farm bill in a very sensitive way—sensitive to the interests of our committee members, sensitive to the interests of the farmers, and sensitive to the interests of those who are affected by the legislation we have drafted in that committee.

So I begin my remarks by saluting him and paying tribute to his leadership and to him personally as a friend of mine, and as someone who has been very kind to me in many ways since I have been in the Senate.

Therefore, it is difficult for me to be in the position of opposing an amendment which he seeks to have added to our appropriations bill today. But I do have to oppose the amendment, not because it is not well intended or that the motivation is not of a most meritorious type, but because there does seem to be a difference of opinion, which I think is a legitimate difference of opinion, about the procedures that are followed in the appropriations process and the effect of pending legislation on an appropriations bill. That is basically what we are talking about.

The Senator from North Carolina is asking the Senate to modify an appropriations bill to make it consistent with a bill that has not yet been acted upon by the Senate. He is suggesting that appropriations levels in the bill before the Senate today must be consistent with authorization levels in a bill that has not yet been enacted into law.

I suggest to the Senate that this would not be the thing to do, to force an Appropriations Committee bill to be changed on the floor so that it is consistent with a piece of legislation that has just been reported by a legislative committee. That is the issue.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment and say, in effect, by doing so, that the appropriations bill must be based on current statutory authority. Our bill is consistent with the authorization for funding programs

that are now on the books, authorized by law.

Let's look at the food stamp account, which is one of those identified by the Senator in which the amount of money appropriated in this bill exceeds the amount claimed to be authorized by the farm bill as reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee. The farm bill as reported by that committee contains a cap, a legally binding limit on spending. That cap in the farm bill is $12,984 million for fiscal year 1986. The bill before the Senate today provides an appropriation amount of $12,716 million.

That is below the cap in the farm bill.

So in the food stamp account, even if the Senate decided that this committee's recommendations for appropriations did not have to be consistent with the authorization in a reported farm bill, we would still be within the legal authority in the food stamp account.

What the Senator complains about is the fact that the appropriations exceed the estimated amount of money needed in the Food Stamp Program if the changes in that program recommended in the farm bill are enacted into law.

There are other assumptions that are made, too, in order to get to that estimate. There are assumptions about the rate of unemployment. There are assumptions about the cost of food in the marketplace, because those factors affect the expense to the Government in the operation of the Food Stamp Program. It is difficult at best, at the beginning of a fiscal year, to estimate the exact amount of money that will be needed in the coming year for that program because these factors change day by day.

If the Appropriations Committee has made an error in its estimate of the amount of money needed in the Food Stamp Program and we have included an amount which is somewhat higher than that actually needed, the higher amount will not be spent. Only the amount of money needed under the eligibility rules and laws of the Food Stamp Program can be spent. So our appropriations bill does not require the Department of Agriculture, through the Food and Nutrition Service—the administrators of this program—to spend all that is appropriated. We have simply estimated the amount that will be needed next year and have taken into account the authorization of current law, the estimate of food costs, an estimate of expected caseload by reason of unemployment, and other factors, and have presented the Senate our best judgment on the exact amount that will be needed. And it is within the cap of the committee-reported farm bill.

Farm credit is the other area identified where this committee has recommended appropriations that exceed the authorized levels in the reported farm bill. It is true, as the distinguished chairman says, that there is an authorization in the reported farm bill of $4 billion for lending by the Farmers Home Administration during fiscal year 1986. Some of that is identified as authority to make guaranteed loans; some of that authority is direct loan authority of insured loan authority.

As a bit of background, during the negotiations with the administration over the level of lending authority that would be included in the budget resolution passed by the Senate, it was decided that we would continue next year with the same amount of lending through Farmers Home as was available in fiscal year 1985.

At the time the negotiations were taking place, the Farmers Home Administration's lending programs amounted to about $4 billion, if you counted direct and guaranteed lending. I recall those discussions and the fact that some of us agreed at that time to support an effort to begin a transition in the Famers Home Lending Program from the direct lending that had grown so much in the past few years to a program of guaranteed lending.

Since that time, the amount of lending by the Farmers Home Administration has increased by almost $2 billion above the level of lending that was being made available through that agency when these early negotiations and discussions were taking place.

I am convinced that now is not the time to reduce the credit available to distressed farmers through the Farmers Home Administration.

I may join other Senators when the farm bill comes to the floor of the Senate to change the authority for lending under the Farmers Home Administration from $4 billion to a level that is more consistent with the facts and the real distress that exists on the Nation's farms today. I think that level may be too low. There may be other Senators who think it is too low.

But is it not unrealistic to say today that the Appropriations Committee is bound by the level authorized in the farm bill reported by the Senate Agriculture Committee? I think that is unrealistic. That is a standard to which this committee should not be held. If that were law, if those levels of authority were enacted into law, we would be bound by it.

We are not bound by those levels and should not be. If Senators think the level of funding is too high in the Farmers Home account, of course, they should vote to reduce those funding levels. I would urge them not to. We are having hearings in both the Senate Agriculture Committee coming up and over in the other body, as well, as trying to identify ways to solve the farm credit crisis.

I do not think the way to solve it is to cut the program that provides needed credit assistance to distressed farmers before the hearings are even held.

We are recommending a level of funding that is simply the same for next year as is being provided in 1985 by the Farmers Home Administration; $4.77 billion is in this bill. It is needed. More is needed, probably, if the truth is known. We have attempted to stay within the limits of the resolutions previously agreed to under the Budget Act, but to be as sensitive as we possibly can to the credit needs to farmers today. Our committee is recommending $4.772 billion for operating loans, including $3 billion for direct loans, and $1.772 billion for guaranteed loans.

I hope the Senate will agree that this is not out of line and that it is a reasonable amount of money to be included in this appropriations bill. So I hope the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we temporarily lay aside the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think that, because we have an amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin pending, which has been temporarily laid aside, so that the Senator from North Carolina could offer his amendment and we could debate it, the appropriate thing to do might be to go to a vote on a motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

We were attempting to accommodate Senators who were away from the Hill. I am told that some who were away are now back on the Hill.

So before taking up any further amendments, I would like for us to have a quorum call at this time and check with the majority leader to see about his wishes as to whether we should proceed to a vote now. There was some discussion about getting a vote before noon. I would ask the Senator, if he could, to withhold his unanimous-consent request until we could check with the majority leader on whether a vote should now occur on the motion to table the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I will be delighted to go ahead and speak about the substance of an amendment which I intend to offer at the appropriate time.

Mr. COCHRAN. If I might, since the request is pending, I object to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, later on today, I will introduce an amendment to this bill and I will describe it more fully at that time. But on this occasion, I would like to preview for my colleagues the issue encompassed by this amendment to be introduced later.

It involves something called sulfiting agents. For several years, we have known of the danger posed by sulfiting agents. These agents are food and drug preservatives, odorless and colorless, that have been linked to 21 deaths and at least 800 other adverse reactions, including putting people in comas and causing irreversible brain damage.

As many as 1 million Americans are ultrasensitive to sulfites and live in fear of these deadly chemicals. And yet these chemicals are common in our food supply. The Food and Drug Administration has, unfortunately, dragged its feet on this important public health issue. Therefore, it is with the greatest sense of urgency that I will offer this amendment to require FDA to complete the safety evaluation of sulfites by June 1, 1986.

The longer we wait for FDA to act, the more people die from reactions to sulfites. It has taken FDA almost 3 years to issue a proposal to ban sulfites from fresh fruits and vegetables. They finally have done so. But there are hundreds of other uses of sulfites in foods and drugs that can kill or cause life-threatening harm. And the FDA does not intend to take quick action on these other uses.

Recently, the New York Times reported two more deaths from sulfite-treated potatoes and white wine, and both uses are unaffected by the FDA's current proposed ban on fresh fruits and vegetables.

Last year, the Senate Appropriations Committee urged the FDA to complete the safety evaluation of sulfites by the end of fiscal year 1985. I was encouraged by this constructive action on the part of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

However, the FDA chose to completely ignore that deadline which was established in the committee's report. And now, in spite of the fact that there are a million American consumers who stand to experience life-threatening reactions to sulfites if they inadvertently consume them in a restaurant or wherever, in spite of that fact, the FDA now says that it expects to drag its feet until late in 1987 before completing its study and proposed regulations on sulfites. And there is, of course, nothing to keep them from missing even that sluggishly determined deadline.

The FDA is capable of endlessly delaying action on sulfites. Initially, the FDA assigned only one staff person to the safety evaluation. In response to recent hearings and prospective legislation, the agency increased the staff level to two. Considering the number of lives in jeopardy because of sulfites, that commitment is not nearly enough to complete the evaluation in an acceptable time frame.

As part of its review of additives generally recognized as safe, or GRAS, the FDA has determined that 24 of its 40 food categories now contain sulfites. Yet, so far, it has completed the safety evaluation for only 2 of those 24 groups—fresh fruits and fresh vegetables. The FDA must bolster its efforts and hasten to complete the review for all food groups, especially cut potatoes. By June 1, 1986, we expect them to complete the GRAS review, including publication of proposed rules on all uses of sulfite agents.

How many more people must pay for FDA's delay with their lives? How many more people must be carried out of restaurants on stretchers in comas because they walked in not knowing that deadly chemicals were used in the food prepared for them?

One of the cases reported to FDA—at least one, I believe there are several—but one with which I am quite familiar involved a woman who knew she was allergic to sulfites. When she entered the restaurant, she went to the management of the restaurant, as was her custom, and specifically asked:

> Do you use sulfites in your food? Please let me know, because it could kill me if I consume them.

The manager of the restaurant, believing that no sulfites were present because he and his staff had not added sulfites, gave assurances to the woman that no sulfites were in the food.

She then went ahead and enjoyed her meal believing she was safe. But unknown to the manager of the restaurant, sulfites had been added to some of the food before it arrived at the restaurant. The woman suffered irreversible brain damage, went into a coma, and she is still in that coma.

How many more such incidents will it take before the FDA stops dragging its feet? Previously the committee urged the FDA to move forward. But the FDA ignored the committee's report language. And this year in the committee's report instead of stepping up the pressure on FDA, the committee report backs off and removes any reference to a date. That may not matter that much because the FDA has already shown that it will ignore a date in a committee report. But in the meantime many more deaths and serious injuries have been reported as a result of consumers continuing to eat sulfites.

What I am going to propose is that we amend this bill to put into the language of the bill the following: Provided further than a portion of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to complete by June 1, 1986, to complete the safety evaluation of sulfiting agents.

Let me say, Mr. President, that for anybody who thinks this is unreasonable, the FDA's own internal work schedules call for the completion of this study by August of 1986. A vote on this amendment would be a clear signal from the Senate that we are concerned about the 1 million Americans who face the threat of death and serious injury just from going into a restaurant. It is also a message from the Senate to the FDA that we want them to place a little higher priority on completing the review of sulfites in food, and moving forward more expeditiously with proposed rules to protect consumers.

I would like to share with my colleagues a list of the food categories that are currently known to contain sulfites. I mentioned earlier that out of the 40 food categories, 24 of them contain sulfites. And out of those 24, only 2—fresh fruit and fresh vegetables—have been the subject of FDA action. but the other groups include baked goods, and within baked goods, cookies, crackers, crepes, mixes with dried fruits and dried vegetables, pie crusts, pizza crust, quiche crust, soft pretzels, tortillas, tortilla shells, and waffles. Within the category of alcoholic beverages, beer, cocktail mixes, and wine. Within the category of nonalcoholic beverages and beverage bases, the cola type drinks and the fruit type drinks. Within the category of coffee and tea, instant tea. Within the category of condiments and relishes, horseradish relish, onion relish, pickled relish, pickles, olives, salad dressing mixes, and wine vinegars. Within the category of confections and frostings, brown sugar, raw sugar, and powdered sugar. Within the category of dairy product analogs, filled milk. Within the category of fish products—processed, frozen, canned, and dried—we find sulfites in clams, shrimp, lobster, crab, scallops, and dried cod. Within the category of fresh fish, clams, shrimp, lobster, crabs, and scallops. Within the categories of gelatines, puddings, and fillings, fruit fillings including apple, flavored gelatin, pectin jelling agents, and unflavored gelatin. Grain products and pastas include corn starch, modified food starch, spinach pasta, breadings, batters, noodle and rice mixes. Within the category of gravies and sauces, gravies including milk-based gravies.

Hard candy, including clear hard candy, jams, and jellies, within the

category of nuts and nut products shredded coconut, within the category of plant protein products, soy protein.

Within the category of processed fruits, canned, bottled, or frozen fruit juices, including lemon, lime, grape, apple, and orange; dried fruit, including apples, apricots, pineapples, peaches, pears, golden raisins, and prunes, canned, bottled, or frozen dietetic fruit juices or juices, marachino cherries, glaced fruit.

Within the category of processed vegetables and vegetable juices, canned vegetables including potatoes and hominy, pickled vegetables including sauerkraut, cauliflower, and peppers, dried vegetables, instant mashed potatoes, frozen vegetables including potatoes, spinach, other green vegetables, avocado mix, and potato salad.

Within the category of snack foods, dried fruit snacks, trail mixes, filled crackers, tortilla chips, and potato chips. Within the category of soups and soup mixes, canned seafood soups, dried soup mixes. And in the next category, white granulated sugar. And then in the final category, sweet sauces, toppings and syrups, corn syrup, maple syrup, fruit toppings, high glucose corn syrup, and pancake syrup.

Mr. President, as you can see from this list, if you happen to be one of the 1 million Americans who faces the threat of death from sulfites, you have a real problem on your hands. We are not telling the FDA, however, what their decision should be. With a list this complicated, obviously the Senate cannot get into the details of how each and every single one of these items should be dealt with. That is a job for the FDA.

All we are asking the FDA to do is to complete their evaluation.

Let me say to my colleagues who have constituents among the 1 million who were threatened by sulfite, that this matter is of utmost urgency to them, utmost urgency. They are scared by the prospect of consuming these sulfites.

Let me also say to my colleagues who might be concerned about the food processing industry and the restaurant industry, they have been supporting a reasonable effort to go forward with the regulations on sulfite. In fact, the National Restaurant Association was leading the charge, saying, "We want to be able to say to our customers that our products are safe."

That is a wise position for them to take. Unless we deal with this in a responsible way, those 1 million Americans are going to get the idea that it is not safe for them to go into food establishments. We want to reassure them that it is. That is part of the job of the FDA.

Let me repeat again, we are not telling the FDA what their decisions should be. In some cases very low levels of sulfites may be able to be used. But my amendment says the FDA must go ahead and make the numerous decisions involved here and make them now, so that we can reassure the public.

Mr. President, because of the procedural situation in which we find ourselves, I have not offered this amendment at this time, but when the time is appropriate I will offer the amendment and I will urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he will withhold his call for a quorum.

Mr. GORE. I withhold.

Mr. COCHRAN. Let me say it is the intention of the managers of the bill to secure votes beginning at 2:30 on motions to table both the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS]. We will be submitting a unanimous-consent request in a few moments to try to limit the number of amendments that will then be in order on the bill.

I would suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that if at this time I can be permitted to move to table both of the pending amendments and we can secure the yeas and nays on those motions to table, that the Senator could then offer his amendment, which would be the pending business before the Senate.

I know the Senator from Idaho, Senator MCCLURE, wants to be heard on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. I hope we can work it out with a colloquy. Possibly we can deal with it after we have the votes on the motions to table the pending amendments.

Mr. GORE. If my colleague will yield, I would certainly be willing to withhold the offering of my amendment until the Senator from Idaho is able to be present and debate the issue. If the distinguished chairman wishes to make his unanimous-consent request and include in it a request that at 2:30 this amendment be the pending business and that the yeas and nays be ordered on it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have no personal problems with that suggestion. I do not know the schedule of the Senator from Idaho, whether or not he could be in the Chamber between now and then. I would not want a vote to occur——

Mr. GORE. I did not mean that the vote would begin at 2:30, but that debate would begin at 2:30 and that the yeas and nays would be ordered.

Mr. COCHRAN. We have in mind that the votes on the motions to table would begin at 2:30, and thereafter begin with the other amendments that will be offered to the bill. After I secure the yeas and nays on the motions to table those two amendments, the Senator could offer his amendment. The bill would be open to amendment by anyone who wants to offer an amendment. I am suggesting that rather than go through all of that, in just about 2 minutes the Senator would be able to offer his amendment.

Mr. GORE. That would be fine with me.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I would also like at this time to express the hope that we could get an agreement that a list of amendments be the only amendments in order to the bill. I know we are checking with Senators to see if we have all the amendments which are to be offered to the bill. We are having a report on that soon, I hope. Then we could include that in a unanimous-consent request to stack these two votes at 2:30.

I suppose I should withhold making the motion to table either of those amendments at this time until we know whether that can all be included in one unanimous-consent agreement.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand we are making progress on the agriculture appropriations bill. I thank the managers on both sides for their patience and diligence and also my colleagues on both sides for coming forth with amendments.

I have been discussing this bill with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. BYRD]. I believe we are now prepared to propound a unanimous-consent agreement which has been cleared on both sides.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the only amendments in order to H.R. 3037, the agriculture appropriations bill: an amendment by Senator QUAYLE requiring that commodity purchases and transportation services under the Public Law 480 title II program be conducted on the lowest landed cost basis; an amendment by Senator LEVIN allowing 1985 Commodity Supplemental Food Programs carryover funds to be used to reimburse sites for costs incurred in the distribution of bonus commodities not included in the food package; an amendment by Senator GORE requiring the Food and Drug Administration to complete

the safety evaluation of sulfites by June of 1986; an amendment by Senator DIXON restoring $3 million in planning funds for a plant and animal sciences research center at the University of Illinois; an amendment by Senator GRASSLEY restoring a special grant for the Agriculture Policy Institute, $450,000, in Missouri and Iowa; an amendment by Senator CRANSTON to add $3.4 million for AIDS; an amendment numbered 779 by Senator PROXMIRE which has already been offered; and an amendment by Senator HELMS which has already been offered and debated, numbered 780.

I also ask unanimous consent that any votes ordered prior to the hour of 2:30 p.m. today with respect to H.R. 3037 be postponed, to begin at 2:30 p.m. today in the order in which yeas and nays were ordered, excluding passage.

I ask unanimous consent that no motions to recommit H.R. 3037 with instructions be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask for regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. COCHRAN. I move to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the vote will be put off to occur at 2:30 p.m.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, No. 780. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the vote will occur following the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, which will occur at 2:30 p.m.

AMENDMENT NO. 781

(Purpose: To require the Food and Drug Administration to complete the safety evaluation of sulfiting agents by June 1, 1986)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. METZENBAUM, and Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 781.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 57, line 15, insert before the period a colon and "*Provided further*, That a portion of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to complete, by June 1, 1986, the safety evaluation of sulfiting agents".

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and the following Senators: Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. METZENBAUM, and Mr. BINGAMAN. It embodies the intent of legislation I previously introduced, S. 573, the Sulfite Safety Act, in behalf of myself, Senator BURDICK, Senator DOMENICI, Senator DURENBERGER, Senator SASSER, Senator STENNIS, and Senator GOLDWATER.

Mr. President, for nearly 3 years we have known of the great danger posed by sulfiting agents—food and drug preservatives that have been linked to perhaps 21 deaths and 800 other adverse reactions, including coma and brain damage. As many as 1 million sulfite-sensitive consumers live in fear of these deadly chemicals. The Food and Drug Administration [FDA] has dragged its feet on this important public health issue. It is with the greatest sense of urgency that I offer this amendment to require FDA to complete the safety evaluation of sulfites by June 1, 1986.

The longer we wait for FDA, the more people will die from reactions to sulfites. It has taken FDA almost 3 years to issue a proposal to ban sulfites from fresh fruits and vegetables. There are hundreds of other uses of sulfites in foods and drugs that can kill or cause life-threatening harm—uses the FDA does not intend to take quick action on. In fact, the New York Times recently reported two additional deaths from sulfite-treated potatoes and white wine—uses that are unaffected by FDA's proposed ban on fresh fruits and vegetables.

Last year, the Senate Appropriations Committee urged FDA to complete the safety evaluation of sulfites by the end of fiscal year 1985. FDA has ignored that deadline. Instead, FDA says it expects evaluation to drag on until late 1987. Left to its own devices, FDA is capable of endlessly delaying action on sulfites.

Initially, FDA assigned only one staff person to the safety evaluation. In response to recent hearings and prospective legislation, the agency increased the staff level to two. Considering the number of lives in jeopardy because of sulfites, that commitment is not nearly enough to complete the evaluation in time.

As part of its review of additives generally recognized as safe [GRAS], the FDA has determined that 24 of its 40 food categories contain sulfites. Yet so far it has completed the safety evaluation for only two groups—fresh fruits and fresh vegetables. The FDA must bolster its efforts, and hasten to complete the review for all food groups—especially cut potatoes. By June 1, 1986 we expect them to complete the GRAS review, including publication of proposed rules on all uses of sulfiting agents.

How many more people must pay for FDA's delay with their lives? A vote is support of this amendment is a vote to save those lives. Completing the safety review is the only hope we have that FDA will restrict any uses of sulfites besides fresh fruits and vegetables.

The great dangers posed by sulfites demand immediate actions. Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join in support of this amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is suggesting by his amendment that we impose a deadline, in effect, on the Food and Drug Administration for completing a study and issuing regulations that relate to the use of sulfiting agents.

On page 115 of the committee report on this bill, we attempt to deal with this issue. We recognize that the Senator has brought to the attention of the Senate, by his amendment, a very important health problem we have in the country today. He has cited in his discussion of the issue some of the harmful consequences to citizens who have come in contact with sulfiting agents and who are susceptible to injury, even to death in some cases.

This is a subject that is in need of the most careful review and study, to be sure that, as a government, we come up with a procedure, a process, for labeling or warning about the use of these agents, or maybe even restricting their use, so that the chances of harm to public will be lessened—eliminated, possibly.

Knowing that problem, therefore, the committee provided this language in its report:

Sulfiting agents.—Given the fact that the Food and Drug Administration has received reports of 21 deaths involving the use of sulfites, and over 800 reports involving other injuries, the Committee remains extremely concerned about the safety of sulfites as a food additive. The Committee commends FDA for instituting action to ban the use of sulfites on fresh fruits and vegetables and urges the earliest implementation of the ban.

The Committee further understands that the Commissioner is considering the safety of sulfites in two other areas—the use on potatoes and all other uses—and it will expect FDA to continue its safety review of sulfites and report to the Committee in a timely manner.

The Senator from Tennessee is suggesting that not only should this language be changed to include a date,

but also, as I understand the amendment, that the deadline date be included in the bill.

I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment as it is proposed by the Senator, although I am very sympathetic to and share with him the concern he has expressed about the need for timely action by the Food and Drug Administration. We demand that in the language of our report. We insist that the ban on the use of sulfites on fruits and vegetables be implemented at the earliest possible date.

What I hope we will refrain from doing, however, is getting ourselves into the business of substituting our decisions on effective dates for the decisions of the administrators of this program. They are best suited to make a decision of that kind. They have direct access to the scientific information, the studies that are ongoing, and those that have been completed. That is their job. That is really not our job.

I hope that, especially on a bill that simply provides funds for the operation of that agency, we not get into the business of legislating and directing in an area that is so sensitive and has such an impact as such a decision would have.

It could be—and I urge the Senator to consider—that we may be able to amend the language to make it reflect a stronger concern over the urgency of the matter. I am not suggesting that this language is the best possible language to include in the report on this subject. Maybe the Senator has a better idea, and if he does I am willing to discuss it with him. I know that there is a way to improve the language in our report. But I hope we could refrain, in this instance, from putting a deadline date in the bill.

That is the problem I have with the amendment, and I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a date was previously set by the Committee on Appropriations 2 years ago. Let me read from the report in the first session of the last Congress. It says:

> Sulfiting agents.—The Committee is concerned about the quality and pace of FDA's safety evaluation of sulfiting agents. The agency's July 1982 proposal to declare these chemicals as safe was based on a study of the relevant scientific literature completed back in 1976. In recent months there has been a report of at least one death which is suspected of being a result of a reaction to sulfite-treated food. Therefore, the Committee expects FDA, within the funds and resources at the agency's disposal, to expedite its safety evaluation of sulfiting agents. The Committee urges that FDA set aside whatever funds and staff resources are necessary to publish a final rule governing the uses of these agents by the end of 1985.

So, 2 years ago, when we had one reported death, a specific date was set. Now we have 21 reported deaths and 800 reports of serious adverse reactions, including a coma and irreversible brain damage; and now all we do is tell the FDA that we want them to proceed in a timely fashion. And timely to the FDA sometimes means never. In this case, I am a little more hopeful since according to their internal work schedule, they are planning on the end of 1987.

It is curious to me how it can be considered appropriate for us to set a firm date when we have one reported death and then turn around when we have 21 reported deaths and 800 serious injuries and eliminate any mention of that deadline and just say let us proceed in a timely fashion; particularly when the FDA has shown that it cannot proceed in a timely fashion on this matter.

Let me give you a little more detail, Mr. President, on the latest two people to die as a result of sulfites.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment and a question?

Mr. GORE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McCLURE. Before going into that detail, and I apologize for interrupting, because I do wish to commend the Senator for his leadership in the area of using sulfite agents in food and I know from my own personal conversations with him of his genuine concern for the safety of foods and I think that is expressed by the introduction of the Senator's bill, S. 573.

Many of us in Congress share the Senator's concern and in addition to the concern for the safety of those who consume the products, I have a concern, too, as I am sure the Senator does, with the industries which use sulfiting agents to produce those foods.

I, of course, have a very keen interest with respect to the potato dehydrating industry in Idaho and in other States as well that make use of sulfiting agents to extend the life of potato products.

In the potato granulating industry, the need for sulfiting agents is critical. Because of the nature of the processing of granulated potatoes, sulfiting agents must be used. At this time there is no acceptable alternative available. The potential damages to the potato industry from a ban on sulfite agents must be weighed against the danger posed to sulfite-sensitive individuals.

Sulfites have been used as an additive in dehydrated potatoes for more than 30 years, and in that time there has been no substantiated case of allergic reaction to that product by a sulfite-sensitive individual. Recent research and ongoing research by the Food Research Institute at the University of Wisconsin by Dr. Steve Taylor has shown that dehydrated potatoes are not a food that affects sulfite-sensitive individuals. Even the FDA admits that dehydrated potatoes have not been implicated in any sulfite-sensitivity reactions.

I know that in the Senator's bill, S. 573, dehydrated potatoes are specifically exempt from a ban on sulfite use. I judge from that from my own conversations that the Senator has concluded that the evidence is persuasive that there is no, at least—let me put it in the other context—that there is no evidence of damage even to sensitive persons in the population from the use of sulfites in potato products. Am I not correct?

Mr. GORE. The evidence indicates that there are no confirmed deaths as a result of freeze-dried dehydrated, granulated potatoes containing sulfites.

The evidence is not entirely clear with respect to adverse reactions but because this particular use is one for which a substitute is not readily available and due to the fact that there is no evidence of deaths here, the bill I introduced did carve out this exception.

But we do want the FDA to look carefully at the matter to see what the evidence really shows, and this is a decision for them to make and one uniquely inappropriately for us to make.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further on that question?

Mr. GORE. Surely.

Mr. McCLURE. I appreciate the comments of the able Senator.

My understanding is that it is expected that the FDA will make a proposed rule in December of this year, that they are ahead of the date the Senator has established.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is quite correct, with respect to this single item. However, there are 21 other food categories that have not been examined by the FDA and they are dragging their feet on them. There are 1 million Americans out there who are highly sensitive to these chemicals and what we want to say to FDA is, "Come on, give it a little higher priority, and let's get moving on this thing."

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Yes, I am glad to yield back.

Mr. McCLURE. The Senator is correct, and that is a matter of concern for many.

But I just want to make the point that as far as dehydrated potatoes are concerned, the studies are further along, they are more comfortable with the data base. They are aware of the fact that there is no suitable alternative that can be used and, therefore, both the Senator and I would conclude at this time probably that FDA is likely not to move but they have a ca-

pacity to move with respect to the use of sulfiting agents in the potato industry.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator will allow me to comment on that, I want to clarify for the record that I agree with the Senator that the FDA does not necessarily have to ban uses of this kind. If their studies indicate that the public can be adequately protected through the use of other measures, such as mandating low levels of sulfites below those levels which are known to cause some harm, or even labeling for this single use, that might well be an appropriate action.

Mr. McCLURE. So that sensitive individuals who know that they have the possibility of allergic reactions will be able to know that this product had been treated by sulfites and avoid its use if they are in that target population.

Mr. GORE. I would not want to prejudge the correct decisions in something as complicated as this, but I think they should move forward, and the comments of the Senator with respect to the dehydrated granulated potatoes I think are well taken. I do not disagree with him.

Mr. McCLURE. I understand the Senator's desire to prod the FDA into doing something else.

I would express a more broad, general concern that if, indeed, they are not comfortable with the factual basis upon which to make a ruling with respect to the other products, they might well feel compelled to issue a blanket rulemaking without the detailed data with respect to individual products, and we might indeed run into the problem where setting an arbitrary date which they cannot meet adequately would force them into actions that would be successfully challenged in court as being overbroad based upon the factual basis that they have.

I am very much in favor of the research that is going on. I hope it will continue that research. We will learn more about it.

I have no hesitancy at all in commending the Senator for his leadership in the area, but I do express some concern as to whether the knowledge base, the factural base will be sufficient to move by the date that is established by the Senator in his amendment.

But I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his contribution to this debate, and I greatly respect the study he has given this matter, and our disagreement lies within a narrow range.

But in responding to some comments made by the able Senator from Idaho, let me assure him and my other colleagues that the date set by the amendment is not arbitrary. The Department of Health and Human Services has published a lengthy task force report entitled "The Reexamination of the GRAS Status of Sulfiting Agents." This was published in January 1985. Based on this document, in the Regulatory Program for the U.S. Government published by OMB, they have set forth their own work schedule of where sulfiting agents are concerned. According to this schedule, they believe that it is perfectly feasible to complete the study called for in this amendment by August 1986. This amendment would merely move that date up 2 months.

Let me say that the effect of an amendment like this is very clear. What it does is encourage the FDA to assign more resources to this task and give it a little bit higher priority.

Now, why do we want to do that? I have said it before and I will say it again, 1 million Americans face the threat of death or serious incapacitating if they consume these chemicals. Now why not urge them to speed this thing up? We know they could do it. They know they can do it because they have published this schedule.

So I would say that this issue seems very clear to me. There are competing concerns. There are the concerns that have been expressed a moment ago on the one hand and there are the concerns about the health and safety of the 1 million Americans at risk. Do we want to say to those 1 million Americans: "You will continue to be at risk indefinitely because we do not want to urge FDA to speed up their work"?

A vote to table this amendment would be a message to those 1 million Americans, saying to them: "We don't care quite enough about the health risks that you face to urge the FDA to finish this thing 8 months from now."

It would be a message saying: "We are a little more concerned about the possible harm that could come within the FDA or industry of them speeding up their work."

I think it is pretty clear. Let me read you the cases of the last two people who died.

On July 30 of this year, Ann Weltman, 30 years old, of Los Angeles, walked into a restaurant and ordered some hash brown potatoes. The hash brown potatoes killed her. She knew she was sensitive to sulfites and she asked the owner of the restaurant, "Do you use sulfites?" And the owner of the restaurant said, "No, we don't use sulfites."

What the restaurant did not know was that processor had put sulfites on the hash brown potatoes. They took them off the grill and served them to Ann Weltman and the hash brown potatoes killed Ann Weltman.

There are a million others like her out there. Do we want to tell the rest of them: "You might die because we don't want to rush up the FDA. We don't want to hurry them along. Just hold your horses and play Russian roulette with hash brown potatoes for the next 2 years or longer?"

The second case was in Dallas, TX, the second of these most recent cases. Daniel Tsevat, 33 years old, of Dallas. He walked into a restaurant and ordered a nice meal, ordered a bottle of wine with his meal, German wine. He poured a glass of wine and drank the wine. The wine killed him, because it had sulfites in it and because he is one of the 1 million who are ultrasensitive to sulfites.

What do we say to the rest of them? What do we say to the rest of the 1 million? "Hold your horses. Just play Russian roulette with German wine for 2 years or more because we don't want to rush up the FDA."

What does this amendment do? It does not go so far as to say ban the sulfites in these uses. No, it is not an amendment that goes that far. We are talking about something that is very mild here. I can hardly believe that the Senate would not just accept this amendment. We have 1 million Americans out there who face the threat of death or permanent brain damage or going into a coma just from eating a meal at a restaurant or drinking some wine. And all this amendment proposes to do is to say to the FDA: "You have to complete your evaluation of these life-threatening chemicals and publish proposed rules 2 months earlier than your own internal documents say you plan to do it."

Come on. What is unreasonable or radical about that? If we care about the threat facing these 1 million Americans, we will vote in favor of this amendment.

Now let me say again that previously the Committee on Appropriations agreed that we should set a date and they set a date in their report language. But that did not do any good because the FDA just ignored the report language.

When the FDA decided to ignore the report language, did the committee get upset? No, evidently not, because the report language the following year took out the deadline and just called upon them to expedite the study. Well, they did not expedite the study. So did the committee get upset? I do not know, but I do know, in the report language this year, the language was toned down even more and instead of setting a date, instead of telling them to expedite it, the report just says, "Do it in a timely fashion."

Well, bureaucrats understand the nuances of those kinds of words. But the one million Americans at risk do not understand the nuances of those kinds of words because they have not been here and seen how agencies and departments downtown feel like they can just ignore report language.

So, on behalf of the 1 million Americans at risk and on behalf of the persons who have cosponsored the bill and this amendment, which include, let me say again, Senator GOLDWATER, Senator STENNIS, Senator BAUCUS, Senator DURENBERGER, Senator DOMENICI, Senator METZENBAUM, Senator BINGAMAN, and Senator BURDICK, I again ask the Senate for favorable action on this amendment—21 deaths, 800 adverse reactions, including anaphylaxis, coma, and irreversible brain damage.

I personally believe this is one of the easiest amendments to vote for that I have ever seen. Every single Member of this Senate has constituents who are threatened with death if they walk in and order some hash brown potatoes or wine or some of the other items on the lengthy list that I read into the RECORD not long ago.

And what is the argument against doing this? The argument, as I understand it, is that the life-threatening consequences for these 1 million Americans are less important than the concern that the bureaucracy might not be able to handle a 2-month speed-up in their internal work schedule.

I can hardly believe that a Member of this body can balance those two concerns on the scales of justice, and come to the conclusion that the necessity to avoid discombobulating the bureaucracy should take precedence over the threat to the life and health of 1 million Americans. I can hardly believe that. So I hope that when the vote comes on this amendment my colleagues will see it the way I do, and place the top priority on these 1 million Americans.

Mr. President, I ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether or not he wishes to debate this amendment further at this time, or whether or not he would join me in a request for the yeas and nays on the amendment. What is the Senator's pleasure?

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it is my intention to move to table the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, to help him secure the yeas and nays on that motion, and to have the vote occur after the votes that have already been ordered to occur beginning at 2:30. I had hoped we would be able to work out some compromise, or some arrangement that would be satisfactory with the Senator from Tennessee. I do not know what this is. We have made some suggestions about strengthening the language in the committee report, and we have not been encouraged with that. I am told now that the chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], is willing to join with the Senator from Tennessee in a letter that would urge the Food and Drug Administration to expedite the research, and the issuance of regulations in the sulfiting agents area. I do not know what else we can do other than accept the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. I am not prepared to recommend that.

Mr. GORE. Will the chairman of the subcommittee yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. GORE. I would be glad to offer a compromise, and that would be to change the date in the amendment to comply precisely with the date suggested by the FDA in this public document which is the regulatory program of the United States. I do not relish that prospect.

Mr. COCHRAN. What is the date?

Mr. GORE. August of 1986.

Mr. COCHRAN. The amendment now, as drawn, requires the action to be taken by June of 1986.

Mr. GORE. That is correct. That is 2 months faster than they have publicly declared in their schedule.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I still have a reluctance to write into the bill the legislative date beyond or about which the agency has to act in a matter of this kind. They tell us that they are going to act by that date as the Senator says in his discussions of the issue. I believe them. I think they will act. I think they want to act expeditiously. They told us that they consider this a matter of great urgency. Every effort is being made to expedite it. With our language in the report urging immediate action as prompt as possible, I think we should be satisfied with the actions of the agency.

I do not know that there is any way to work this out. Mr. President, assuming there are no other Senators who want to discuss the issue, I move to table the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote on the amendment will occur following the 2:30 p.m. vote on the two previous amendments.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate lay aside the pending business and turn to S. 1730, the reconciliation bill, until not to exceed 2:30 p.m. today, and for debate only.

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

CONSOLIDATED OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1985

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1730).

Mr. GARN. Mr. President, I have a brief statement about title III of the pending reconciliation bill. This title is the submission from the Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee to meet the reconciliation requirements. The savings from the submission are nearly $8.3 billion in budget authority and $10.5 billion in outlays over 3 years.

The Senate Banking Committee submitted the following items essentially as assumed in the Budget Reconciliation Joint Resolution:

First, termination of direct Federal loans through the Federal Financing Bank under the Section 108 Program of Community Development Block Grants, while maintaining authority for private sector financing of guaranteed loans.

Second, authorization of the necessary reduction in public housing operating subsidies.

Third, authorization of forgiveness of public housing debt of approximately $14 billion.

Fourth, authorization of the required reduction in over-all loan levels in the Farmers Home Administration Rural Housing Programs with new authority for selling loans directly to the public.

In addition, a majority of the committee decided to make changes in the UDAG selection criteria in an attempt to make the program more equitable. I support the UDAG program, but I believe that it should be changed even more toward awarding grants on the merits of the project. The program would then achieve more "bang for the buck" with increasingly limited economic development dollars. My personal preference would have been to work within the strict parameters of reconciliation and then come back to a separate housing bill that accomplishes that further change in the UDAG selection system.

I also point out for the record that the House Banking Committee has gone far beyond the requirements of reconciliation and submitted 226 pages of substantive legislation now in the companion House reconciliation bill. Reconciliation should not be a procedure for rewriting the housing laws and creating new programs. Such substantive legislative provisions are simply not acceptable in conference on a reconciliation bill. If the House passes a separate housing bill under

the normal procedures, I am sure that the Senate will go to a conference and consider substantive housing law changes.

TITLE I OF S. 1730

Mr. ZORINSKY. Mr. President, under Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry was instructed to recommend changes in legislation under its jurisdiction that would result in outlay savings of $7.9 billion over the 3 fiscal years 1986 through 1988. The recommendations of the committee are contained in title I of S. 1730. According to the estimates of the Congressional Budget Office, these provisions, if enacted, would achieve savings for the 3 fiscal years of $8.084 billion.

Title I makes changes in three areas: First, mandatory sale for export of dairy products owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, second, the Food Stamp and Commodity Distribution Programs, and third agricultural credit.

The major portion of the savings would be achieved through the provisions involving agricultural credit and would provide savings over the 3-year period of $7.167 billion. The 3-year savings from the Food Stamp and dairy sales provisions would total $586 million and $331 million, respectively.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT PROVISIONS

The provisions in S. 1730 that relate to agricultural credit were developed by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry in connection with the committee's formulation of the 1985 farm bill, S. 1714. S. 1714 was developed as a result of numerous hearings held by the committee on the continuing crisis in American agriculture.

In developing the agricultural credit provisions included in title I of S. 1730, the objective was to make improvements in the Farmers Home Administration [FmHA] loan programs that directly benefit agricultural producers in this country while reducing Federal expenditures.

I believe that the legislation meets the objective very well.

CONSOLIDATION AND AUTHORIZATION OF FARM OWNERSHIP AND OPERATING LOAN PROGRAMS

Under the provisions of the bill relating to agricultural credit, the authorization for FmHA Farm Ownership and Farm Operating Loan Programs would be consolidated; $4 billion would be authorized annually for these programs for fiscal years 1986 through 1988. These authorizations would be apportioned between insured loans and guaranteed loans as follows:

First, for fiscal year 1986, $2 billion would be provided for insured loans and $2 billion for guaranteed loans.

Second, for fiscal year 1987, $1.5 billion would be designated for insured loans and $2.5 for guaranteed loans.

Third, for fiscal year 1988, $1 billion would be designated for insured loans and $3 billion for guaranteed loans.

The gradual increase in the Guaranteed Loan Program is the primary source of savings under the legislation.

The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to transfer up to 25 percent of the funds designated for guaranteed loans to the insured loan program.

AVAILABILITY OF DIRECT LOANS TO NEW FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION BORROWERS

The legislation would ensure that eligibility for insured loans could not be restricted to current borrowers, as the Department of Agriculture had planned to do by regulation. This provision is very important in view of the current agricultural crisis in the United States. If eligibility were to be so restricted at this time, it could have a devastating effect on a large number of our farmers and ranchers who do not qualify for commercial or guaranteed loans because their current cash flow cannot support repayments at the current rates of interest on such loans. If FmHA loans having favorable interest rates are available, a number of these agricultural producers would have a reasonable chance of overcoming economic stress and continuing in business.

INTEREST RATE BUY-DOWN PROGRAM

The legislation also contains a number of other provisions that would help alleviate the financial problems of American agricultural producers, including a program for interest-rate reductions on FmHA guaranteed loans.

The program would require the Secretary to enter into contracts with lending institutions that reduce the interest rate on guaranteed loans for a period not to exceed 3 years. The contract would specify the amount by which the interest rate on such loans would be reduced. The Secretary would pay the lender not more than 50 percent. The Secretary would pay the lender not more than 50 percent of the cost of making the reduction. Any payment made by the Secretary under the program could not exceed the cost of reducing the annual rate of interest by more than 2 percent.

The interest rate buy-down progam would be available only to borrowers who cannot locally obtain sufficient credit under reasonable rates and terms to meet their actual needs. In addition, a borrower would be required to have an estimated cash income for the following 12-month period equal to, or in excess of, the estimated cash expenses to be incurred by the borrower during such period. The program would not, however, be available to a borrower if the borrower could otherwise make payments on the guaranteed loan in a timely manner.

The bill would authorize up to $490 million from the agricultural credit insurance fund to be used to carry out the program. This authorization level would permit the Secretary to effectuate an interest rate reduction of 4 percent for 3 years on approximately $8 billion of loans guaranteed by the FmHA. The program is designed to deal directly with one of the gravest problems facing many agricultural producers today—that is, the problem of high rates of interest on outstanding indebtedness. By reducing the rate of interest on guaranteed loans, the program would provide immediate assistance to thousands of financially troubled farmers and ranchers in the United States.

EMERGENCY LOAN PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

The legislation would make a number of changes in the Emergency Loan Program administered by the Farmers Home Administration. These changes are expected to reduce Federal outlays under the program with no significant adverse effect on agriculture. The provisions would, among other things, repeal the authority for the Secretary to make emergency loans to producers who can receive credit elsewhere and encourage the use of Federal crop insurance by precluding the making of a loan on the basis of the loss of a crop that could have been covered by such insurance.

The limit on the size of an emergency loan under the program would be reduced to $200,000 for each disaster. Current law provides for similar limits of $500,000. The total amount of indebtedness that a borrower could have outstanding under the program would be reduced to $400,000.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS

Under current law, there is limited authority for the settlement of debt obligations of FmHA borrowers. The legislation would broaden this authority to provide the Secretary with greater flexibility to compromise repayment obligations. This would allow the Secretary and the borrower, prior to any liquidation of the loan, to negotiate what assets the borrower may retain as the result of the liquidation. Currently, a borrower is required to liquidate all property securing the loan until the debt is settled. In some cases, the indebtedness exceeds the value of the collateral, which can result in the borrower remaining liable for substantial loan repayments even after all the property securing the loan is liquidated. Under these circumstances, there is little incentive for a borrower to voluntarily liquidate, and often the Government becomes involved in protracted legal proceedings to liquidate the loan.

With the new expanded authority to settle debts, the Secretary would be able to negotiate, on a case-by-case basis, agreements that would allow severely delinquent borrowers to retain some property—including their home—in order that the borrower may

make a transition from agriculture to another means of livelihood—thereby permitting FmHA loans to be liquidated in a more timely manner.

RELEASE OF NORMAL INCOME SECURITY

The legislation would also require the Secretary to release from the normal income security for a FmHA loan amounts that are sufficient to enable the borrower to pay essential household and farm operating expenses unless the Secretary determines that the loan should be liquidated. Such security consists of, among other things, crops produced on the farm by the borrower.

When the crops securing the loan are sold, the borrower generally repays the indebtedness. However, the sale of the crops, in some cases, does not generate sufficient proceeds to allow the borrower to repay the loan and have enough money left over to cover necessary living and operating expenses. In such cases, the borrower would be allowed to receive from the proceeds of the sale enough money to meet these essential expenses. The release of the funds would help many farmers to continue their operation and meet essential expenses without undue financial stress.

DISPOSITION AND LEASING OF FARMLAND IN THE INVENTORY OF THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Because of the continuing financial crisis in American agriculture, the Farmers Home Administration had liquidated an increasingly large number of loans, and as a result, the inventory of farms owned by the Farmers Home Administration has vastly increased. Prior to 1981, the Farmers Home Administration had never owned more than 260 farms. By April 1984, the inventory increased to 2,135 farms with 506,642 acres in total. The number of farms in FmHA inventory currently is around 3,000.

The legislation would make a number of important changes in the manner in which such farmland is leased or sold by the Secretary. Included among these are the following:

First, to the extent practicable, the farmland would be first offered for sale or lease to operators of family-sized farms.

Second, farmland may be leased, with the option to purchase, to operators of family-sized farms.

Third, farmland would be offered for sale at a price that reflects the annual income that may be expected from farming the land.

Fourth, in leasing farmland, the Secretary would be required to give special consideration to a previous owner or operator of the farm if there is a reasonable prospect that such operator will be successful in the proposed farming operation.

Fifth, farmland may be sold through installment sales contracts or similar devises if the interest of the Government in the land is protected.

Sixth, if the farmland is in tracts larger than that necessary for family-sized operations, the land would have to be subdivided and sold in units suitable to such operations.

The legislation would help to ensure that family farmers would be given the opportunity to purchase farmland from the Government at affordable prices and that such farmers would not be placed at a disadvantage in competing with large operators or nonfarmers for the purchase of additional farmland.

OTHER CREDIT PROVISIONS BENEFITTING FARMERS AND RANCHERS

Several provisions are designed to directly or indirectly assist farmers and ranchers. These include:

First. Improved procedures for the prompt processing of loan applications by the Farmers Home Administration.

Second. Improved appeals procedures for prompt and fair review of adverse determinations affecting FmHA borrowers.

Third. Availability of FmHA borrowers of summary loan statements.

Fourth, authorization for loan funds to be used by the borrower for training in the maintenance of records of farming and ranching operations.

Fifth, authorization for a borrower to make prospective payments on a loan from the proceeds of the lease or sale of mineral rights from real estate that secures the loan.

WATER, WASTE, AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES LOANS AND GRANTS

The legislation would also make certain changes in the Farmers Home Administration's programs that provide loans and grants to rural communities for the purpose of constructing or improving water, waste disposal, and other essential community facilities.

Under current law, eligibility for water and waste facility loans at interest rates not to exceed 5 percent are restricted to communities in which the median family income is below the Federal poverty line. This requirement is very restrictive and precludes the granting of assistance to many communities that need to construct or upgrade facilities to meet applicable health standards but cannot meet repayment terms on loans at higher rates of interest. The bill would address this problem by amending the eligibility requirement for these loans so that communities in which the median family income is below 80 percent of the statewide nonmetropolitan median household income would qualify for such loans. In addition, the bill would provide for loans at rates between 5 and 7 percent for communities in which the median family income does not exceed 100 percent of the statewide standard.

SUMMARY OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT PROVISIONS

The agricultural credit provisions of S. 1730 would provide substantial savings to the Federal Government in a manner that would not adversely affect American agriculture. Indeed, many of the credit provisions are designed to provide direct and immediate benefits to our nation's financially troubled farmers and ranchers. However, in view of the stressful situation facing agriculture, I would note that adjustments may be necessary in the level of loans authorized for certain of the FmHA lending programs as the Senate and the House complete action on the reconciliation bill, the 1985 farm bill, and the agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1986.

FOOD STAMP AND COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS AMENDMENTS

The provisions of S. 1730 involving the Food Stamp Program, the Commidity Distribution Program, and related programs are identical to provisions in the 1985 farm bill, S. 1714, reported by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. According to the estimates of the Congressional Budget Office, these provisions would save $586 million during fiscal years 1986 through 1989. The savings would result from amendments made to the Food Stamp Act of 1977.

A majority of the provisions that would result in savings would not adversely affect food stamp recipients. A number of the provisions would, in fact, be beneficial to certain eligible low-income households. However, it should be noted that some of the provisions would result in higher costs to the States.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM SAVINGS

The savings in the Food Stamp Program would be accomplished by—

First, maintaining the Puerto Rico nutritional assistance block grant at the current level of $825 million per fiscal year—estimated 3-year savings of $230 million;

Second, ending the current exclusion from income under the Food Stamp Program of allowances, earnings, and payments under the Job Partnership Training Act—estimated 3-year savings of $163 million;

Third, providing that low-income energy assistance payments must be considered in calculating a food stamp household's excess shelter deduction—estimated 3-year savings of $165 million;

Fourth, authorizing States to collect food stamp overissuances that result from agency-caused errors—estimated 3-year savings of $30 million;

Fifth, modifying the Food Stamp Program error rate sanction provisions to require States with error rates in excess of 5 percent to repay to the Federal Government the sum of (A) 75 percent of the dollar value of benefits

overissued between 5 and 7 percent, and (B) 100 percent of the amount overissued in excess of 7 percent, less (C) 75 percent of value of any overissued benefits collected by the States that would otherwise be returned to the Federal Government—estimated 3-year savings of $41 million; and

Sixth, prohibiting a household's food stamp allotment from being adjusted to reflect a reduction in AFDC or SSI benefits made as a result of the receipt by such household of a nonrecurring lump-sum payment—estimated 3-year savings of $18 million.

OTHER FOOD STAMP PROGRAM PROVISIONS

The food stamp provisions would make numerous other changes in the program, most of which would have little budgetary impact.

Among other things, the legislation would—

First, prohibit the imposition of State and local sales taxes upon food stamp transactions. Currently, such taxes are imposed in about 17 States. This prohibition would result in the loss of revenue in those States. However, the imposition of sales taxes on food stamp purchases has the effect of reducing food stamp recipients' benefits by the rate of the tax imposed, which may be as high as 6 percent. This prohibition against the imposition of such taxes on food stamp transactions would allow recipients to use the full value of their benefits for food—which is the purpose of the Food Stamp Program;

Second, require States to establish employment and training programs and place in such programs 25 percent of food stamp work registrants by the end of fiscal year 1987, 35 percent of such persons by the end of fiscal year 1988, and 45 percent by the end of fiscal year 1990. To assist States in the implementation of these programs, the Federal Government would allocate to States $40 million for fiscal year 1986, $50 million for fiscal year 1987, $60 million for fiscal year 1988, and $75 million for fiscal year 1989, and would share 50 percent of any additional costs that a State may incur over its allocation. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that under these levels of funding, the increased 3-year cost to the Federal Government would be $10 million. It should be noted that this requirement may result in higher administrative costs to the States in operating these work and training programs. However, if such programs are successfully operated, savings to the States under other programs, such as AFDC and unemployment compensation, should offset these increased costs;

Third, expand the definition of disabled member to cover anyone receiving a Federal benefit based on a determination of blindness and disability under criteria similar to those used under the Supplemental Security Income Program. Under current law, certain blind or disabled veterans, railroad retirement recipients, and other Federal program beneficiaries are not covered under the definition of disabled member even though they have the same degree of disability as others who are considered blind and disabled for Food Stamp Program purposes. The expanded definition would ensure that all similarly blind or disabled persons who receive benefits under Federal law would be treated the same under the Food Stamp Program;

Fourth, provide for categorical eligibility under the Food Stamp Program for most AFDC and SSI recipients; and

Fifth, require educational grants, loans, and scholarships, to the extent that they cover more than tuition and mandatory fees, to be counted as income if they are provided in the form of a vendor payment. The costs of required textbooks for courses covered by such grants, loans, and scholarships would not be considered mandatory fees for this purpose; therefore, any portion of a grant, loan, or scholarship paid to a educational institution or other supplier on behalf of a student for required textbooks would be considered income for Food Stamp Program purposes.

There are also a number of provisions in the bill that are intended to reduce fraud and abuse in the program and to provide for greater collections by State agencies of overissued benefits. These provisions should provide for better administration of the program by the States.

COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

S. 1730 would extend, through fiscal year 1989, the Secretary's authority to purchase commodities for distribution to institutions, commodity supplemental food programs, disaster relief areas, summer camps for needy children, needy families on Indian reservations and in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and other commodity distribution programs.

COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

The Commodity Supplemental Food Program would also be extended through fiscal year 1989. This program provides food packages of USDA-purchased commodities to low-income pregnant, breastfeeding, and postpartum women, and infants and children up to 6 years of age. The Commodity Supplemental Food Program currently operates in Nebraska and 11 other States as well as the District of Columbia. In addition, the legislation would extend, through fiscal year 1989, three demonstration food projects for low-income elderly persons.

The Secretary would also be authorized to permit State agencies to serve low-income elderly persons when unused caseload slots are available at any of the Commodity Supplemental Food Program sites.

TEMPORARY EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The legislation would extend the temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program through fiscal year 1987.

To assist States in meeting the costs of storing and distributing commodities made available to them under the program, Congress appropriated $50 million for fiscal years 1983 and 1984 and $57 million for fiscal year 1985. Under current law, there is no requirement for the States to match the funds provided for this purpose.

Under S. 1730, annual appropriations of $50 million would be authorized. However, beginning January 1, 1986, any funds provided to a State by the Federal Government from the appropriation would be required to be matched dollar for dollar by the State. No in-kind contributions would be counted as satisfying the matching requirement.

OTHER PROVISIONS RELATING COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION

The legislation would extend the Naitonal Commodity Processing Program through June 30, 1986, and would authorize a public or private nonprofit organization to transfer to another such organization perishable agricultural commodities purchased under section 32 of Public Law 74-320 if the other organization agrees to use the commodities in providing nutrition assistance to low-income individuals without cost or waste.

The provisions of S. 1730 relating to the commodity distribution programs would not have any suifficient budgetary effect.

EXPORT SALES OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

The legislation would require the Secretary of Agriculture to sell, on the international market, 150,000 metric tons of dairy products owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation during each fiscal year 1986 through 1988. The sale prices for these dairy products would be determined by the Secretary.

As of September 1, 1985, the Commodity Credit Corporation had uncommitted inventories of dairy products with a milk equivalent of 9.6 billion pounds. These inventories include 149.6 million pounds of butter, 660 million pounds of American cheese, and 982.4 million pounds of nonfat dry milk.

The sale of dairy products as required by this legislation would help reduce these inventories. It would also generate revenue for the Government and reduce Government storage costs. The Congressional Budget Office's estimate of the 3-year savings from the sale of these products is $331 million.

In recent years, exports of dairy products from the United States has declined from 3,988 million pounds in 1982 to 2,938 million pounds in 1984. The decline can be partially attributed

to the unfair trade practices in the international market.

S. 1730 would allow the United States to compete on a more equal basis with countries that use unfair trade practices to export their dairy products. Such competition from the United States may encourage these countries to enter into negotiations to establish a system for fair and open international dairy trade.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, the provisions of title I of S. 1730 proposed by the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry would accomplish savings in excess of the amounts the committee was required to make under its reconciliation instructions. I believe that this legislation is responsible, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand that if there are quorum calls, the time will be charged equally to both sides under the Budget Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. DOLE. It would have the effect of reducing the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. DOLE. That last part was the important part.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the quorum call has been in place for about an hour. It is being charged equally to both sides on the budget reconciliation measure.

Starting at 2:30, we will have three votes that I know of on motions to table amendments. There has been some advance notice and I hope that those votes will move rather rapidly. It may be possible to reduce the time on the roll calls on the second and third votes to 10 minutes each.

Mr. President, I also met with the President just a few moments ago and he would like very much to have nominations confirmed today. There are over 5,000 nominations pending. They have been held for some time. It is my hope that the distinguished minority leader would have an opportunity today to take up that subject in the Democratic caucus. I can indicate that the President asked me personally to try to speed up the process with reference to all nominations. Hopefully we can dispose of those today.

As indicated, there will not be a late night session tonight because of an engagement that Members on both sides have which starts fairly early this evening. We will probably be in until about 6 or 6:30.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. DOLE. I am plesed to yield.

Mr. BUMPERS. On the question of the Executive Calendar, as I understand it, there are about 5,000 military officers on that. Is that correct?

Mr. DOLE. That is correct.

Mr. BUMPERS. Has an offer been made by the minority leader to let those go through?

Mr. DOLE. There was an offer last week to let those go through, but not some 70 or 80 others on the calendar, yes. I do not see any reason to hold any of them up. We had a meeting with White House counsel and agreed to a suggestion made by distinguished minority leader that if there are any recess appointments to be made, both majority and minority leaders be advised well in advance so they would have an opportunity to do or say something. That seemed to satisfy everyone there. I hope that, based on that understanding, those nominations can be released, unless there is some specific reason not to do so.

Obviously, if a Senator or Senators have problems with a nominee, they have no obligation to do anything except to bring it up and have a vote on it.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I know the majority leader knows there has been strong feeling on this side about recess appointments. That is the reason for the donnybrook. I was hoping that whole thing could be compromised but I was also hoping that at least until it was, confirmation on these military appointments could go forward. We could do that in about 5 minutes and get these military officers off the calendar. I am not involved in that debate and I do not presume to speak for the minority leader. He is quite capable of handling any discussion on that point.

Mr. DOLE. the proposal on military officers was only made a few days ago. They have been held for quite some time, around 30 days. There are a number of others that have been held for some time. We do not want to quarrel about it. We would just as soon let them go, let everyone go, unless there are some specific objections. We have one on this side, one nominee for ambassador that we have not been able to clear.

Mr. BUMPERS. He is the one I would like to see let go, Mr. President.

Mr. DOLE. I share that feeling.

Mr. BUMPERS. Would the majority leader yield further?

Mr. DOLE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BUMPERS. We are on the reconciliation bill right now. I had a 5- or 10-minute statement I wanted to deliver on the agriculture appropriation bill, unless somebody else wants to speak on the reconciliation bill right now, I wonder if we could get an agreement to let me speak until someone comes to present something on the reconciliation bill.

Mr. DOLE. Sounds like a winner to me.

Mr. BUMPERS. I would like to make that request, Mr. President, with the time to be charged equally on both sides as it is on the reconciliation bill.

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

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1986

The Senate continued with consideration of the bill.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, later today, there will be a vote on a motion made by Senator COCHRAN, chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, to table the Helms amendment. It is a rather broad amendment which I strongly oppose. As I understand it, he tries to make the agriculture appropriations figures conform to a yet unpassed agriculture authorization bill. I am extremely concerned about a lot of items there but perhaps none more than the Farmers Home Administration Water and Sewer Facility Loans Program and the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Grants Program.

Mr. President, I am very pleased that H.R. 3037, the fiscal year 1986 agriculture appropriations bill, includes an amendment I offered that was accepted during the committee's markup providing level funding—in effect a funding freeze instead of a rather dramatic cut—for two vitally important programs included in the Farmers Home Administration's rural development insurance fund. The water and sewer facility loans and rural water and waste disposal grants enable thousands of rural communities to have a means of obtaining essential water and sewer services which they couldn't otherwise afford. The bill now contains $340 million for the Water and Sewer Facility Loans Program and $115 million for the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Grants Program. These levels are the same as those included in the House bill and the same level provided for both programs in fiscal year 1985. I certainly recognize the need for spending restraint and commend the chairman and ranking minority member on their fine efforts to report a good bill under such difficult circumstances. I do want to emphasize that these particular funding levels do not bust the budget, but

rather merely maintain the programs at last year's levels.

If the Helms amendment should prevail, the $340 million for the Water and Sewer Facilities Loans Program for rural areas would be reduced to $75 million and the $115 million in the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Grants Program would be totally eliminated. I want to make a few points to dramatize to my colleagues how important, how absolutely essential, these programs are to rural America.

I speak as a Senator from a rural, agricultural State. Given the current critical state of the rural economy, State and local resources for even the most vital services such as water and waste disposal are extremely limited. For rural communities, which are defined as "having a population of 20,000 citizens or less," the Farmers Home Administration is frequently the only available source of assistance.

To qualify for FmHA rural water and waste disposal grants, the median family income of the area must be a mere $10,650 or less. That is almost below the poverty level. As of August 1984, at least 50 percent of Arkansas' water and waste projects required significant funding assistance from FmHA grants. Even with these funds, monthly water bills average $18 to $20 per customer. That monthly obligation can be a severe strain to those families earning $10,650 or less. It is highly unlikely in such poor areas that any significant local funds exist to replace cuts in Federal funds. Available State funds must be shared with urban areas, which have their own unique needs.

In Arkansas, the State Soil and Water Conservation Agency is the only agency putting State money into rural areas for assistance with these important needs. That agency has only $2 million available for fiscal year 1986; $2 million becomes pretty thinly stretched when it is distributed among many communities, all of which have dire needs for clean water and adequate waste disposal, due to critical ground water contamination problems.

In my State, since 1963, we have funded at least 530 programs with these FmHA loans, and 50 percent of them qualified for grants as well. If you want to know what Senator HELMS' proposal will do to a State like Arkansas, and I know I speak for a lot of other agricultural States as well, here is an illustration.

The amendment of the Senator from North Carolina reduces the loan program from $340 million to $75 million for the entire Nation. You might as well eliminate the whole thing if you are going to make cuts like that. Right now, the Farmers Home Administration in the State of Arkansas has somewhere between 140 and 150 preapplications on their desk. A significant percentage of them will qualify for loans. A minimum of $75 million, and possibly over $100 million, will be needed just in the State of Arkansas alone to fund the programs that meet the qualifications and the criteria. What the Helms amendment would do is reduce this entire program to only $75 million for all 50 States, when my State alone has a demonstrable need for that amount of money for only part of the applications on file.

Last year, it was discovered in the little community of Green Forest, AR, which has a population of about 1,000 to 1,500 people, that the underground wells which were used for their municipal water supply were polluted. The National Guard carried water to that area for 6 months. Why? The Farmers Home Administration said the income level out there was too high. It was just a little above this $10,650 figure. Finally, the Farmers Home Administration worked out a solution to the problem so these people could get a Farmers Home grant and solve their pollution problem.

As more and more of our underground water supplies are contaminated in rural areas from toxic waste, polluting industries, and what have you, the need for these funds grows more acute. It has become a convenient way to oppose something in this body to call it a budget buster.

We all know what budget constraints are. You cannot get any money for education, and yet the illiteracy rate in this country continues to go up. We are the only developed Nation on Earth that has a continually rising illiteracy rate. It is the shame of the Nation. And the poverty rate among children under 18 years of age in the States has grown to 22 percent since the mid-1960's. Every time you try to do something about those very serious problems, you are accused of being a bleeding-heart liberal trying to bust the budget.

Ask the taxpayers of this Nation what is important to them. They will tell you that they believe in a strong defense, but they will also tell you that they believe in education and our children's future. They will tell you that they believe in cleaning up these toxic waste dumps and helping people solve their water and waste water treatment facility problems.

You may get an argument on Amtrak. You may get an argument on the urban development action grants or the community development block grants. You may get arguments on the National Endowment for the Humanities. Those are all nice, and I support them. But we are talking about the most basic needs of people here. We are talking about human needs, essential needs.

The other day, testimony for the National Institutes of Health was presented before the committee which Mr. WEICKER chairs. There was about $126 million in the bill for research on AIDS, which has the potential for being a real blight on civilization if it is not conquered. Senator WEICKER told the witness, "You tell us what you want, and we will give it to you." Not many people in this country will oppose that, because we all know the potential disaster that AIDS holds for this entire Nation.

So everything around here is always a matter of priorities. There are priorities that the American taxpayers do not object to seeing their money spent for, and those are to save lives and to prevent further polluting. They believe in trying to bring all the people of this country up to a high standard.

So I trust and certainly hope that our colleagues will vote to table the Helms amendment. Because citizens of rural communities continue to have critical water and waste disposal needs and health needs, I believe it is crucial that the important FmHA loan and grant programs be maintained at existing levels.

I want to express my appreciation to my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their support of my efforts to see these funding levels continued, and to ask them now to vote to table that amendment.

Mr. President, another program of vital importance to my State and several others across the South is the Brucellosis Eradication Program. Brucellosis is a serious infectious disease that mainly affects cattle, although it may affect humans. In cattle, it causes a somewhat reduced growth rate and abortion. In Arkansas, which continues to be one of the most seriously infected States, brucellosis causes losses of $5 million in direct production per year.

The centerpiece of the Brucellosis Eradication Program is the quarantine and herd examination process. Once an infected herd is located, the whole herd is quarantined and clearly infected cattle are given a "B" brand and slaughtered within 15 days. This program is of critical importance to States such as Arkansas, Mississippi, Florida, Oklahoma, Alabama, Texas, and Louisiana. Florida, for example, has had an infected herd rate of 28.79 per 1,000. At least 4,585 herds nationally have been quarantined.

Arkansas has made some progress in dealing with the problem because of tough State laws and a concerted Federal and State effort. In July 1984, Arkansas had 572 infected herds. By last month that had dropped to 400, still a very serious problem. We are making progress, but I certainly don't believe that warrants cutting funds now for this successful program. The House-passed bill includes $73.4 million for brucellosis eradication, and the Senate's bill includes $63.5 million.

I had given serious consideration to offering a floor amendment to increase funding in the Senate bill to the House-passed level. This would not have been an increase in funding over fiscal year 1985, but would in effect have been a funding freeze. Again, I recognize and respect the severe budgetary restraints the chairman was under in reporting this bill, and I know he, too, is keenly aware of the serious nature of the problem.

I therefore do not intend to offer an amendment to increase funds for this program. However, I would like to urge that the Senate's conferees give every consideration to concurring with the House's funding level during conference. If the Senate's 13- to 14-percent cut is implemented, we might expect a corresponding increase in the number of infected herds in Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, Florida, and across the entire South. The modest budget savings that would be achieved would not be worth the devastating costs incurred.

Mr. President, I thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns on these issues of critical importance to citizens throughout rural Arkansas and rural America.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 779

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DECONCINI (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "aye." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. LAXALT], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 223 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Abdnor	Garn	Mathias
Andrews	Glenn	Matsunaga
Boschwitz	Goldwater	McClure
Bumpers	Gore	McConnell
Burdick	Gorton	Melcher
Byrd	Grassley	Metzenbaum
Chiles	Hart	Packwood
Cochran	Hatch	Pressler
Cohen	Hatfield	Pryor
Cranston	Heflin	Riegle
D'Amato	Heinz	Rockefeller
Danforth	Hollings	Sarbanes
Denton	Inouye	Sasser
Dixon	Johnston	Simon
Dodd	Kassebaum	Specter
Dole	Kasten	Stafford
Domenici	Kennedy	Stennis
Durenberger	Kerry	Stevens
Eagleton	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Evans	Leahy	Wallop
Exon	Levin	Weicker
Ford	Long	Zorinsky

NAYS—28

Armstrong	Helms	Quayle
Baucus	Humphrey	Roth
Bentsen	Lugar	Rudman
Bingaman	Mattingly	Simpson
Boren	Mitchell	Symms
Bradley	Moynihan	Trible
East	Nickles	Warner
Gramm	Nunn	Wilson
Hawkins	Pell	
Hecht	Proxmire	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

DeConcini, against

NOT VOTING—5

Biden	Harkin	Murkowski
Chafee	Laxalt	

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mrs. HAWKINS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

(Later the following occurred:)

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, this is just a unanimous consent request to change a vote that I cast before on tabling the Proxmire motion. I ask unanimous consent to have that vote changed from nay to yea. It will not affect the outcome of the vote, and I appreciate getting unanimous consent to make that change.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

AMENDMENT NO. 780

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. LAXALT], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] would vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOSCHWITZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who wish to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 224 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Abdnor	Ford	Melcher
Andrews	Glenn	Metzenbaum
Baucus	Gore	Mitchell
Bentsen	Gorton	Moynihan
Bingaman	Grassley	Nickles
Boren	Hart	Nunn
Bradley	Hatfield	Packwood
Bumpers	Heflin	Pell
Burdick	Heinz	Pressler
Byrd	Hollings	Pryor
Chiles	Inouye	Riegle
Cochran	Johnston	Rockefeller
Cohen	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Cranston	Kasten	Sasser
D'Amato	Kennedy	Simon
Danforth	Kerry	Specter
DeConcini	Lautenberg	Stafford
Dixon	Leahy	Stennis
Dodd	Levin	Stevens
Durenberger	Long	Trible
Eagleton	Mathias	Weicker
Evans	Matsunaga	Zorinsky
Exon	McConnell	

NAYS—27

Armstrong	Hatch	Quayle
Boschwitz	Hawkins	Roth
Denton	Hecht	Rudman
Dole	Helms	Simpson
Domenici	Humphrey	Symms
East	Lugar	Thurmond
Garn	Mattingly	Wallop
Goldwater	McClure	Warner
Gramm	Proxmire	Wilson

NOT VOTING—5

Biden	Harkin	Murkowski
Chafee	Laxalt	

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next vote be 10 minutes.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 781

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] to lay on the table the amendment (No. 781) of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The vote on this motion has an agreed limitation of 10 minutes. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. LAXALT], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 77, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 225 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Abdnor	Gorton	Kassebaum
Armstrong	Gramm	Mathias
Boschwitz	Hatch	McClure
Cochran	Hawkins	Nickles
Denton	Hecht	Symms
East	Helms	Wallop

NAYS—77

Andrews	Goldwater	Nunn
Baucus	Gore	Packwood
Bentsen	Grassley	Pell
Bingaman	Hart	Pressler
Boren	Hatfield	Proxmire
Bradley	Heflin	Pryor
Bumpers	Heinz	Quayle
Burdick	Hollings	Riegle
Byrd	Humphrey	Rockefeller
Chiles	Inouye	Roth
Cohen	Johnston	Rudman
Cranston	Kasten	Sarbanes
D'Amato	Kennedy	Sasser
Danforth	Kerry	Simon
DeConcini	Lautenberg	Simpson
Dixon	Leahy	Specter
Dodd	Levin	Stafford
Dole	Long	Stennis
Domenici	Lugar	Stevens
Durenberger	Matsunaga	Thurmond
Eagleton	Mattingly	Trible
Evans	McConnell	Warner
Exon	Melcher	Weicker
Ford	Metzenbaum	Wilson
Garn	Mitchell	Zorinsky
Glenn	Moynihan	

NOT VOTING—5

Biden	Harkin	Murkowski
Chafee	Laxalt	

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GOLDWATER, Senator METZENBAUM, and Senator BINGAMAN be added as original cosponsors of the amendment.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is not my intention to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment itself unless someone else does.

I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment (No. 781) was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to discuss a problem related to the Commodity Supplemental Food Program with the chairman. Focus: HOPE, a nonprofit organization operating a CSF Program in Detroit, has experienced a deficit during fiscal year 1985 as a result of distributing cheese and other bonus commodities that are technically not a part of the food package for mothers and infants. Current law provides administrative funds for the distribution of only those items administratively designated as part of the food package. As a result, bonus commodities which are being distributed by Focus: HOPE to needy persons just like every other commodity in the food package are not being taken into account in determining the level of administrative funding for the CSF Program.

Although the current law does not provide administrative funds for the distribution of these bonus items, in practice food program operators have received administrative funds from the USDA every year since 1982. In fiscal year 1982 and 1983, CSF Program operators received 15 percent of the value of these bonus commodities for administrative expenses after the Congress approved special appropriations to take care of the problem. In fiscal year 1984, the USDA administratively provided 5 percent of the value of the bonus commodities to offset administrative costs incurred by program operators.

Furthermore, the House farm bill contains a provision which would amend the administrative funding formula for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program to include all commodities distributed to program recipients. This issue will therefore be resolved in the farm bill and all CSF operators will have fair warning of congressional policy with respect to bonus commodities.

I am told that there are funds remaining from the CSFP appropriations for fiscal year 1985. Does the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations agree that any unspent funds should be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to reimburse Commodity Supplemental Food Program operators for administrative costs they incurred by distributing bonus commodities that are not a regular part of the CSFP food package?

Mr. COCHRAN. The Senator from Michigan is correct. In practice, CSF Program operators have been receiving administrative funds for the distribution of bonus commodities that are not a regular part of the food package. Hopefully, this issue will be resolved in the farm bill. I agree with the Senator from Michigan that in the interim, the Department of Agriculture should use any unspent funds from fiscal year 1985 for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program to reimburse CSFP operators for the administrative costs associated with storing and distributing bonus commodities that are not a regular part of the CSFP food package.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, along with my colleague from Michigan, I would also like to share my thoughts on this issue with the chairman of the subcommittee. As you know, Focus: Hope has incurred a deficit for fiscal year 1985 because they have distributed bonus commodities, like cheese and nonfat dry milk, that are not a regular part of the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. Under current law, administrative funding is not provided for the distribution of bonus commodities not considered a part of the Commodity Supplemental Food Program. We have been unsuccessful in past attempts to change this administrative formula to be based on the value of all commodities actually received. As a result, we have had to ask for additional funds each year to cover the debt. These funds have been provided from any left over moneys from the Commodity Supplemental Food Program during that fiscal year.

Focus: Hope is the largest Commodity Supplemental Food Program in the Nation for pregnant and post-pregnant mothers, infants and preschool children. Each month Focus: Hope distributes U.S. Department of Agriculture commodities to more than 47,000 low-income persons, on prescription from 450 cooperating clinics, hospitals and health service agencies. Study after study has shown that the Commodity Supplemental Feeding Program is effective in meeting the essential needs of its participants at the least possible cost to the Government.

In addition, studies have proven the program's effectiveness in reducing infant mortality, morbidity, and the incidence of low birthweight babies, virtual elimination of anemia among children, and assurance of normal height and weight growth patterns. For these reasons, I urge the chairman to provide any remaining funds from the Commodity Supplemental Food Program during fiscal year 1985 to be made available to Focus: Hope to cover their deficit.

AMENDMENT NO. 782

(Purpose: To provide additional appropriations to the Food and Drug Administration for activities related to acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS))

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator RIEGLE, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mr. CRANSTON], for himself and Mr. RIEGLE, proposes an amendment numbered 782.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the read-

ing of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 57, line 10, strike out the first amount and insert in lieu thereof an amount that is $3,385,000 greater.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, this amendment would provide additional funds for the Food and Drug Administration for AIDS-related activities. Specifically, the amendment would add $3.385 million to the fiscal year 1986 appropriation for the FDA to enable it to keep pace with the acceleration in AIDS research. My understanding is that a supplemental budget request from FDA is now pending at OMB for this amount. I have discussed this amendment with the distinguished Chairman [Mr. COCHRAN] and ranking minority member [Mr. BURDICK] of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, and understand that they are prepared to acccept it.

Mr. President, only $6.63 million was initially requested by the administration for AIDS-related activities—$2.2 million less than the amount appropriated for the FDA for this purpose in fiscal year 1985. Yet, during fiscal year 1986, our Nation's scientists will be greatly accelerating their research efforts in order to find effective treatments for AIDS patients.

In this connection, I am very pleased to note that the fiscal year 1986 Labor-HHS-Education-Related Agencies Appropriations Act, H.R. 3424, as reported from the Appropriations Committee on October 4, includes a total of $205 million for AIDS research and public health activities. That measure should be before the Senate shortly. I congratulate the chairman of the Labor/HHS Subcommittee [Mr. WEICKER] for proposing that level, which would increase the AIDS budget in that measure by $87 million over the administration's amended budget request.

That increase in the Labor/HHS bill was a result of testimony received at a Labor/HHS Appropriations Subcommittee hearing on AIDS on September 26—2 days after the full committee reported the Agriculture Appropriation Act, H.R. 3037—and consultations between the distinguished subcommittee chairman [Mr. WEICKER] and individual researchers, During that hearing, the Acting HHS Assistant Secretary for Health, Dr. James Mason, testified that he had requested an additional $70 million for AIDS activities, although that request has not yet been forwarded to the Congress. His request included the $3.385 million for the FDA that I am now proposing.

Of the additional funding included in the Labor/HHS appropriations measure, $57 million will be used by the National Institutes of Health to initiate and expand several AIDS research projects. Specifically, this funding will enable scientists to make an accelerated effort to see that promising drugs—to inhibit the virus which causes AIDS, to stimulate the immune system, and to treat "opportunities" infections—are vigorously pursued and properly tested.

It is anticipated such an effort to find safe and effective AIDS treatments will stimulate many new drug applications and investigational new drug submissions. The FDA must be ready to respond as quickly as possible to these product applications.

In addition, the Labor/HHS Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1986 as reported includes $6.9 million for the Centers for Disease Control to fund the purchase and distribution of drugs for the treatment of AIDS patients not included in the NIH clinical trials. When a drug is determined to be safe and effective for the treatment of AIDS, but before it is licensed by FDA, the drugs will be made available for the treatment of AIDS patients under a treatment IND to help improve the quality of life of the people with AIDS. Because of the severity of the AIDS illness, these IND applications necessitate immediate action by the FDA.

The additional $3.385 million I am proposing would enable the FDA to carry out effectively its work in the screening, testing, and approving of drugs for treating AIDS, of vaccines, and of blood-screening tests.

Mr. President last year, at just about the same time, we were faced with a similar situation. The Senate had recently completed action on the fiscal year 1985 Labor/HHS Appropriations Act. I had offered an amendment to that measure, which was accepted, to add $14.6 million for AIDS research. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, S11800 daily ed. Sept. 25, 1984.) These funds had been recommended by the then-Assistant Secretary for Health, Dr. Edward N. Brandt, Jr., in a May, 1984 memorandum. Although Dr. Brandt's request for additional AIDS funding was never formally transmitted to Congress, Congress recognized his expertise, as the highest ranking individual in the Federal Government, in assessing the overall needs of the Federal AIDS Research Program and heeded his recommendations. When the continuing resolution was considered on October 3, 1984, I offered an amendment to increase the FDA's budget for AIDS by $8.35 million. This amendment, too, was derived from Dr. Brandt's recommendation, and, again, it was accepted. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, S13003, daily ed. Oct. 3, 1984.) Those funds were urgently needed to fill out the research package that Dr. Brandt had compiled; the additional funding gave FDA the capacity to keep pace with the rapid movement then underway on AIDS.

Mr. President, in a similar fashion, the amendment I offer today will serve to bring the budget for FDA's AIDS activities in line with that of the other Public Health Service agencies. It would be tragic if our ability to provide AIDS patients with effective treatments were needlessly delayed because the FDA did not have the means to screen and approve the necessary drug applications.

Mr. President, the additional amount I am seeking is modest, but the stakes are very high. It is absolutely essential to finding the means to treat and, ultimately, prevent and cure the AIDS. As our Nation's biomedical scientists move forward in finding treatments for AIDS, the FDA must have the resources to facilitate that progress.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this vitally important amendment. Adoption of this amendment is one more important step in our efforts to halt the spread of this killer disease.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment would provide funding for 31 full-time employees to conduct in-house work and to provide funds for related equipment and support.

I further understand that there is a request for this funding now pending at the Cffice of Management and Budget.

We have no objection to the amendment, Mr. President, and we urge the Senate to approve it.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished floor managers for their assistance on this amendment and for agreeing to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment (No. 782) was agreed to.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, earlier this year, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and I brought a proposal to the attention of the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee to initiate funding for a Center for Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas.

Mr. President, an ATTRA Center would proving a useful and cost-effective tool to the American farmer at a time of severe need for assistance, including technical assistance. After careful study, I have concluded that such a center would be a wise expendi-

ture of taxpayers' dollars and would yield substantial benefit to the American farmer and, thus, the American consumer.

Mr. GORE. If the distinguished senior Senator will yield, I would like to add my strong support for a Center for Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas. This Center would establish a much needed data base of national and international technologies on rural resource management, including soil and water conservation, energy efficiency, sustainable agriculture, water quality management, and land management. The center would further provide specialized, site-specific technical assistance on these resource management technologies. The center staff would work closely with existing agencies and would complement their activities. A complete data base of this nature and a staff of specialists trained to work with rural communities, farmers, extension agents, and others in applying appropriate technologies currently do not exist.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the Senator for his comments. Let me say that I endorse his comments and would add that I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will carefully consider our proposal in a later appropriations measure.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senators from Tennessee for bringing this matter to my attention. As you are aware, the appropriations committee has had to make some difficult decisions in order to live within the budget resolution constraints. Unfortunately, we have had to make reductions in many USDA programs. In view of the need to cut the Federal budget, the committee was unable to approve funding the proposal for an ATTRA Center. However, I do want to assure my colleagues from Tennessee that we will carefully consider this matter when the opportunity to initiate new programs is established.

Mr. SASSER. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his comments. Many valuable programs are going unfunded this year because of the severity of the budget crisis. The ATTRA Center is one of them. I just want the chairman to know that I believe such a center could provide American farmers some very valuable and necessary assistance. The American farmer faces an uncertain future. He will need every tool at his disposal. He will need to adopt appropriate technologies and will need the kind of assistance that would be provided by an ATTRA Center.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator would yield further, I would add that an ATTRA Center would provide farmers and rural communities valuable assistance about cost-saving technological developments at a time when the Nation's farmers clearly would benefit from such assistance. I understand that because of the extremely serious nature of the current deficit, many worthy programs cannot be funded and others will have their funding reduced. However, I thank the chairman for having given this proposal the serious consideration it deserves and for his willingness to consider it further at the appropriate time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, we have under the unanimous-consent agreement limited amendments that can be offered.

I might state to the Senate that the colloquy that was entered into the RECORD a few moments ago between Senator LEVIN and myself took care of the issue that was to be raised by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

I understand that we have two or three other amendments under this agreement that have not been offered, that may be offered: An amendment to be offered by the Senator from Indiana, Senator QUAYLE, dealing with cargo preference; an amendment to be offered by Senator DIXON, of Illinois, dealing with a plant and animal science research center; and an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] which deals with the Agricultural Policy Institute.

We have now completed action on all of the other amendments in the unanimous-consent agreement.

I hope that we can now complete action on these remaining three amendments and then go to final passage of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 776

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished manager of the bill would yield for a series of questions?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois. I understand the Senator has an amendment which would provide for a $3 million appropriation for a plant and animal science research center. We are hoping that we can discuss that proposal and that the Senator will agree to withhold the offering of the amendment or to withdraw the amendment. I do not think the amendment is at the desk.

Mr. DIXON. I say to my colleague, the manager of the bill, that the amendment is at the desk. It is amendment No. 776 to H.R. 3037.

Mr. President, I say to the distinguished manager, I express on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] and myself the profound respect for the important work that he and the manager on this side, Mr. BURDICK, are doing in respect to this legislation.

I think my colleague knows that this particular subject matter is included in the House bill. My understanding is that my colleague and friend from Mississippi has talked to his old friend and colleague from the House side, Representative ED MADIGAN, who supports this amendment with great enthusiasm. I believe this $3 million, to be used for the planning, design, and development of a plant and animal science research center at the University of Illinois—located in Champaign-Urbana, IL, which, I tell my colleague, is my alma mater—is of great importance to our State. My colleagues on the House side, particularly his old friend, ED MADIGAN, has suggested that I talk to him about the importance and the merits of this legislation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, let me say to my colleague that I had an opportunity to talk by telephone just a few minutes ago with my good friend, Representative ED MADIGAN, who had requested an appropriation on the House side for this plant and animal science research center. He tells me that this is an important project. I am sure that it is and could provide many benefits in the area of plant and animal science research.

Our problem with the amendment here is not whether this is a worthy project or has merit; I am sure that it does. We are constrained by the budget resolution and the 302(b) allocation that we have had imposed upon the subcommittee's prerogatives. We have tried to live within those guidelines and targets, and we have, by and large.

Let me say, Mr. President, that in spite of that, we will have an opportunity to discuss this issue with the House conferees when we meet to work out the differences between the House- and Senate-passed bills. I hope we can reach agreement on many of the differences that do exist in the bill. That is one that will be subject to discussion.

Let me say to my friend that it will have a high priority in our discussions. I am not able to make a commitment that we will come out of conference with an agreement to provide these funds, but for my part, I shall have an open mind about it and shall remember the discussions that I have had with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON] about the project and his interest in it and his strong feeling that it is important that it be included in the bill.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment can be withdrawn with the assurance that it will be looked at carefully, it will be a matter of discussion

with the House conferees, and we shall try to work out something that is satisfactory. I hope we can. If he could accommodate us on this, it would be appreciated.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, may I say to my warm friend from Mississippi that all of us have such great and profound respect for him as the manager of this bill and for the manager on our side, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], and I appreciate the expressions of interest in this matter by the Senator from Mississippi. I express the thanks of my colleague [Mr. SIMON] and myself and Representative ED MADIGAN and others on the House side, Representative BRUCE from the affected district and others, and Representaive DURBIN as well. We thank the Senator for his indication that this will have a high priority and will receive his careful evaluation in the conference.

On that basis, Mr. President, we are willing at this time to withdraw this amendment with our profound appreciation for the managers' consideration of the matter in conference.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

The amendment (No. 776) was withdrawn.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, we have been operating under a unanimous-consent agreement providing that certain amendments would be the only amendments in order to H.R. 3037, the agriculture appropriations bill. All of them have been disposed of except an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. QUAYLE], and an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY].

The managers of the bill have been advised that neither Senator QUAYLE nor Senator GRASSLEY intend to call up and offer their amendments. We had been advised by the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], that he had an amendment that he was interested in offering. His amendment is not listed among those amendments that are in order to be offered.

At this point we are prepared to go to third reading. But I do not want to cut anyone off, or to in any way impinge upon the rights of any Senator either under the unanimous-consent agreement or otherwise. It is my purpose in rising to address the Senate now to state that it will be the intention of the managers of the bill, unless otherwise notified by those who are listed in the unanimous-consent agreement, to go on to third reading, and dispose of the bill. If there is any further debate on the bill, of course, Senators are not cut off. We have a right to discuss the provisions of the bill.

But I make that announcement, Mr. President, and say that it is the intention of the manager to go to third reading, unless we are notified that there are other amendments.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: under the Navy, Calendar Nos. 372, 373, 374, 375, and 376; under the Judiciary, Calendar Nos. 380 through 386; Calendar No. 387, No. 388, Nos. 389 through 391, No. 392, Nos. 396, 397, and 398, No. 399, Nos. 400 through 406, No. 407, No. 408, Nos. 409 through 413, No. 417, skipping 414, 415, and 416; Calendar Nos. 417, 418, 419, and No. 421.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Mr. DOLE. Calendar Nos. 423, 424, 425, 426, and 427; Nos. 428, 429, and 430; Nos. 431, 434, 435, 437, 438, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, and 461.

Under the Army, Calendar No. 463 and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the distinguished majority leader would indulge me, I wrote a letter to the President last year and I also wrote to the President in July of this year expressing concern about recess appointments, at the instructions of the Democratic Conference. I received no response to the letters, the last of which, I think, was dated July 30 of this year.

I spoke to the distinguished majority leader about the matter and indicated that the White House had not responded to the letter which I had written at the instruction of the Democratic Conference.

About 1 or 2 days after I had spoken to the distinguished majority leader, I received a response from the White House, for which I was grateful, and for which I thank the majority leader. I am not at all sanguine as to whether or not, but for the majority leader's intervention, the White House would have responded at all.

I had indicated a readiness to discuss the subject of recess appointments with representatives of the White House and on two occasions I had had to cancel such appointments because of business on the floor which kept me occupied. On last Thursday a meeting was arranged in my office with Mr. Fielding and Mr. Friedersdorf. I invited the distinguished majority leader, and he came and was there awhile and then he had to leave.

The representatives who were in my office from the White House, Mr. Friedersdorf and Mr. Fielding, indicated, in response to a question that I asked as to whether or not there were any recess appointments planned during the Columbus Day break, that they knew of none but would double check. Indeed, no such appointments were planned and no recess appointments occurred.

They also, in response to a request that I voiced, indicated that in the future, prior to any recess breaks, the White House would inform the majority leader and me of any recess appointment which might be contemplated during such recess. They would do so in advance sufficiently to allow the leadership on both sides to perhaps take action to fill whatever vacancies that might be imperative during such a break.

As I stated to Messrs. Friedersdorf and Fielding, I did not question or challenge the President's right under the Constitution to fill vacancies that may happen during such a recess; however, I did not feel that the Senate should be circumvented in its constitutional role of advice and consent; that I felt on behalf of my colleagues, there have been entirely too many recess appointments and all too often they had been made in situations which were not of an emergency nature or of a nature that such recess appointments could be justified.

The White House response was satisfactory to me, and that response was made while the distinguished majority leader was present; namely, that he and I would be informed in the future, prior to a recess, if there were any plans to make recess appointments or if there were any offices, the filling of which constituted an emergency or it were imperative that action be taken before the Senate would return from its recess. My colleagues and I thought the responses were satisfactory. I brought them to the attention of my conference earlier today and there seemed to be all-around satisfaction as to the work that had been done and the results that had been produced.

Mr. METZENBAUM was present in my office upon that occasion, Mr. INOUYE and Mr. CRANSTON were there—that having been the ad hoc committee which I appointed in conference to work with me on this matter.

Now, on last Thursday, late in the day, following that meeting with administration officials, the distinguished majority leader and I had a colloquy on the Senate floor about the appointments of certain nominees that were on the calendar. I indicated that we on this side were ready to give our approval to 16 out of 17 judgeship nominations that were on the calendar, also to 5,000, perhaps, 5,600—in any event, circa 5,000—military nominations. We were ready to confirm them. I also indicated that we were ready to confirm the nominee for the Ambassadorship to the People's Republic of China. As it turned out, however, that particular nominee had not been cleared on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DOLE stated that the White House had requested of him that unless all of the nominations on the calendar—with the possible exception of one here or one there, against whom a particular Senator or group of Senators had placed a hold—none should be confirmed. The White House felt that all of the other nominations ought to be cleared and that if all could not be cleared then the White House would not want any to be confirmed as of that date. The indication was that the White House felt that to confirm some and leave others on the calendar would be prejudicial or discriminatory toward those remaining on the calendar.

The majority leader was not, as far as I am concerned, voicing his personal opinion. I think he was voicing the White House's wishes. I do not find any fault with him for that. He had been in touch with the White House and that was the position that they took, that is, all or nothing. So I said, "Well, OK, if that is the way they want it, it is OK with me. We are ready to go forward on 16 out of 17 judges and 5,000 who are military nominations." I also indicated that I, as an agent of my conference, would bring the matter to the attention of the conference today—at that point I said next Wednesday—and I expressed a feeling there would not be any problem with respect to most of the other nominees because our discussions with the White House representatives led to a satisfactory resolution of the matter by which we Democrats had been concerned, namely, the recess appointments.

I wish to thank the distinguished majority leader for his courtesies, No. 1, of telling the White House that they ought to answer their mail and, No. 2, in helping to arrange meetings. In every way he has been helpful and understanding.

Now, today I was somewhat amused by the following excerpt from today's White House briefing.

I am reading from the excerpt:

Mr. SPEAKES. Okay. It's our understanding that Senator Byrd, the Minority Leader, is meeting today, perhaps even at this hour, wtih the Democratic Caucus, to discuss whether he will release more than 5,000 "hostages" that he is holding—(laughter)—that one man is holding, that one man is holding, in the United States Senate. These include more than 100 Executive Branch appointees, at a time when we're receiving criticism for not having fully staffed positions in the government. They are holding 17—about 20 judges, when caseloads are backing up in the federal courts, and they are holding 5,000 military promotions, innocent people, who are being denied pay raises——

Q. This is a job for the Delta Force.

Mr. SPEAKES [continuing]. Being denied pay raises and promotions, all because of the whim of one individual sitting up there in Congress, who has put a hold on 'em.

Q. Are you putting a warrant out for Byrd? [Laughter.]

Mr. SPEAKES. When Jesse Helms decided to hold——

Mr. DONALDSON. Yeah, he did.

Mr. SPEAKES [continuing]. A handful of nominees, it was big front page news. When Bob Byrd——

Q. He helped make it so.

Mr. SPEAKES [continuing]. When Bob Byrd decides to—well, what about this?

Mr. PLANTE. Helms was in the same party as the President.

Mr. SPEAKES. When have you ever heard me stand here and talk about the Minority Leader of the Senate in this fashion?

Mr. WALLACE. About a week ago.

Mr. SPEAKES. One man is taking—and it didn't scratch. It didn't scratch.

Mr. DONALDSON. Is he a terrorist? Are you saying he's a terrorist?

Mr. SPEAKES. One man is holding the entire 5,000 "hostages" in the United States Senate. We call on the Minority Leader, one man, to release these hostages, set them free.

Mr. WALLACE. "Let my people go." [Laughter.]

Mr. SPEAKES. All right, let's see what kind of reporting. A wire guy didn't make a single note, and I expected only the wires to do it. The Post put it on the bottom of the federal page. The Times put it on page A or B-18, wasn't it?

[Several speak at once.]

Mr. SPEAKES. Yes, we do want our Ambassador to China appointed.

Ms. MITCHELL. Helms——

Mr. SPEAKES. It's over 5,000, compared to one.

Q. Thanks!

Q. Let's go!

Mr. President, I realize that President Reagan used to be associated with a television program about the old frontier—"Death Valley Days," but I did not realize that the President was so fond of the program or that period of history that he had returned the White House to the days of frontier communications. Apparently, the news of what happened here in the Senate Chamber last Thursday evening, to which I have alluded earlier, in open view of the world, has not yet reached the White House, 6 days later. Even the pony express could deliver a message faster than that on "Death Valley Days."

I have already discussed the meeting that occurred in my office, and I would close by saying that if there are any "hostages" in this case, they have been held by the White House, in their refusal to allow the distinguished majority leader to proceed on last Thursday. Or, maybe the pony express rider who delivers information to the White House about what happens 16 blocks away in the Capitol, is being held "hostage" somewhere along that wild and woolly frontier route known as Pennsylvania Avenue.

Well, I hope that the administration will be able to find all these today, together with the pony express rider, and I hope that we hear from him soon that the fearsome wilderness passage known as Pennsylvania Avenue has been reopened to allow the vital communications flow on which the most powerful Nation on the face of the Earth must depend.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters which I wrote to the President on July 30, 1985, and August 6, 1984, together with the September 19 White House response to my letter, written by Richard A. Hauser, Deputy Counsel to the President; a statement by the principal Deputy Press Secretary as of October 8, 1985; a reprint of the colloquies between the distinguished majority leader and myself on last Thursday; and an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on Thursday, October 10, carrying the caption "Who Has the Power To Appoint?"

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

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, July 30, 1985.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the Congress approaches adjournment for the August break, I would like once again to convey my views, and those of the Democratic Conference, on the subject of recess appointments. This same matter was the subject of my letter to you on August 6 of last year when I expressed my deep concern about the number of recess appointments which had been made during our brief July 1984 recess.

The forthcoming August recess should not, in our judgment, be considered the kind of extended recess contemplated by Article III, Section 2, Clause 3, of the Constitution. Rather, recess appointments should be limited to circumstances when the Senate, by reason of a protracted recess, is incapable of confirming a vitally needed public officer. Any other interpretation of the Recess Appointments clause could be seen as a deliberate effort to circumvent the Constitutional responsibility of the Senate to advise and consent to such appointments.

I would therefore ask that you refrain from making any recess appointments during the August break.

Your personal attention to this matter would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. BYRD.

U.S. SENATE,
DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE,
August 6, 1984.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to express my deep concern about the number of recent recess appointments and to urge you to refrain from making similar appointments when the Senate is fully capable of exercising its constitutional function of advising and consenting to executive nominations.

The latest in a series of recess appointments was made on July 20, scarcely 72 hours before the Senate reconvened following the July 4 and Democratic Convention recess. At the beginning of the same recess, sixteen recess appointments were made to a number of different federal bodies. In my view, none of the most recent recess appointments were made in the circumstances that induced the Framers to allow for appointments "that may happen during the recess of the Senate". As indicated in a long line of opinions by Attorneys General, presidential powers arising in the event of an adjournment of the Congress are to be determined by the ability of the Senate to perform its functions. In overturning an exercise of the presidential pocket veto power during an abbreviated congressional recess, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in 1974 observed that "(t)he modern practice of Congress with respect to intra-session adjournments creates neither . . . the hazards (of) long delays (nor) public uncertainty. . . ." At no time has the Senate been out of session long enough to prevent the filling of vacancies which, in the public interest, may not be left open for any protracted period.

In brief, the appointments of Dr. Martha Seger to the Federal Reserve Board, Vice Admiral Lando N. Zech, Jr., to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, six members of the National Council on the Humanities, and other recent appointments could and should have followed the constitutionally prescribed manner. In the words of the Supreme Court:

"The Appointments Clause could, of course, be read as merely dealing with the etiquette or protocol in describing 'Officers of the United States,' but the drafters had a less frivolous purpose in mind. . . . We think its fair import is that any appointee exercising significant authority pursuant to the laws of the United States is an 'Officer of the United States,' and must, therefore, be appointed in the manner prescribed by S 2, cl. 2, of . . . Article (II)."

Over the course of the last three and one-half years, some 80 recess appointments have been made to a wide variety of agencies and commissions. The Senate has demonstrated its willingness to support these selections by subsequently confirming the bulk of the recess appointments.

In the early days of the Republic, a recess was interpreted to mean the period between the first and the second sessions of a Congress. More recently, recess appointments have been made during intra-session recesses of several weeks duration. But the unstated rationale has remained the same. Recess appointments should be made when the Senate is recessed for a protracted period and where the lack of an appointee will seriously hamper the operations of the government.

The line between what is and what is not an extended recess during which an appointment can be made has not been clearly delineated by the courts. Most of the doctrine on the matter has emerged from historical practice and infrequent opinions from the Justice Department. No doubt, that line should be more carefully defined at some point in the future.

The occasion for making a recess appointment can be questioned on practical as well as constitutional grounds. Both grounds are involved when a recess appointment is made to evade the proper role of the Senate or to avoid controversy surrounding a nominee.

I am especially concerned about the appointment of Dr. Martha Seger whose nomination is a case in point. At stake is a fourteen-year appointment to what many consider the country's most influential economic body, the institution that controls the money supply, and plays a lead role in regulating the nation's financial system. A July 2, 1984 recess appointment to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Dr. Seger's nomination was sent forward only a month earlier on June 2, 1984. The Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee held four days of hearings and favorably reported her nomination on June 28. The Senate then recessed for twenty-three days. The recess appointment was made the following Monday.

I know of no compelling reasons that justify Dr. Seger's appointment on that basis. There are six other sitting Governors on the Federal Reserve Board. Her presence was not required at the July Federal Open Market Committee meeting to make a quorum or to debate policy. Because of doubts regarding her qualifications, Dr. Seger's nomination was highly controversial. All the Democratic Committee members opposed her nomination and several indicated they would oppose her nomination on the floor. A recess appointment sidesteps a full and timely airing of such controversies in a manner that does not, in my view, serve the nation's best interests. And, as you may know, there have been similar objections raised to several of the recess appointments to the National Council on the Humanities.

Because a recess appointee can be removed by a subsequent, differing nomination by the President or rejected by the Senate, there is a real danger that the independence of the appointee could be undermined by his or her recess status. It is just this kind of objection that has been raised to a recent recess appointment to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. According to press reports, ". . . both officials and critics of the . . . nuclear industry questioned the appointment . . . saying the Commission's ruling would be more credible if its members were confirmed normally." The appointment to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is rendered all the more questionable because the committee of jurisdiction was not even given an opportunity to hold hearings on the nominee.

I must again emphasize my objection to the excessive use of the recess appointment power, and urge that no recess appointment be made to circumvent the constitutional function of the Senate. Instead, I urge that recess appointments be limited to circumstances when the Senate, by reason of a protracted recess, is incapable of confirming a vitally needed public officer. Existing law gives the Executive more than ample authority to shift personnel about to fill vacancies for temporary periods. Resort to recess appointments in questionable circumstances serves neither the Constitution nor the appointee. It fuels cynicism and builds disrespect for law and deprives the appointee of the national perspective that inheres in senatorial confirmation.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, September 19, 1985.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I have been asked to respond to your letter to the President dated July 30, 1985, concerning recess appointments.

In your letter, you expressed the view that the recent August recess "should not * * * be considered the kind of extended recess contemplated by Article III [sic], Section 2, Clause 3, of the Constitution," and that "recess appointments should be limited to circumstances when the Senate, by reason of a protracted recess, is incapable of confirming a vitally needed public officer." Such limitations on the President's power, however, do not appear in the Constitution. Article II, Section 2, Clause 3 of the Constitution simply provides: "The President shall have Power to fill up all Vacancies that may happen during the Recess of the Senate, by granting Commissions which shall expire at the End of their next Session."

The courts have rejected the suggestion that the recess appointment power was intended to be used only in rare and exceptional cases. Perhaps the clearest statement may be found in an opinion rejecting a challenge to one of former President Carter's recess appointments:

"There is nothing to suggest that the Recess Appointments Clause was designed as some sort of extraordinary and lesser method of appointment, to be used only in cases of extreme necessity. * * * There is no justification for implying additional restrictions not supported by the Constitutional language. Recess appointments have traditionally not been made only in exceptional circumstances, but whenever Congress was not in session." *Staebler* v. *Carter*, 464 F. Supp. 585, 597 (D.D.C. 1979).

Your letter also suggests that use of the recess appointment power is somehow an improper circumvention of the advice and consent role of the Senate. We do not share this view. The power to make recess appointments is found in the Constitution, as is the Senate's advice and consent role. As the Supreme Court has stated, "The Constitution * * * must be regarded as one instrument, all of whose provisions are to be deemed of equal validity." *Prout* v. *Starr*, 188 U.S. 537, 543 (1903). In no way is the provision for Senate confirmation constitutionally superior to the provision for recess appointments.

In conclusion, the decision to make a recess appointment is not made lightly. For example, there were over ninety-seven nominations pending when the Senate recessed in August, but only seven recess appointments were made. The power to make such appointments, however, is an important part of the system of checks and bal-

ances crafted by the Framers, and the President would do a disservice to that system and the insitution of the Presidency were he to acquiesce in the reading of the Recess Appointments Clause set forth in your letter.

Sincerely,

RICHARD A. HAUSER,
Deputy Counsel to the President.

STATEMENT BY THE PRINCIPAL DEPUTY PRESS SECRETARY

The President is deeply displeased that 70 key appointments touching virtually every area of the Executive Branch are being deliberately held up by Senate Democratic Leader Robert Byrd. These are Assistant Secretaries, Ambassadors, Federal Circuit and District Judges, and members of important agencies, commissions and boards. Over 5,000 mid-level career military personnel alone are being denied promotions and pay raises. It is the largest backlog of Presidential appointments in modern history.

Senator Byrd has decided to block these and other nominations because of what he terms his "deep concern" about the seven recess appointments made last August.

The President's power to make recess appointments is grounded in the Constitution, and this issue was decided long ago. George Washington made three recess appointments between the sessions of the First Congress. President Carter made 17 direct appointments during temporary Senate breaks, including a Cabinet member. Fifteen recess appointments have been made to the United States Supreme Court, including one sitting Justice.

President Reagan did not evade the Senate's power to confirm. The individuals he appointed had already been nominated before the recent Senate recess—the Senate just hadn't acted on the nominations. And those appointees were renominated when the Senate returned.

The Constitution speaks without equivocation on the power and right of the President to make recess appointments. The courts have held the President has the power. And history dating to the First President confirms it. These individuals stand ready to serve.

The President respectfully requests Senator Byrd's cooperation in freeing up his nominations without further delay.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 10, 1985]

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, earlier today at the request of the distinguished minority leader or the suggestion of the distinguished minority leader, I attended a meeting in his office concerning nominations on the Executive Calendar, and present were Senator Byrd, myself, Senator Inouye, Senator Ford, Senator Thurmond, Senator Metzenbaum, and White House representative Mr. Friedersdorf, and the counsel at the White House, Mr. Fielding.

The discussion concerned recess appointments, and it seemed to me that we had reached some general agreement that there would be notice given to the majority and minority leaders prior to the time of a recess and enough in advance so that if we had comments on any of the recess appointments which would be made, both minority and majority leaders would have an opportunity to comment on those potential recess appointments.

I believe that the meeting was satisfactory, and I would hope that we would now be in position to clear the nominations on the Executive Calendar, including military and judicial and all other nominations except in cases where we are waiting further information on a certain nominee or certain Senators have asked for additional information or have asked to hold a nomination.

I know on this side a number of Senators have a hold on the nomination of Winston Lord to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of China. There may be similar requests on the other side of the aisle. But it would be my hope that we might be able to take action on the nominations.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a comment?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the Vice President of the United States is to visit the People's Republic of China. For him to do so without being accompanied by the President's newest nominee for the ambassadorship to China would be, in my view, a disservice to our country.

The Vice President has an opportunity to introduce Mr. Lord as a friend of the President, as he is, a representative of our country, as he would be, and not to do that seems to me a serious disservice to our Nation.

And I hope this can be done.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I share the view expressed by the Senator from New York. I understood there is still a chance that might be resolved today, that the President had taken a personal interest in the matter, and was going to contact Senators on this side.

But I share the view that it does not reflect well on the system, that the Vice President arrives and we have no ambassador.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the following calendar items under the Judiciary have been approved on this side of the aisle. As a matter of fact, all nominees on the calendar listed under the Judiciary have been cleared on this side of the aisle, with the exception of one, and that would be Calendar Order No. 379 on page 3. The rest, Calendar Order Nos. 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 396, 397, 398, 425, 426, 427, 449, 450, and 451—in other words 16 out of the 17 nominations under the Judiciary—are cleared on this side.

Additionally, Calendar No. 436, Winston Lord of New York to be Ambassador, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the People's Republic of China has been cleared; all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, Navy—a little over 5,000—are cleared on this side of the aisle.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader. I earlier had indicated to the White House representatives that there might be a possibility of confirming the military, and maybe all or nearly all of the judiciary. As I understand it, a call was then made to Air Force One which is coming back from Chicago. The Chief of Staff talked with the President. The President said that he wanted his nominees, they were all important, and he felt there was no reason to hold any of the nominees except where there were specific objections. I was advised that unless that could be accommodated they would all remain on the executive calendar.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Mr. Friedersdorf called me back after the meeting in my office, and indicated he had been in touch, I believe, with Mr. Reagan. My understanding of what Mr. Friedersdorf said was that the President was pleased that the nominees for the judiciary and the military were going to be cleared, and that he would hope that all the other nominees on the calendar could also be cleared. And I told Mr. Friedersdorf that I was an agent of the conference, that those nominees which we had indicated in our meeting in my office earlier in the afternoon were being cleared, and that it would be necessary for me to report back to my conference with respect to the remaining nominees. So I should think that I would have some further word when my conference meets at sometime on Wednesday of next week. It usually meets on Tuesday. But inasmuch as there will be no rollcall votes on Tuesday, I doubt that our conference attendance would justify a meeting. We probably would not have a quorum.

In any event, we will have a conference on Wednesday, and at that time I will make a report to the conference. I would hope that the rest of the nominees can be cleared at that time. The ad hoc group that I appointed earlier in conference to advise me on the nominations proposed that the judiciary members be cleared, and that the military nominations—numbering I believe about 5,000—be cleared. And that is why I have been pleased to announce their clearance to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. I again thank the distinguished minority leader. I double checked. I again called after the President had landed, and they were in the White House. I called the Chief of Staff, Mr. Regan, to ask him again if it had been discussed with the President. He said it had. The President felt very strongly that these nominations had been available for some time, been on the calendar, and if no one had raised objections—they have in some cases—they felt that it would discriminate against a number of people who have done nothing but wait and wait if we started selecting out certain judicial or military nominees, and leave others—whether it be the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, or the Department of Energy, or a number of others. I guess the point is they feel they are all equally as important, and they would rather not do it on a piecemeal basis unless there are specific objections to one or more of the nominations. So perhaps we should take it up again next week.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I ask, is the nomination of Winston Lord cleared on the other side? It is cleared on this side.

Mr. DOLE. That is the one that we have not cleared on this side. There is specific objection. There was to be a phone call to certain Senators on our side. I understand that phone call was made but it was not completed. So that nomination is being held up on this side. I think one of those who was holding is the Senator from South Carolina, who just removed his hold. There could be others.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate often confirms some nominees very quickly and just as often leaves other nominees on the calendar to another day. They are not being discriminated against. However, it is entirely up to the majority leader.

The White House will be taking the wrong position in thinking that other nominations on the calendar are being discriminated against just because they have not been cleared tonight.

As I say, I will be glad on Wednesday to take the matter up with my conference and through the regular procedures, try to get

cleared the remaining nominations on the calendar. I do not anticipate at the moment any great problem in that regard.

If the White House feels that way, it is not the majority leader's fault nor is it mine. We will just leave it the way they want it.

We did have a good meeting, may I say, with Mr. Fielding and Mr. Friedersdorf. The majority leader was able to attend a part of the meeting. He was not able to stay for the entire meeting.

At the meeting there was a good understanding, and I feel certain that come Wednesday there may not be any problem.

I would hope that the nominees who have been cleared for tonight can be confirmed, but I cannot do anything about that if the majority leader feels he cannot go forward with them because the White House has asked him not to do so.

[From the New York Times, October 10, 1985]

WHO HAS THE POWER TO APPOINT?

"The President is deeply displeased" with Senate Democrats for holding up 70 appointments to executive and judicial posts, says a spokesman. Well, Robert Byrd, the minority leader, is displeased too. He's blocking some Senate confirmations because the President keeps ignoring his plea to stop making appointments when Congress is in brief recess.

President Reagan, having tried the Senate's patience with his misuse of the recess-appointment power, would be well advised to seek an accommodation rather than confrontation.

The Constitution lets the President "fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate." These recess appointments expire at the end of the following session of Congress, ousting the officeholders unless they are by then nominated and confirmed.

That provision, in Senator Byrd's judgment, was designed for the long Congressional absences common early in the nation's history. Plainly they don't apply to the vacation breaks of today's year-round Congress. They certainly should not be used to circumvent the Senate's constitutional duty to advise on and consent to appointments.

That is what Mr. Reagan tried to do concerning the Legal Services Corporation. He used the recess appointment power 40 times in an attempt to destroy Legal Services by appointing directors unacceptable to the Senate to run it into the ground. He has, additionally, used the recess-appointment authority almost casually, 146 times in five years.

Senator Byrd's specific protest concerns seven appointments made in August, following a similar ruse during last year's summer recess. The seven are not crucial. They fill vacancies at a safety review commission, the Agriculture Department, a farm agency and the United Nations delegation.

This contest between two branches can't be resolved by the third; courts can only confirm that each side has considerable power to check the other. Mr. Reagan could make his cause more appealing by finally acknowledging that the power to fill vacancies is not his alone. He may not like the Senate's advice, but he is bound to secure its consent.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I apologize to the distinguished majority leader for not responding immediately and to the point to his request. I am now ready to respond.

Mr. President, cleared on this side of the aisle are the following calendar order numbers: 372, 373, 376, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386—in other words, all nominees on pages 2 and 3 of the executive calendar, with the exception of Calendar Order No. 379.

On pages 4 and 5, all nominees have been cleared on this side of the aisle—namely, Calendar Order Nos. 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 394, 395.

All nominees on pages 6 and 7 : Calendar Order Nos. 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407.

All nominees on pages 8 and 9: Calendar Order Nos. 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412.

On page 10: 412 and 413.

On page 11: Calendar Order Nos. 417, 418, 419.

On page 12: Calendar Order Nos. 420, 421, and 423.

On page 13: All nominees—424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430.

On page 14: 431; skip 433. Cleared are 434, 435, 436, 437.

On page 15: Calendar Order Nos. 438, 439, 440, 441.

On page 16, Calendar Order Nos. 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448.

On page 17, Calendar Order Nos. 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, and 455.

All nominees on page 18, Calendar Order Nos. 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, and 461. Delete for the moment, pass over 462.

I said all nominees on page 18. I was in error. All except 462.

Then on page 19, all nominees, Calendar Order Nos. 463 and 464.

Mr. PROXMIRE will have a statement that he will make in connection with 464.

On page 20 and page 21, all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, and Navy.

I am glad to respond to the distinguished majority leader's request. I am glad that the stumbling block to confirmations of these nominees has been removed—rather late in the instances to which I addressed my remarks earlier which occurred on last Thursday when the White House said all or nothing after they had gone public and had been critical of the Senate Democrats for having held up some appointments.

All is well that ends well, and I think it has ended well, so all is well.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin might wish to speak to Calendar No. 464, William Seidman.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would like to speak to that. Is this the time to offer that?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the majority leader.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM SEIDMAN TO THE FDIC

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of Mr. William Seidman to the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Mr. Seidman is a man of considerable ability and talent with an excellent educational and business background. He has served with distinction in the Ford administration. In many ways, the Government will be fortunate to get a man of his ability and experience. Nonetheless, I will reluctantly vote against this nomination.

Why?

My reasons for opposing the nomination are twofold: First, his former accounting firm, Seidman and Seidman, was strongly criticized by the SEC in 1976 for not fulfilling its responsibilities in the manner required by the standards of the accounting profession. As the firm's managing director when the failures occurred, Mr. Seidman must bear ultimate responsibility. Second, he was deficient in responding to a question from Chairman GARN asking whether he was ever deposed by the SEC in connection with the accounting firm's difficulties. A more detailed explanation of these two incidents follows.

THE 1976 SEC REPORT

In 1974, the SEC began an investigation of fraudulent activity on the part of several of Seidman and Seidman clients including Equity Funding, Omni-Rx and SaCom. The collapse of Equity Funding in 1973 involving $120 million in fictitious assets was one of the major financial scandals of the decade. Two employees of Seidman and Seidman were eventually convicted of criminal fraud for their role in the Equity Funding scandal. These employees were formerly with a smaller accounting firm, Wolfson and Weiner, acquired by Seidman and Seidman in early 1972 along with the Equity Fund account managed formerly by Wolfson and Weiner.

The SEC eventually expanded its investigation to include an investigation of Seidman and Seidman itself. In 1976, the SEC reached a settlement agreement with Seidman and Seidman. Without admitting or denying guilt, the firm agreed to appoint a special committee to review its auditing practices and to implement any reasonable recommendations of the special committee. The firm also agreed not to accept any new auditing clients for 6 months and to submit to another SEC inspection following the report of the special committee.

The SEC release announcing the settlement agreement with Seidman and Seidman includes the following determinations by the SEC: (SEC release No. 196, Sept. 1, 1976; Exchange Act Release No. 12752)

Seidman and Seidman did not fulfill its reponsibilities in the manner required by the standards of the profession.

Seidman and Seidman's conduct represented a breach of its ethical and professional responsibilities in practicing before the Commission.

Seidman and Seidman failed to undertake a reasonable investigation prior to the combination of the firms and failed to properly review practices and professional qualifications of staff members of the Wolfson/Weiner office or to adequately inquire into factors bearing on their independence from clients. After the combination, Seidman and Seidman failed to take reasonable steps to ensure the maintenance of professional audit review practices and independence in connection with former Wolfson/Weiner clients.

There is no evidence that Mr. William Seidman or other partners or employees of Seidman and Seidman—other than the convicted former Wolfson/Weiner personnel—had any personal knowledge of the fraudulent activities at Equity Funding. Nor is there any indication of any other troubles with the SEC on the part of Seidman and Seidman. Nonetheless, Mr. Seidman was the managing director of the firm during the time the SEC's criticisms were directed. As managing director, I believe the ultimate responsibility for failing to maintain proper standards must rest on his shoulders.

COMMITTEE REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Following his nomination hearing before the Senate Banking Committee, Mr. Seidman was given the following written question by Mr. GARN:

QUESTION. Were you ever deposed by the SEC in connection with this case? Could you tell us what the substance of your testimony was? Was this the only time you were deposed in this matter?

ANSWER. I do not recall that I was ever deposed in the SEC investigation of Equity Funding. I believe that my testimony in the stockholder actions v. S&S, et al., is the only testimony I gave in the Equity Funding matter. Seidman & Seidman states that they can find no other deposition in their records.

In fact, Mr. Seidman was deposed twice by the SEC in connection with its investigation of Omni-RX and SaCom. The deposition also covered Equity Funding and went at length into the circumstances surrounding the purchase of Equity Funding's former accounting firm, Wolfson and Weiner, by Seidman and Seidman. The first deposition was taken on October 2 of 1974 and the second on August 4, 1975. The entire deposition runs 137 pages. It is true that Mr. Seidman qualified his negative answer with the statement that he did not recall any deposition. Nonetheless, considering the fact that he was responding to a committee of the U.S. Senate in connection with his nomination to a responsible position within the Federal Government, I believe he should have made a greater effort to ensure that his reply to this question was accurate and complete. I feel strongly on this point even though a review of the SEC deposition does not implicate Mr. Seidman in any fraudulent activity or indicate personal knowledge of such activity.

Under the Constitution, the Senate has an important duty in the nomination process. I take that responsibility seriously, especially for independent regulatory agencies such as the FDIC which are not under the direct supervision of the President. By his careless response to the committee's inquiry, I believe Mr. Seidman demonstrated a less than full appreciation of the seriousness of the advise and consent process. He had ample time to refresh his memory and search his records in response to the committee's inquiry and yet he failed to do so. I know of no better way to express my deep concern on this failure other than to vote no on the nomination.

Mr. President, I will do so.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished colleague from Wisconsin and I also thank the distinguished minority leader.

I think we then do have an agreement now that we can follow on recess appointments. It did result from the meeting in the minority leader's office with Mr. Fielding, White House Counsel, Mr. Friedersdorf, Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs, and I would hope that we can avoid any future problems.

Obviously from time to time Senators have strong feelings on a nominee and they have a perfect right to express those concerns. In fact, even after the minority leader's efforts today there will still be six nominees who are being held on this side by different Senators for different reasons.

Again, as I understand it, we may be able to clear two or three additional nominees if not today, tomorrow on the Senator's side.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I call attention to the one nominee on which I either misstated myself or an objection came in following.

Mr. DOLE. That is Calendar No. 439?

Mr. BYRD. 439, yes.

Mr. DOLE. Yes; we will withhold that one.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; so I cannot clear that.

I have since, however, been able to clear two which I did not name earlier, Calendar No. 414 and Calendar No. 415, the Commodity Future Trading Commission and the Farm Credit Administration, respectively.

Mr. DOLE. Then I would ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 414 and 415 be added.

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

Mr. DOLE. Also, I think the distinguished minority leader pointed out Calendar No. 440 is now cleared, is that correct, but not Calendar No. 439?

Mr. BYRD. Not Calendar No. 439, that is correct; 440, yes.

Mr. DOLE. And also I add to my request Calendar No. 464, which was not being held but just awaiting comment by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRD. The distinguished majority leader is correct.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be entitled to insert statements in support of particular nominees at this point.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I would also indicate that Calendar Order Nos. 394, 395, 420, and 436, which have been cleared by the minority leader, have not been cleared on this side, so he might want to make that notation on his list.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations just identified be considered en bloc and confirmed en bloc.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officer for appointment as Vice Chief of Naval Operations pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section [redacted]:

Vice Adm. James B. Busey IV. [redacted] 3214/1310, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer having been designated for command and other duties of importance and responsibility within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 601, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. James B. Busey IV. [redacted] /1310, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be admiral

Adm. Lee Baggett, Jr., [redacted] /1110, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Arthur S. Moreau, Jr., [redacted], U.S. Navy.

THE JUDICIARY

Ralph B. Guy, Jr., of Michigan, to be U.S. circuit judge for the sixth circuit.

Stephen H. Anderson, of Utah, to be U.S. circuit judge for the 10th circuit.

51-059 O-86-21 (Pt. 20)

Ferdinand F. Fernandez, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California.

Glen H. Davidson, of Mississippi, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Mississippi.

Robert B. Maloney, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas.

David Bryan Sentelle, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of North Carolina.

Brian B. Duff, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Donald James Quigg, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert B. Sims, of Tennessee, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be admiral

Adm. Sylvester R. Foley, Jr., [redacted] 1310, U.S. Navy.

The following-named commodore of the line of the Navy for promotion to the permanent grade of rear admiral, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 624, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

RESTRICTED LINE—SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (CRYPTOLOGY)

Charles Francis Clark.

The following-named captains of the U.S. Navy for promotion to the permanent grade of commodore, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 624, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Lewis Mantel.

SUPPLY CORPS

James Edward Miller.
James Elton Eckelberger.
William Egbert Powell, Jr.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Alvin Berthold Koeneman.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Benjamin Franklin Montoya.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Richard Kennon Willard, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

THE JUDICIARY

Edmund V. Ludwig, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

Stephen V. Wilson, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California.

David Sam, of Utah, to be U.S district judge for the district of Utah.

COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL

J.C. Argetsinger, of Virginia, to be a Commissioner of the Copyright Royalty Tribunal for the term of 7 years.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

William Barclay Allen, of California, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities.

Mary Joseph Conrad Cresimore, of North Carolina, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities.

Leon Richard Kass, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities.

Kathleen S. Kilpatrick, of Connecticut to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities.

Robert Laxalt, of Nevada, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities.

James V. Schall, of California, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities.

George D. Hart, of California, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the U.S. Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 624, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Stuart E. Barstad, [redacted] FR, U.S. Air Force, chaplain.

To be brigadier general

Col. John P. McDonough, [redacted] FR, U.S. Air Force, chaplain.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named Army Medical Service Corps officer for appointment in the U.S. Army to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 611(a) and 624:

To be permanent brigadier general

Col. Walter F. Johnson, III, [redacted], Medical Service Corps, U.S. Army.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Richard A. Miller, [redacted] 1310, U.S Navy.

The following named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711, to be reassigned in his current grade to be senior Navy member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations and to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

Vice Adm. Donald S. Jones, [redacted] 1310, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10. United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under Title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Joseph B. Wilkinson, Jr., [redacted] /1310, U.S. Navy.

The following-named captains of the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commodore in the line and staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5912:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

John William Gates, Jr.
Stephen Gordon Yusem.
Richard Squier Fitzgerald.
Samuel Edward McWilliams.

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

Paul Keith Arthur.

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS

Robert Layman Summitt.
Robert Conrad Nuss.

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICER

James Hock Mayer.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Thomas R. Kinnebrew, [redacted] /1110, U.S. Navy.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Susan Meredith Phillips, of Iowa, to be a Commissioner and Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Larry L. DeVuyst, of Michigan, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

The following-named persons to be the Representative and Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the 29th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency:

Representative:
Danny J. Boggs of Kentucky.
Alternate Representatives:
Richard T. Kennedy of the District of Columbia.
Richard J. Palladino of Pennsylvania.
Bruce Chapman of Washington.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Leo C. McKenna, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Jean Broward Shevlin Gerard, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be Representatives and Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the 40th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Representatives:
Vernon A. Walters of Florida.
Herbert Stuart Okun of the District of Columbia.
Daniel A. Mica, U.S. Representative from the State of Florida.
Gerald B. H. Solomon, U.S. Representative from the State of New York.
John Davis Lodge of Connecticut.
Alternate Representatives:
Patricia Mary Byrne of Ohio.
Hugh Montgomery of Virginia.
Joseph Verner Reed of New York.
Robinson Risner of Texas.

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Elliott Abrams, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

Mark L. Edelman, an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation.

THE JUDICIARY

David A. Nelson, of Ohio, to be U.S. circuit judge for the sixth circuit.

James L. Ryan, of Michigan to be U.S. circuit judge for the sixth circuit.

Henry T. Wingate, of Mississippi, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Mississippi.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Brian P. Joffrion, of Louisiana, to be U.S. Marshal for the western district of Louisiana for the term of 4 years.

Stepehn M. McNamee, of Arizona, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Arizona for the term of 4 years.

Patrick M. McLaughlin, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Marshall Jordan Breger, of the District of Columbia, to be chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States for the term of 5 years.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Elizabeth Flores Burkhart, of Texas, to be a member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for the term of 6 years.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Patricia Mary Byrne, of Ohio, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Deputy Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Hugh Montgomery, of Virginia, to be the Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Herbert Stuart Okun, of the District of Columbia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Bill D. Colvin, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

U.S. SENTENCING COMMISSION

Stephen G. Breyer, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 2 years.

Paul H. Robinson, of New Jersey, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 2 years.

Michael K. Block, of Arizona, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 4 years.

Helen G. Corrothers, of Arkansas, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 4 years.

George E. MacKinnon, of Maryland, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 4 years.

Ilene H. Nagel, of Indiana, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 6 years.

William W. Wilkins, Jr., of South Carolina, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 6 years.

William W. Wilkins, Jr., of South Carolina, to be chairman of the U.S. Sentencing Commission.

THE JUDICIARY

Alan H. Nevas, of Connecticut, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Connecticut.

Paul N. Brown, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Texas.

Alan A. McDonald, of Washington, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Washington.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

William A. Maddox, of Nevada, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Nevada for the term of 4 years.

Roger Hilfiger, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Roger Dale Semerad, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

James M. Stephens, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Roger William Jepsen, of Iowa, to be a member of the National Credit Union Administration Board.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Lawrence J. Jensen, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Jennifer Joy Manson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Craig C. Black, of California, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

Charles L. Hosler, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

William J. Merrell, Jr. of Texas, to be an Assistant Director of the National Science Foundation.

IN THE ARMY

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the Adjutant General's Corps, Army National Guard of the United States, Reserve of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, Sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Edward D. Baca, [redacted]
Brig. Gen. Alfredo J. Mora, [redacted]
Brig. Gen. Ernest R. Morgan, [redacted]
Brig. Gen. Nathaniel G. Troutt, [redacted]

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

L. William Seidman, of Arizona, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of 6 years.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK IN THE AIR FORCE, ARMY, COAST GUARD, MARINE CORPS, NAVY

Air Force nominations beginning Theodore M. Sahd, and ending James M. Kinsella, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Air Force nominations beginning Charles D. Ables, and ending Kenneth W. Welsh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Air Force nominations beginning Maj. Dennis M. Anderson, and ending Maj. John H. Elledge, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Air Force nomination of James M. Kinsella, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Air Force nominations beginning Raymond A. Abole, and ending Daniel R. Zink, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Col. Richard O. Covey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 11, 1985.

Air Force nominations beginning Maj. John M. Lounge, and ending Maj. James D. Vanhoften, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 20, 1985.

Army nominations beginning William F. Norris, and ending Loraine G. Goodman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Army nominations beginning Johnny R. Abbott, and ending Donald B. Zamora, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Army nominations beginning Marc A. Abramowitz, and ending Henry J. Zielinski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 16, 1985.

Army nominations beginning William F. Reade, and ending James L. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 17, 1985.

Army nominations beginning Jon W. Day, and ending Gary B. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 20, 1985.

Army nominations beginning Henry W. Adams, and ending Joseph A. Siegel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 20, 1985.

Army nominations beginning Giorgio S. Tureila, and ending William J. Howard III which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 20, 1985.

Coast Guard nominations beginning Thomas P. Vieten, and ending Neal D. Shadix, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 16, 1985.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Paul D. Allen, Jr., and ending Robin F. Wirching, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 30, 1985.

Marine Corps nomination of James M. Johnson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Harold D. Jones, and ending Wellington Y. Wheaton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Navy nominations beginning Robert P. Burroughs, and ending Walter F. Threlkeld, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Navy nominations beginning Nicholas Sabalos, and ending George J. Thielemann III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Navy nominations beginning Orlando A. Alfred, and ending James W. Crawford, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Navy nominations beginning Donald Jacob Beyer, Jr., and ending Edwin Frank Zupinski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 11, 1985.

Navy nominations beginning Robert A. Fabrini, and ending Lewis L. Ware, which

nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 2, 1985.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the nominations were confirmed.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified that the Senate has given its consent to these nominations.

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

NOMINATION OF GLEN H. DAVIDSON, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to endorse the Senate Judiciary Committee's recommendation of Mr. Glen H. Davidson for confirmation as U.S. district judge for the northern district of Mississippi.

I was honored to have recommended this fine young attorney to the President for this position, and I urge the Senate to support his nomination.

Glen Davidson is eminently qualified for service on the Federal bench. He is a graduate of the University of Mississippi, where he earned both his undergraduate and law degrees. His experience as an attorney includes both public service and private practice, civil and criminal cases, in Federal and State courts.

Mr. Davidson's career includes 3 years active duty in the U.S. Air Force Judge Advocate Corps, where he earned the rank of captain. For a number of years, he was in private law practice in Tupelo, MS. In the public sector, he served terms as city prosecutor, assistant district attorney, and later, as district attorney for the First Judicial District of Mississippi. In 1973, he formed a partnership that resulted in extensive trial practice experience. In 1981, I was honored to recommend Mr. Davidson to the President to serve as U.S. attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, and he has served in that position with distinction.

In addition to his exemplary performance as an attorney and as a public servant, the nominee has been a leader in community groups such as the Boy Scouts and the chamber of commerce. He has a keen intellect and a willingness to work hard and effectively in any job he undertakes.

Glen Davidson possesses the sense of fairness, good judgement, judicial temperament, and solid reputation among his fellow citizens which will enable him to be an outstanding Federal judge.

I commend the chairman and the Judiciary Committee for their prompt approval of this nomination.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT B. SIMS, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today to endorse the nomination of Mr. Robert B. Sims to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Bob Sims is a native of Alamo, TN. Since October 1983, he has served at the White House as Deputy Press Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

Bob Sims' career in journalism began in the printing rooms of the Crockett County Times, then owned by his father. He started at the bottom and worked his way to the top. The insights and perspectives gained from experiences in all aspects of journalism have served him well over his career in the Government as a public affairs officer. He understands the ways of reporters and appreciates the role a free press plays in a democratic society.

Bob Sims is a professional military officer. He joined the Navy in 1958 and retired in 1984 with the rank of captain. His service in the Navy has been primarily in the public affairs field, including positions as deputy chief of information for the Navy in 1978 to 1981 and special assistant for public affairs to the Secretary of the Navy from 1974 to 1978. This military service provides valuable insight into the operation of the military.

Finally, Mr. President, Bob Sims is a scholar and an author. He holds a masters degree in both political science and journalism from the University of Wisconsin. He was a Rotary Foundation Fellow at the University of Sydney, Australia. And, he is a graduate of the National War College. While at the war college he wrote "The Pentagon Reporters" a book describing the reporters who cover the Pentagon. The purpose of his book was to enlighten Government officials on the news services and reporters who cover the Pentagon, and the role played by the press.

Not only will the Government be well served by Bob Sims, but the press knows that it has an official who is honest, fair, and straightforward. Charles Corddry, of the Baltimore Sun, describes Bob Sims as, "undeviatingly pleasant. He is low key in that he never tries to sell you anything. He simply tells you as he sees it."

As the new Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Bob Sims is uniquely qualified. He will be an asset to the press and to his Government.

In closing, my statement, I would like to read a passage from Bob Sims book, "The Pentagon Reporters." I think the following passage provides a good assessment of how he will approach his position. In addition it is wise advice to all public officials who interact with the press.

In the final analysis, policies and programs that cannot be successfully explained to the public are usually ill-conceived. Therefore, a realistic policy of dealing with the media makes good sense. Some things can not and should not be discussed with reporters; some American military battlefields of the future may be closed to the immediacy of modern news coverage. But the major subjects of keenest interest to defense reporters can be discussed with them, and should be. Good policies and good programs ought to be explainable—and good officials ought to know how to do the explaining.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to approve the nomination of Robert Sims as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

NOMINATION OF HENRY T. WINGATE, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I commend the chairman and Judiciary Committee for its recommendation of Mr. Henry T. Wingate for confirmation as U.S. district judge for the southern district of Mississippi.

It was with utmost confidence in his abilities that I recommended Mr. Wingate to the President for this position. I urge the Senate to confirm him.

Mr. Wingate's legal experience clearly demonstrates that he is well qualified to serve in this position. He is a graduate of Grinnell College and Yale Law School, and has extensive trial experience in both the State and Federal court systems.

Mr. Wingate served for 3 years as a criminal trial attorney and senior assistant defense counsel for the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the U.S. Navy. He continues to serve as a lieutenant commander in the U.S. Navy Reserve.

Following his release from active duty, the nominee served 4 years as special assistant attorney general for the State of Mississippi, and 4 years as assistant district attorney for the seventh circuit court district. Since 1984, Mr. Wingate has served as assistant U.S. attorney for the southern district of Mississippi.

In addition to his exemplary performance as an attorney and public servant, the nominee serves as an adjunct professor of law and as a lecturer on criminal law and procedure, and has been published in these areas. He is a community leader and member of numerous charitable and service organizations.

Henry Wingate is highly regarded among his peers and fellow citizens as an individual of great intellect, sense of fairness, and moral character. I am confident that his service will reflect credit on the Federal bench.

NOMINATION OF STEPHEN H. ANDERSON TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I recommend to this body Mr. Stephen H. Anderson of Salt Lake City, UT, for appointment to the Tenth Circuit Court of

Appeals. I was proud and happy when President Reagan nominated Mr. Anderson for this position, and I am now proud to urge my colleagues in the Senate to enthusiastically confirm his nomination.

Having known Steve for many years, I have developed the highest respect and admiration for his professional skills and his interpersonal qualities. He is a man of extraordinary character. His dedication to law and justice is exemplary. In a legal career spanning over 25 years, he has served in a wide variety of positions, public, private, and philanthropic. In every one, he has served with distinction.

He has been President of the Utah State Bar, president of the Salt Lake County Bar Association, and has served as an active participant on dozens of important commissions, committees, and organizations. Throughout them all, Steve has demonstrated a consistent dedication to the well-being and improvement of our judicial system. He was responsible for establishing a small claims court program in Utah which utilized the voluntary services of practicing lawyers as part-time judges in the evening hours. In so doing, he opened the courtroom doors to thousands of good, hard-working citizens whose disputes were genuine and who very much needed a civilized place for litigation resolution. If it is true that plagiarism is the purest form of compliment, then Mr. Anderson's small claims court program was an unqualified masterpiece, because it has been copied in a large number of other jurisdictions.

There is no question in my mind that Steve Anderson, who is the managing partner of one of Salt Lake City's largest, oldest, and most prestigious firms, is making a financial sacrifice to accept a judgeship on our Federal appellate bench. But I am also sure that he has a genuine desire to take the bench and serve the public. He really wants to help, to continue to do what he can to improve the judicial system.

Because I feel he is extraordinarily well qualified for the job, I vigorously support Mr. Anderson's nomination and ask my fellow Senators that we now give him our unanimous bipartisan consent. He will be a significant asset on our Federal appellate bench.

NOMINATION OF DAVID SAM TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to recommend to my fellow Senators, Judge David Sam of Springville, Utah for appointment to the U.S. District Court for the district of Utah. David Sam is one of the most outstanding Americans I know. He is hardworking, dedicated, and scrupulously honest. From personal experience and association with this fine gentleman, I know for a fact he is especially deserving of our respect and admiration. In my estimation he is extremely well qualified to serve as a Federal district judge.

Throughout an illustrious legal career, David Sam has consistently distinguished himself. Early in his professional career, he spent years honing his skills while representing the ranchers and the farmers of the mostly agrarian communities of Utah's Uintah Basin. He knows and understands the common man. Then, in 1976, he accepted a prestigious appointment to the State district bench in Provo, UT, where he has served with distinction for the past 10 years.

To sum up my feelings about David Sam's suitability for the Federal bench, I would simply say that Mr. Sam is one of those rare individuals who I am absolutely convinced will bring a temperament to the trial bench that is perfectly suited for the task at hand. He will be fair while being just, and he will treat every man or woman, regardless of rank or stature, with courtesy and patience.

More than most people I know, David Sam really cherishes his citizenship as an American. It is not something he takes for granted. For it wasn't all that long ago that a young Romanian by the name of Andrew Sirb traveled by foot across the entire country of Romania to escape the ravages and hopelessness of a freedom-destroying monarchy to start all over again with his new wife in a land across the Atlantic where hope and freedom were allged to be in abundance.

Fortunately for us, Andrew Sirb successfully made that journey, crossing the border into Austria, then Germany, then aboard a steamer to the United States where he finally fulfilled his dream. He selected the most American name he could possibly find—Sam, in honor of his newest favorite uncle—and Andrew Sirb became Andrew Sam. Then, he and his wife settled in Gary, IN, and had 11 children. A little boy named David was No. 11.

Now David Sam appears before this body for confirmation to the Federal bench. He and his family have been through a lot to get him here; and I am satisfied that the end result will be a credit to Utah's Federal district bench. I strongly support his nomination and ask my colleagues that we now give him our unanimous bipartisan consent.

NOMINATION OF JENNIFER JOY MANSON TO BE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the nomination of Jennifer Joy Manson, a resident of Alexandria, VA, who has been nominated by President Reagan to be the Assistant Administrator of EPA for External Affairs.

Leading EPA's communications and legislative activities will be a heavy responsibility and I am confident Miss Manson will rise to the challenge.

I have known Miss Manson for nearly 9 years and have always been impressed with her professionalism, intelligence, honesty, and dedication to serving the public.

She is an effective and organized manager who knows how to work on a bipartisan basis to achieve the best policy results.

Mr. Chairman, Miss Manson brings to EPA an impressive and varied background of achievement.

She attended high school in Norfolk, VA, and then graduated from the University of North Carolina.

As a member of the White House staff, she has worked on national domestic issues.

She was the chief of staff for the former distinguished Governor of Virginia John Dalton.

Subsequently, she joined my staff and became my senior legislative strategist and advisor.

Miss Manson's ability to quickly grasp complex issues has enabled her to effectively go to the heart of a policy debate.

I can't think of any better qualifications to manage the Office of External Affairs for EPA.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend her parents, Captain and Mrs. Frank Manson, who deserve so much of the credit for providing the values and judgement by which their daughter lives.

I know I speak for the Members of the Virginia Congressional Delegation, Governor Dalton, and especially myself, in providing Miss Jennifer Joy Manson our highest recommendation.

She will undertake her responsibilities, as she has in the past, with the utmost dedication and integrity.

I am confident she will do a truly outstanding job for the people of the United States, the President, and the distinguished Administrator Lee Thomas.

I urge my colleagues to support this nomination.

NOMINATION OF PAUL ROBINSON

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate today has confirmed the appointment of Prof. Paul Robinson to serve on the Federal Sentencing Commission.

Professor Robinson is a resident of New Jersey and a professor at the Rutgers University School of Law; where he has achieved a level of recognition for his outstanding criminal law scholarship which is remarkable for a person his age. Rutgers has promoted him to the rank of distinguished professor, its highest rank. I am told that he is the youngest person holding that position in the university. He also has an extremely broad background in the

criminal justice system, having served as an attorney with the Department of Justice, with the U.S. Attorney's Office and with the Senate Judiciary Committee. He has also written extensively on a wide range of criminal law and criminal procedure issues.

I look forward to the contribution the Sentencing Commission will hopefully make to rationalize the often irrational differences in sentencing and parole practices for similar crimes. Hopefully, the Commission will establish guidelines that will not only help the Federal judiciary, but will give the public greater confidence that fair, impartial, yet firm dispensation will be made where individuals have been convicted of crimes. I am sure that Professor Robinson can contribute greatly to the work of the new Commission.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

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

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues from Mississippi and North Dakota for yielding.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1986

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H.R. 3037).

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, while there will be no other amendments to dispose of in connection with the agriculture appropriations bill and we will be ready to go to third reading very shortly, we did want to indicate before we went to third reading that the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON] had brought to the attention of the committee earlier in the year and we had considered a funding request for a facility in his State. I want to, at this time, thank him for bringing that to the attention of the committee and express my hope that we can work out some accommodation of his request at a later time.

For the purpose of discussing the proposal and whatever other comments the Senator would like to make, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington at this time.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the manager of the bill.

Washington State University in Pullman, WA, has for some time been seeking funding under the Research Facilities Act for a research facility of immense importance to the Pacific Northwest. The university has proposed the creation of a food-human nutrition facility in the heart of the Northwest wheat country. The regional support for this facility is very strong and its construction is vital to the future of the Northwest agriculture economy. The State of Washington has already appropriated $12.9 million in matching funds for the facility which is, of course, an indication of its strong support there.

The food-human nutrition center will provide the region with invaluable research in the areas of food marketing, processing, and animal and plant biotechnology. The result of this research will help the wheat and feed grain industry to establish new markets around the world and, just as important, to reestablish the markets we have lost to subsidized foreign competition. The WSU center has the support of the National Association of Wheat Growers, the Department of Agriculture, and universities in the Northwest.

Mr. President, the difficulty has been that the Research Facilities Act has been inadequate to facilitate either this kind of project or any other. The Research Facilities Act has been substantially amended or rather proposals substantially to amend it are included in both the farm bill which has passed the House and the farm bill which is about to come before the Senate. That authorization is, of course, not complete and is one of the primary reasons that no appropriation is included either in the House bill or in the Senate bill for carrying out the purposes of the Research Facilities Act.

I would like the Senator from Mississippi to assure me, if he can, that appropriations for these purposes and specifically for Washington State University will be considered very seriously and as priority matters, either in any supplemental appropriations bill which should come along later or, alternatively, in next year's agriculture appropriations bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am happy to respond in this way. The Research Facilities Act, under which funding is being urged by the Senator from Washington, is included in the farm bill that has been approved by the Senate Agriculture Committee, and will be considered by the Senate maybe next week. Under that authorization, the first $4 million of appropriations must be divided among the land grant colleges and universities which are eligible for funding under that authorization.

It is my hope that we will be able to secure funding of that program. It is an important program. This Senator supported its inclusion in the farm bill. However, it is not possible at this time to provide funding. It could be, as we take up a supplemental appropriations bill, that it would be ripe for consideration, and we might be able to add funds at that time for facilities under that authority.

I am convinced from my conversations with the Senator from the State of Washington that this is a project that is meritorious, and that it is a facility that could provide important benefits and information in the areas that would be included in its research activities.

So I commend the Senator for bringing to the attention of the Senate the need for funds for this project. I wish we had money available to fund this project and the projects that have been discussed earlier today, which were not included in the bill. But we are operating under some severe budget constraints. We know that, and the distinguished Senator from Washington is aware of that. I appreciate his understanding of our inability to provide funding at this time in this bill for this project. But I hope we can find a way to provide funds later on. We will work with the Senator. We will have hearings next year, if we do not include it in the supplemental appropriations bill, and we will try to get the support of the Department of Agriculture for this project.

But I pledge to the Senator to work with him to try our best to find ways to help ensure the construction of this facility.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE'S WORK IN THE CHESAPEAKE BAY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, with the passage of the fiscal year 1986 agriculture appropriations bill, we assure the continuation of the important work by the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service to help save Chesapeake Bay. I am pleased to share with my colleagues information on what the SCS is doing to control nonpoint sources of pollution—a major culprit of the problems of the bay.

Last November, the Soil Conservation Service signed a memorandum of understanding with the Environmental Protection Agency, pleading to devote its resources to the Chesapeake Bay Cleanup Program. To effectively and immediately carry out its bay responsibilities, SCS needs 21 more positions to provide technical assistance to farmers and landowners. This is in addition to 10 staff positions, which Congress last year directed the SCS to devote to the bay cleanup. On September 24, the Appropriations Committee approved $840,000 for the 21 positions. With 21 new field positions, SCS will have a total of 31 additional staffers working with State, county, and local people on alleviating the bay's pollution.

Earlier this year, the SCS celebrated 50 years of dedicated service to the citizens of the United States. The SCS grew out of the turbulent Dust Bowl era when much of the Nation's agri-

cultural productivity was threatened by natural disaster and detrimental farming practices on fragile lands. The pollution problems we face today in the Chesapeake Bay are akin to those earlier experiences on the land. Our desire to enjoy the bay and make a living from it has pushed the bay beyond its carrying capacity and capability to restore itself to its former productivity.

A significant part of the bay's recent decline results from adverse effects of sediment, nutrients, and animal waste, and their detrimental interaction on the bay's ecosystem. In July, my colleague, the Senator from Maryland, Mr. SARBANES, the EPA Administrator, Lee Thomas, Secretary of the Interior, Donald Hodel, SCS Chief, Wilson Scaling, the Governors of Maryland and Virginia, and others joined me for a tour of Chesapeake Bay. We viewed the problems of the bay and the progress being made by the Federal agencies working on those problems. We saw firsthand those problems related to sediment and nutrients.

Sediment is a ferry, delivering toxic cargoes to the bay every day. The bay has over 6,000 miles of shoreline, with much of it eroding at a rapid rate. Additionally, large amounts of sediment from distant parts of the bay's six-State watershed are carried to the bay by the Susquehanna, Potomac, James, and other rivers. Sediment particles attract and tightly hold substances, such as phosphate nutrients and many pesticides. Thus, every time a sediment particle is delivered to the bay, it potentially carries thousands or even millions of attached pollutant molecules.

In its report on the Chesapeake Bay, the EPA stated that farmland is a major contributor of sediment to the bay. The SCS estimates that gross erosion from Maryland cropland exceeds 9 million tons of soil annually. Of this amount, more than 1½ million tons were lost last year from cropland at the "T" or "tolerance" level up to twice "T".

Obviously, not all of this soil reaches the bay, but the sediment problem is significant in all the States bordering the bay. This does not mean that the SCS is sitting idly by. Last year, the SCS in Maryland prevented the loss of more than 600,000 tons of soil, an amount equivalent to a line of loaded dump trucks stretching across the 4-mile Chesapeake Bay bridge 80 times.

Animal waste is another bay concern. Animal wastes, high in nutrient value and organic matter, have been used for generations as a source of fertilizer. Spreading manure on fields eliminates the immediate problem of what to do with tons of animal waste, but the number of livestock in the bay watershed has increased dramatically in recent years, creating local situations of too much manure for the available land. Excess nutrients and organic matter make their way to the bay, further degrading it.

To help combat nonpoint source pollution entering the bay, the State of Maryland has started a new 5-year $40 million Agricultural Erosion Control Program. But Maryland must depend on the SCS to help train all the new people working in this program. The SCS has the only readily available expertise and training capability needed for the newly hired personnel of the States, counties, and soil conservation districts.

Sediment, nutrients, and animal wastes—a deadly trio—can and must be controlled if Chesapeake Bay is to be restored to its former role as the Nation's most productive estuary. The Soil Conservation Service has the technology and capability to help control nonpoint source pollution problems in the Chesapeake Bay—including keeping erosion rates on agricultural lands within tolerances compatible with good water quality, a safe environment, and high productivity.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 3037, the fiscal year 1986 Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, H.R. 3037 as reported provides $28.2 billion in budget authority and $23.0 billion in outlays for fiscal year 1986 for important programs of the Department of Agriculture and related agencies. The bill, together with outlays from prior-year budget authority and other adjustments, is at the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator COCHRAN, for a number of tough decisions he had to make in bringing this bill to the floor today. I particularly want to congratulate the chairman on his courageous efforts to reduce expenditures in the rural housing accounts. I know this was difficult for him.

Let me also congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee for reporting a bill that is devoid of the usual budget gimmicks we have come to know in this bill. The bill fully funds those things that have to be funded, such as the losses incurred in the credit funds, and, unlike past years, it provides full year funding for the nutrition programs.

Most importantly, the bill does something that has long been sought after by budget process people, it recognizes the limited control the Appropriations Committee has over CCC expenditures. The bill makes funding for CCC a current indefinite appropriation. I hope the Senate can prevail in this position when it goes to conference with the House.

The bill does provide for a major reexpansion in FmHA direct farm operating loans. While I understand the pressures that have developed for this, I do believe that the issue of farm credit will need to be addressed again in the authorizing bill we will be debating shortly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two tables showing the relationship of the reported bill to the congressional budget, the House-passed bill, and the President's budget request, and a summary of total appropriations action to date, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPENDING TOTALS—SENATE-REPORTED BILL

[Dollars in billions]

	Fiscal year 1986	
	BA	O
Outlays from prior-year budget authority and other action completed	$0.4	$2.2
H.R. 3037, as reported in the Senate	28.2	23.0
Possible later requirement:		
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service—salaries and expenses	0.1	
Adjustment to conform mandatory programs to Budget Resolution assumptions	−0.5	−0.1
Subcommittee total	28.2	25.2
Subcommittee 302(b) allocation	28.2	25.2
House-passed level [1]	28.2	25.2
President's request [1]	27.6	24.1
Subcommittee total compared to:		
Subcommittee 302(b) allocation	−(*)	−(*)
House-passed level [1]	+(*)	−(*)
President's request [1]	+0.5	+1.1

(*) Less than $50 million.
[1] Reflects CCC adjustment for comparability with Senate crosswalk.
Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS IN THE SENATE

[In billions of dollars]

Subcommittee	Appropriations Committee's 302(b) allocation		Adjusted bill totals [1]		Bill compared to crosswalk		Bill status
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	
Agriculture	28.2	25.2	28.2	25.2	−(*)	−(*)	Senate-reported.
Commerce-Justice	12.0	11.9	11.9	12.0	−0.1	+0.1	Senate-reported.
Defense	285.5	252.2					
District of Columbia	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	+(*)	+(*)	Senate-reported.

STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS IN THE SENATE—Continued

[In billions of dollars]

Subcommittee	Appropriations Committee's 302(b) allocation		Adjusted bill totals [1]		Bill compared to crosswalk		Bill status
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	
Energy-Water	15.3	15.6	15.3	15.6	−)*)	−(*)	Conference.
Foreign Ops	15.2	14.7					
HUD-Independent	58.7	61.2	58.7	62.0	+(*)	+0.8	Senate-reported.
Interior	8.2	8.9	8.2	9.3	+(*)	+0.4	Senate-reported.
Labor-HHS	108.0	115.3	108.0	115.3	−(*)	−(*)	Senate-reported.
Legislative Branch	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	−(*)	+(*)	Senate-passed.
Military Construction	9.0	7.6					
Transportation	10.5	26.6	10.0	26.7	−0.5	+0.1	Senate-reported.
Treasury-Postal	13.1	13.1	13.1	13.1	−(*)	−(*)	Senate-passed.
Unassigned	1.2	−0.4			−1.2	+0.4	
Total, Appropriations Committee	567.1	554.1	255.8	281.5	−1.7	+1.8	

[1] In addition to the bill, includes outlays from budget authority enacted in prior years, possible later requirements, adjustments to conform mandatory items to the budget resolution level, and other adjustments.
(*) Less than $50 million.
Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding.
Source: Senate Budget Committee Staff.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, H.R. 3037, the fiscal year 1986 Agriculture appropriations bill, contains several provisions which are of special concern to New Jersey.

Mr. President, The Department of Agriculture has considered closing New Jersey's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service [ASCS] office and consolidating it with Maryland's office into an office in Delaware. I am concerned about the adverse impact a regionalization of agriculture centers could have on the agricultural community in New Jersey.

The New Jersey ASCS Center in Robbinsville serves as a valuable link between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the State of New Jersey. The center has worked closely with the New Jersey Department of Agriculture and the Department of Environmental Protection to ensure that New Jersey's agricultural needs are addressed. Conservation programs, water quality assessments, and price stabilization plans, all vital to the health of the New Jersey farm community, have been effectively administered through the ASCS State office. The individual needs and interests of each State's agricultural community require the maintenance of individual State offices.

I am pleased that language I sought concerning the closing of New Jersey's ASCS offices was included in the committee report which accompanies this bill. The committee report states that the committee is concerned about the closing of any State or county offices and expects the Department of Agriculture to notify the Congress at least 4 months in advance of any changes in organization or location of offices. The inclusion of this language insures that if the Department of Agriculture decides to move ahead with plans to consolidate New Jersey's ASCS office, we will have sufficient notice to react to such a plan.

I am also pleased, Mr. President, that language I sought directing the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Plant and Animal Health Inspection Service [APHIS] to continue its program of certifying logs as free of gypsy moths was included in the committee report. APHIS had announced that as of october 1, 1985, it would discontinue its program of certifying that logs traveling to Canada or interstate are free of gypsy moths. The State of New Jersey notified me that if APHIS had discontinued this program, the State could not set up its own certification program. Since Canada and some States refuse to accept any logs without certification, the discontinuation would have posed a real problem for New Jersey businesses which ship about $3 million worth of logs to Canada and interstate each year.

Another provision of this bill which I strongly supported was funding for programs to reduce the use of pesticides. The committee approved $7.531 million in the Extension Service account and $10.117 million in the Agricultural Research Service account for the Integrated Pest Management [IPM] Program. IPM has been instrumental in helping New Jersey to reduce pesticides. Although currently only a relatively small percentage of the 1 million acres under cultivation in new Jersey benefit from IPM, the volume of pesticides used in the State has been reduced by over 500,000 pounds per year as a result of this program. Reductions in pesticide nationally are estimated to be 50 million pounds per year. In New Jersey, the program is run through the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station and the Cooperative Extension Service of Cook College at Rutgers University.

The decreased use of pesticides resulting from the IPM programs has saved New Jersey farmers $1.08 million and farmers throughout the country $100.8 million per year in production costs. IPM has also had a beneficial impact on the environment by decreasing the deposit of excess residues. New Jersey's farmers support for the IPM program is demonstrated by the fact that they contribute to the IPM effort each year.

Finally, Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention to an unusual but worthwhile program provided for in this bill: the Urban Gardening Program. In the Appropriations Committee, I sought funding for the Urban Gardening Program, and am pleased that at least $1.75 million was included for this program. The Urban Gardening Program has made it possible for urban dwellers in Newark, NJ, and 20 other cities to grow their own fruits and vegetables in community gardens. It has created an additional food source for inner city residents, and fostered community pride by teaching its participants to transform urban wasteland and unused city plots into productive vegetable gardens. By growing their own fruits and vegetables last year, 186,000 program participants added fresh foods to their diet that are not always readily available or affordable.

Mr. President, last year, the $3.5 million allocated for the program enabled 186,000 urban gardeners to grow $20 million worth of produce, a 5 to 1 return on the Federal dollar. The program also attracted $1 million in contributions from private companies and city governments and 2,000 volunteers last year, a reflection of the program's recognized value to the community. The House of Representatives has approved $3.5 million, a freeze at last year's level, for this program.

Mr. President, I am pleased to support the 1986 Agriculture appropriations bill, and urge my colleagues to approve it. I very much appreciate the consideration of our chairman, Senator COCHRAN, and our ranking minority member, Senator LEAHY, in accommodating my requests.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I know of no other amendments to the bill and no other Senator seeking to offer amendments. I think we are ready for third reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be

proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the bill.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SIMPSON. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. LAXALT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who wish to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 226 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Abdnor	Exon	McConnell
Andrews	Ford	Melcher
Baucus	Garn	Metzenbaum
Bentsen	Glenn	Mitchell
Biden	Gore	Moynihan
Bingaman	Gorton	Nickles
Boren	Grassley	Nunn
Boschwitz	Harkin	Packwood
Bradley	Hart	Pressler
Bumpers	Hatch	Pryor
Burdick	Hatfield	Quayle
Byrd	Hawkins	Riegle
Chiles	Heflin	Rockefeller
Cochran	Heinz	Rudman
Cohen	Hollings	Sarbanes
Cranston	Inouye	Sasser
D'Amato	Johnston	Simon
Danforth	Kassebaum	Simpson
DeConcini	Kasten	Specter
Denton	Kennedy	Stafford
Dixon	Kerry	Stennis
Dodd	Lautenberg	Stevens
Dole	Leahy	Thurmond
Domenici	Levin	Trible
Durenberger	Matsunaga	Warner
Eagleton	Mattingly	Weicker
Evans	McClure	Zorinsky

NAYS—14

Armstrong	Helms	Roth
East	Humphrey	Symms
Goldwater	Lugar	Wallop
Gramm	Pell	Wilson
Hecht	Proxmire	

NOT VOTING—5

Chafee	Long	Murkowski
Laxalt	Mathias	

So the bill (H.R. 3037), as amended, was passed.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes thereon and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to and the Presiding Officer [Mr. GORTON] appointed Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. KASTEN, Mr. MATTINGLY, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. CHILES, Mr. SASSER, Mr. BUMPERS, and Mr. HARKIN, conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, let me express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota again for his very able assistance in the development of this legislation, the handling of it, the management of the bill on the floor of the Senate, and its successful passage this evening. There were others, of course, who assisted, who are members of the subcommittee, members of the full committee, and other Senators. We appreciate very much the cooperation of these Senators in the passage of the legislation.

I also want to let the Senate know that we have had very capable and professional assistance from our staff members—Irma Hanneman, who is the chief clerk of the subcommittee, Forest Thigpen, assistant clerk, and Rocky Kuhn, who is a member of the minority staff. Koni Gleason also was very helpful to the committee. All of these staff members worked very hard. We appreciate their help in the passage of the legislation.

NATIONAL DAY OF FASTING TO RAISE FUNDS TO COMBAT HUNGER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, having conferred with the Democratic leader and obtaining his approval, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to House Joint Resolution 386, National Day of Fasting, now being held at the desk.

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

The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 386) to designate November 24, 1985, as "National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be considered as having been read the second time by title.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 386, a joint resolution designating Sunday, November 24, 1985, the Sunday before Thanksgiving, as the National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger. Senator KENNEDY and I had the honor of sponsoring the resolution here in the Senate, along with 35 of our fellow members.

As I am sure many of you know, today is World Food Day, a day for celebrating national and international efforts to feed the world. Obviously, it is also a day for remembering that, despite these efforts 35,000 people are still dying daily from starvation, malnutrition, and famine. World Food Day is an appropriate time for us to recommit ourselves to working together to end the tragedy of hunger, and thus, a most appropriate time for Congress to be considering the resolution before us.

The resolution we will vote on today will provide another opportunity to help those who so desperately need our assistance. It would designate Sunday, November 24, 1985, as National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger. We hope that on this Sunday, Americans will join us in forgoing a meal or two and contributing the savings to the fight against hunger. Obviously, all contributions will be welcome and the sponsors hope every American will choose to participate in some way, even if fasting is not possible.

Participants will be asked to send their contributions to either the charity of their choice or to the following post office box:

Fast to End Famine,
Post Office Box 33219,
Farragut Station,
Washington, DC 20033.

The congressional sponsors of the resolution are thrilled that InterAction, the world renowned umbrella organization of groups fighting hunger, has agreed to distribute the funds collected through the post office box. InterAction has agreed to reserve 15 percent of all funds to fight hunger here in the United States. They intend to spend 45 percent of the funds on long term assistance in Africa, 35 percent on emergency food and medical relief, and the remaining 5 percent on educational needs.

I am especially pleased that the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, and the National Association of Manufacturers have endorsed the resolution and if it is enacted they will work with us to publicize the fast. All three organizations have demonstrated quite clearly their interest and commitment

to defeating famine and should be commended for their involvement.

I hope it is recognized that in passing this resolution, we have no intention of interfering with the panoply of events already planned for this fall, such as the upcoming World Food Day or Oxfam America's program of events. It is our hope that the national day of fasting will heighten awareness and provide another opportunity for Americans to help defeat famine, malnutrition and starvation.

Mr. President, what better time than the Sunday before Thanksgiving, our national day of gratitude and prayer, to give up a little or the bounty we enjoy each and every day and share our fortune with those who are staring? I am sure that the fast can only enhance our appreciation of the Thanksgiving holiday.

Before concluding, I want to acknowledge the work of several of my colleagues who have done so much to move this legislation through the Senate. First of all, I thank Senator KENNEDY for his dedicated support and efforts to ensure that the resolution has bipartisan support. Also, a special thanks should go to Senator TRIBLE, who has played such a large part in the development of the Resolution. Senator THURMOND's leadership has been critical to our being able to vote on the resolution today. And, let us not forget Representative RON PACKARD who developed the idea of a national fast and has worked so diligently to see it implemented.

Finally, Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority and minority leaders for their help in bringing up the resolution during such a busy period in the Senate.

Famine knows no politics and our response to it has and should continue to transcend political beliefs and ideologies. By working together, we can end famine, feed the hungry and enrich the lives of all mankind. Passage of this resolution will move us closer to this worthy objective, and I ask all of my colleagues for their support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators BIDEN, DURENBERGER, and GORE be added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 218, the Senate version of House Joint Resolution 386.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 386) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. HATFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

ANNUAL REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF RADIATION CONTROL FOR HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 88

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 360D of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 263 1), I am transmitting the report of the Department of Health and Human Services regarding the administration of the Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act. The report discusses the progress of the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) Center for Devices and Radiological Health toward the accomplishment of its objectives during calendar year 1984.

The report recommends that Section 360D of the Public Health Service Act that requires the completion of this annual report be repealed. All of the information found in this report is available to the Congress on a more immediate basis through congressional committee oversight and budget hearings and the FDA Annual Report. This annual report serves little useful purpose and diverts Agency resources from more productive activities.

RONALD REAGAN,

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 16, 1985.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:08 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the bill (S. 1264) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, the Museum Services Act, and the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act, to extend the authorization of appropriations for such acts, and for other purposes, with amendments, it insists upon its amendments and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. ARMEY as managers of the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2100. An act to extend and revise agricultural price support and related programs, to provide for agricultural export, resource conservation, farm credit, and agricultural research and related programs, to continue food assistance to low-income persons, to ensure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

At 1:21 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions:

S. 1349. An act to provide for the use and distribution of funds awarded in docket 363 to the Mdewakanton and Wahpekute Eastern or Mississippi Sioux before the United States Court of Claims and Claims Court;

S.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution designating February 1986 as "National Community College Month"; and

S.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 20, 1985, through October 26, 1985, as "National CPR Awareness Week".

The enrolled bill and joint resolutions were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2100. An act to extend and revise agricultural price support and related programs, to provide for agricultural export, resource conservation, farm credit, and agricultural research and related programs, to continue food assistance to low-income persons, to ensure consumers an abundance of food and fiber at reasonable prices, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 16, 1985, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 158. Joint resolution designating February 1986 as "National Community College Month"; and

S.J. Res. 175. Joint resolution to designate the week of October 20, 1985, through October 26, 1985, as "National CPR Awareness Week".

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1877. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cumulative report on budget rescissions and deferrals dated October 1, 1985; pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, referred jointly to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-1878. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Urban Mass Transportation Administration Quarterly Report for the third Quarter of fiscal year 1985; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1879. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the 1984 Youth Conservation Corps program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1880. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial exhibits of the Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects for fiscal year 1984; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1881. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 6-87 adopted by the Council on September 24, 1985; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1882. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 6-90 adopted by the Council on September 24, 1985; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1883. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 6-88 adopted by the Council on September 24, 1985; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1884. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 6-92 adopted by the Council on October 8, 1985; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1885. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of D.C. Act 6-86 adopted by the Council on October 8, 1985; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1886. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Ethics in Governmental Act of 1978 to improve the Confidential Disclosure System"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-1887. A communication from the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Revised Statutes section 722 (42 U.S.C. 1998) to exempt State judges and judicial officers from assessment of attorney's fees in cases in which such judge or judicial officer would be immune from actions for damages arising out of the same act or omission about which complaint is made; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1888. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General (Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs), transmitting pursuant to law, an update of the 1983 evaluation report on the U.S. Trustee pilot program for Bankruptcy Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1889. A communication from the Director of ACTION, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a final regulation entitled "Denial of Application for Refunding"; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-1890. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Financial Condition of American Agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1891. A communication from the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of functions to be examined as functions and services presently performed by Coast Guard personnel which are not inherently governmental in nature and which may be performed with equal effectiveness at lower cost under contract to the private sector; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1892. A communication from the National Treasurer of the Navy Wives Clubs of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the audit report of the Club for the year ending August 31, 1985; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. STAFFORD, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with amendments:

S. 1706: A bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol, in cooperation with the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, to design a building or buildings adjacent to Union Station in Washington, DC (Rept. No. 99-158).

By Mr. STAFFORD, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. Res. 238: An original resolution waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to consideration of S. 1706; referred to the Committee on Budget.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Con. Res. 71: Concurrent resolution to commemorate the accomplishments of Public Law 94-142, "The Education for All Handicapped Children Act" on the 10th anniversary of its enactment.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the attached listing of nominations.

Those identified with a single asterisk (*) are to be placed on the Executive Calendar. Those identified with a double asterisk (**) are to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to save the expense of printing again.

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

(The nominations ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk were printed in the RECORD of October 4, October 7, and October 8, 1985, at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

**1. In the Air Force and Air Force Reserve there are 39 appointments to the grade of colonel and below (list begins with John R. Sharp). (Ref. No. 627)

**2. In the Air National Guard there are 28 promotions to the grade of lieutenant colonel (list begins with Mitchell J. Catoe). (Ref. No. 628)

**3. In the Air Force Reserve there are 4 appointments to the grade of colonel and below (list begins with Armin B. Olsen). (Ref. No. 629)

*4. Major General John H. Moellering, U.S. Army, to be lieutenant general. (Ref. No. 634)

**5. In the Air Force there are 744 promotions to the grade of colonel (list begins with John C. Aarni, Jr.) (Ref. No. 638

**6. In the Air Force there are 5 appointments to the grade of colonel (list begins with Francis G. Andrews). (Ref. No. 639)

**7. In the Air Force there are 3 promotions to the grade of lieutenant colonel and below (list begins with Willie W. Gray, Jr.) (Ref. No. 640)

**8. In the Air Force there is 1 appointment to a grade not higher than major (Susan Parker-Hotchkiss). (Ref. No. 641)

**9. In the Air Force there is 1 appointment to a grade not higher than major (Robert A. Ferguson). (Ref. No. 642)

**10. In the Air Force there is 1 appointment to the grade of major (Robert A. Ferguson). (Ref. No. 643)

**11. In the Air Force there are 1,851 appointment to the grade of captain (list begins with Paul E. Abt). (Ref. No. 644)

Total, 2,678.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1765. A bill to amend the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 in order to provide for the establishment of national seismic data centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MATHIAS (for himself and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 1766. A bill to designate the Cumberland terminus of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park in honor of J. Glenn Beall, Sr; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 1767. A bill to designate certain public lands in the State of Michigan as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. 1768. A bill for the relief of Golumbinka Jakimova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. STAFFORD, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. Res. 238. An original resolution waiving section 402(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to consideration of S. 1706; to the Committee on the Budget.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1765. A bill to amend the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 in order to provide for the establishment of national seismic data centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

NATIONAL SEISMIC DATA ACT

● Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am today introducing the National Seismic Data Act of 1985.

The legislation establishes two regional seismic data centers—one in the Eastern United States and one in the West. The purpose of these centers is to collect, analyze, catalog, and disseminate data about earthquake activity in this country.

As a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I chaired the Science and Technology Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight. In that capacity, I held a number of hearings on earthquakes in the United States, particularly east of the Rocky Mountains. Those hearings convinced me that there are still serious gaps in what we know about the causes of earthquakes and how we can limit the damage from them. This is especially true for earthquakes in the Eastern United States.

The most powerful earthquake ever to hit the continental United States occurred along the New Madrid Fault in 1811. That quake was so tremendous that it is said to have caused the Mississippi River to run backwards. Shock waves from it rang church bells in Boston. In fact, the force released from the quake was greater than that from all other earthquakes in the United States combined.

Public awareness of the potential dangers of earthquakes was heightened recently by the great tragedy in Mexico City. Earlier this month I participated in a hearing by the Commerce Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, on which I serve, on the cause of the Mexican quake and why so many lives were lost and so much destruction occurred. I was especially anxious to take part in the hearing to find ways to ensure that a similar disaster never happens in this country.

During the hearing one item was emphasized again and again. This was the absolute necessity for reliable information on earthquake activity. Accurate information is vital if we are to predict the likelihood of earthquakes in our country and to minimize the damage that could otherwise be caused by them.

The importance of having accurate and thorough data on earthquake activity cannot be overemphasized. Dr. Arch Johnston, the director of the Tennessee Earthquake Information Center at Memphis State University and one of the foremost authorities on the New Madrid Fault, has estimated that there is a 40- to 60-percent likelihood that a major quake measuring at least 6 on the Richter scale will strike the New Madrid area in the next 15 years. He has further estimated that the odds of such a quake occurring before the year 2035 increase to 97 percent. Even in making these estimates, however, Dr. Johnston has made it clear that our knowledge of earthquake activity along the New Madrid Fault is lacking. Because the historical experience with earthquakes in the East is limited, we have not yet developed the detailed data base necessary to understand them completely.

Currently, most of our data on earthquakes in this country is generated by some 1,600 seismic stations operating as part of 50 separate seismic networks. Unfortunately, because the seismic networks are independent of each other, most of this data is never analyzed in a comprehensive fashion. Information exchange among the networks is erratic, and research into earthquake activity suffers significantly.

The legislation I am introducing corrects this problem by establishing two regional seismic data centers to serve as focal points for the information gathering activities of the various seismic networks. One center would be located west of the Continental Divide, and the other would be located east of it.

Under the bill, each network would provide its data to the seismic data center in its region. The regional center would then analyze the data it has collected from the network and catalog it into a format that is easily accessible and understandable to earthquake researchers. The centers would also make this data available to the public.

Mr. President, the legislation I am introducing today is simple and straightforward. Its central purpose is to improve our national ability to collect and analyze data on earthquake activity in this country in order that we will be able to understand better the causes of quakes and avoid a great tragedy like that in Mexico City. Earthquakes are a matter about which we should all be concerned. This legislation will do much to help minimize the dangers from them.●

By Mr. MATHIAS (for himself and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 1766. A bill to designate the Cumberland terminus of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park in honor of J. Glenn Beall, Sr.; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEMORIAL FOR SENATOR J. GLENN BEALL, SR.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I consider it a personal privilege to be able to introduce a bill that would dedicate the Cumberland terminus of the C&O Canal National Historic Park to Senator J. Glenn Beall, Sr., in recognition of his efforts to protect and preserve the canal and towpath, that are the principal feature of this magnificent park. I am joined in this effort by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES].

Senator Beall's career in Congress spanned 22 years, including 10 years in the other body as the Representative from western Maryland followed by 12 years in the Senate. During that time, he gained the respect and admiration of millions of Marylanders for his service to the State. His distinguished career was marked by a myriad of accomplishments. One project that was particularly dear to his heart and that occupies a prominent place in his record of service was the C&O National Historical Park.

The 184-mile C&O Canal, built between 1828 and 1850, parallels the Potomac River from Washington, DC., to Cumberland, MD. At the groundbreaking for the canal in Georgetown, on July 4, 1828, an occasion of great pomp and ceremony, President John Quincy Adams declared:

> The project contemplates a conquest over physical nature, such as has never yet been achieved by man. The wonders of the ancient world, the Pyramids of Egypt, the Collossus of Rhodes, the Temples of Eqhesus, the Mausoleum of Artemis, the Wall of China, sink into insignificance before it—insignificance in the mass and momentum of human labor required for the execution—insignificance in the comparison of the purposes to be accomplished by the work when exceuted.

While Adams' remarks may have seemed somewhat overstated at the time, it is difficult to exaggerate the significance of the canal.

However, for more than three decades in this century, from the end of commercial operations in 1924 until the midfifties, it lay neglected, except for such preservation as the local resi-

dents, who have been staunch friends and caretakers, were able to provide.

By the 1950's, there was so little regard for the importance of the canal that they proposed to convert it into a highway. But Justice William O. Douglas and other persons with environmental interests launched a campaign to prevent that from happening. Justice Douglas led an 8-day hike along the canal to bring to public attention its unique values and the need to preserve it. That hike quickly became part of the lore of the canal. More importantly, it achieved its purpose.

J. Glenn Beall, Sr., introduced, in 1956, the first piece of legislation recognizing the historic importance of the canal and creating a vehicle for its preservation and restoration. Many other similar bills were introduced in the House and the Senate by myself and others over the next 16 years. Finally, Congress passed the legislation in 1971, 1 year after Senator Beall's death.

It took the concentrated, and collective, efforts of many citizens, legislators, and Government officials to make the C&O Canal National Historic Park a reality. But the first legislative initiative clearly came from Senator Beall in 1956. His first bill laid the groundwork for the legislation ultimately enacted into law.

A fitting way to honor Senator Beall for his leadership would be to develop the Cumberland terminus of the C&O Canal as an interpretive park that would relate the area's rich history, recognize Senator Beall's role, and enhance both his home county of Allegany and the national park he championed.

Between 1850, when the full 185-mile waterway was finally opened, and its shutdown in 1924, Cumberland, the seat of Allegany County, was the center of a boatbuilding industry and the port where the canal's principal cargo—western Maryland coal—was collected and loaded for the trip downriver. The area was a commercial crossroads where the trade routes of the upper Potomac Valley intersected with the National Road and the railroads, which unlike the canal, actually spanned the mountains to the Ohio Valley and the West.

The Beall family has lived in western Maryland since 1783 when Thomas Beall moved to a farm on Evitts Creek near Cumberland. The family's leadership in Maryland's business and civic affairs is an integral part of the region's history. Senator Beall's efforts to preserve the canal testified to his own appreciation of western Maryland's heritage and its continuing national significance.

The Cumberland terminus is an appropriate place to honor Senator Beall's great contributions to the development of the C&O Canal National Historic Park. It is prominently located in the heart of Cumberland, where river, rail, and road corridors still intersect. However, since most of the physical remains of the canal were buried and the area's appearance greatly changed by construction of a flood control project in the 1950's, visitors must rely largely on exhibits, brochures, and their own imaginations to grasp how the terminus looked and bustled a century ago.

Congressional designation of the terminus as a memorial to Senator Beall would provide the impetus for developing the site as an open, inviting, interpretive park with permanent exhibits, landscaping, and walkways, mini-plazas, and benches to draw people to the river and the canal lock area. Durable displays, like those in place elsewhere along the canal, could be used to depict the 19th century scene, describe the canal's history, and significance, and recall Senator Beall's role in creating the park. Special brochures and other materials in the nearby visitor center could complement the outdoor exhibits.

In accord with the park's successful tradition of open planning, detailed plans for enhancing the terminus would be developed by the National Park Service in consultation with the community, other interested groups, and the park's advisory commission. This process could also spur cooperative efforts to improve parking and vehicular access to the terminus. Although no cost estimates have been developed, the kind of park envisioned would not involve large outlays and might well be accomplished within available funds.

Senator Beall was a distinguished Member of this body and an outstanding representative of the State of Maryland and its citizens. This bill pays tribute to him and serves the public interest of the people of Maryland and of the Nation to whom the C&O Canal National Historic Park is forever dedicated.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1766

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Cumberland terminus of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park is hereby dedicated to J. Glenn Beall, Sr., in grateful recognition of his outstanding efforts to preserve and protect the canal and towpath from development.

(b) In order to carry out the provisions of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to provide such identification by signs, including changes in existing signs, materials, maps, markers, or other means as will appropriately inform the public of the contributions of J. Glenn Beall, Sr.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized and directed to cause to be erected and maintained, within the exterior boundaries of the Cumberland terminus of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, an appropriate memorial to J. Glenn Beall, Sr. Such memorial shall be of such design and be located at such place as the Secretary shall determine.

(d) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 3

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 3, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the combined earnings of a husband and wife during the period of their marriage shall be divided equally and shared between them for benefit purposes, so as to recognize the economic contribution of each spouse to the marriage and ensure that each spouse will have social security protection in his or her own right.

S. 259

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 259, a bill to protect the public interest in stable relationships among communities, professional sports teams and leagues and in the successful operation of such teams in communities throughout the Nation, and for other purposes.

S. 549

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 549, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the separate definition of disability presently applicable to widows and widowers, and to provide in turn that the months of a widow's or widower's entitlement to SSI benefits on the basis of disability may be used in establishing his or her entitlement to medicare benefits on that basis.

S. 570

At the request of Mr. WALLOP, the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] were added as cosponsors of S. 570, a bill to amend the Mineral Lands Leasing Act of 1920 to improve the administration of the Federal Coal Leasing Program, and for other purposes.

S. 670

At the request of Mr. PELL, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. HEINZ], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE] were added as cosponsors of S. 670, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to give employers and performers in the performing arts rights

given by section 8(e) of such act to employers and employees in similarly situated industries, and to give to employers and performers in the performing arts the same rights given by section 8(f) of such act to employers and employees in the construction industry, and for other purposes.

S. 1093

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1093, a bill to amend the patent law to restore the term of the patent grant in the case of certain products for the time of the regulatory review period preventing the marketing of the product claimed in a patent.

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. GORTON, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. TRIBLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1126, a bill to provide that certain activities performed in space, the use of certain property in space and certain articles produced in space shall be treated as activities performed, property used and articles produced within the United States for purposes of any tax laws of the United States.

S. 1207

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1207, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide equal benefits, under certain educational assistance programs administered by the Veterans' Administration, to eligible veterans or other eligible persons enrolled in degree courses and eligible veterans or other eligible persons enrolled in nondegree courses offered by fully accrediated institutions of higher learning which offer courses leading to a standard college degree and courses not leading to a standard college degree.

S. 1209

At the request of Mr. CHILES, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1209, a bill to establish the National Commission To Prevent Infant Mortality.

S. 1244

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1244, a bill to provide that services provided by a clinical psychologist in a rural health clinic need not be provided under the direct supervision of a physician in order to qualify for payment under the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

S. 1296

At the request of Mr. MATHIAS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1296, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the requirement for naturalization of an understanding of the English language.

S. 1381

At the request of Mr. QUAYLE, the names of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1381, a bill to amend the General Education Provisions Act to improve and expand the Assessment Policy Committee.

S. 1451

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1451, a bill to allocate funds appropriated to carry out section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for nutrition programs which reduce vitamin A deficiency.

S. 1733

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1733, a bill to extend, improve, and authorize additional appropriations for the Emergency Veterans' Job Training Act of 1983, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 184

At the request of Mr. DENTON, the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. EAST] were added cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 184, a joint resolution to authorize the "Korean War Memorial, Inc." to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 193

At the request of Mr. SYMMS, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 1983, a joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning October 20, 1985, as "The Lessons of Greneda Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 218

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 218, a joint resolution to designate November 24, 1985, as "National Day of Fasting to Raise Funds to Combat Hunger."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTON 71

At the request of Mr. WEICKER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], and the Senator from Florida [Mrs. HAWKINS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 71, a concurrent resolution to commemorate the accomplishments of Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act on the 10th anniversary of its enactment.

SENATE RESOLUTION 210

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 210, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the system of political representation in South Africa.

SENATE RESOLUTION 227

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 227, a resolution urging a joint United States-Soviet effort to achieve worldwide disease immunization by 1990.

SENATE RESOLUTION 238—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED WAIVING CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

Mr. STAFFORD, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. RES. 238

Resolved, That pursuant to section 402(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the provisions of section 402(a) of such Act are waived with respect to the consideration of S. 1706, a bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol, in cooperation with the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, to design a building or buildings adjacent to Union Station in Washington, DC.

The waiver of section 402(a) is necessary to permit consideration of provisions authorizing new budget authority of $2,000,000 in fiscal year 1986 to make a report on the design of a new building or buildings to be used by the administrative agencies of the Federal judiciary.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1986

SPECTER AMENDMENT NO. 778

Mr. SPECTER proposed an amendment of the bill (H.R. 3037) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 57, beginning with the colon in line 12, strike out through "expended" in line 15.

PROXMIRE AMENDMENT NO. 779

Mr. PROXMIRE proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3037, supra; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

Sec. ——. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount of budget authority appropriated, or otherwise made available, by this Act for each appropriation account shall be reduced by 4 percent.

HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 780

Mr. HELMS proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3037, supra; as follows:

On page 32, line 9, strike out "real" and all that follows through "shall be guaranted loans; and" on line 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"real estate and operating loans in an amount equal to $4,000,000,000; $2,000,000,000 of which shall be for insured loans and $2,000,000,000 for guaranteed loans. Not less than $260,000,000 of the monies authorized for insured loans shall be for farms ownership purposes and not less than $260,000,000 of the monies authorized for loan guarantees shall be for guarantees of farm ownership loans. The Secretary may transfer not more than 25 percentum of the amounts authorized for guaranteed loans to the amounts authorized for insured loans. In addition, the Secretary is authorized to make".

On page 33, line 5, strike out "$340,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000,000".

On page 33, line 6, strike out". $100,000,000" and all that follows through line 7 and insert in lieu thereof "for the production and distribution of ethanol in rural areas, $150,000,000".

On page 33, strike out lines 14 through 18.

On page 51, line 24, strike out "$11,891,570,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,725,000,000".

GORE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 781

Mr. GORE (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. METZENBAUM, and Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3037, supra; as follows:

On page 57, line 15, insert before the period a colon and "*Provided further*, That a portion of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to complete, by June 1, 1986, the safety evaluation of sulfiting agents".

CRANSTON AMENDMENT NO. 782

Mr. CRANSTON proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3037, supra; as follows:

On page 57, line 10, strike out the first amount and insert in lieu thereof an amount that is $3,385,000 greater.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1986

HAWKINS AMENDMENT NO. 783

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mrs. HAWKINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill (H.R. 3424) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1986, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 36, line 18, strike out "$2,006,422,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,012,122,000".

● Mrs. HAWKINS. Mr. President, today I am submitting an amendment to H.R. 3424, the Labor, HHS, Education appropriations bill to increase the funding for the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act by $5.7 million in fiscal year 1986.

Currently both the House and Senate versions of H.R. 3424 provide level funding of $23.25 million for the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. I feel that an increase of $5.7 million to $28.95 million for these programs is not only justified, it is essential if we are to avoid increased financial expenditures for children that are lost to the streets.

I recently chaired a hearing in my Subcommittee on Children, Family, Drugs and Alcoholism on the exploitation of runaways. Testimony presented at that hearing clearly demonstrated the effectiveness of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs. Dorcas Hardy, the Assistant Secretary for Human Development Services of the Department of Health and Human Services testified as to the success of the 273 youth centers and shelters financially supported by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program. HDS acknowledges the need for Federal financial support of new runaway and homeless youth centers. Last year, they funded 10 new programs in underserved areas. However, because this expansion took place without a corresponding increase in Federal funds, many existing programs had their Federal financial support reduced. This is taking place at a time when existing runaway and homeless youth centers are having to turn away children needing their services and when the children being served by these programs appear to be much more troubled, and thus in need of many more services than in the past.

June Bucy, the executive director of the National Network of Runaway and Homeless Youth Services, Inc. also testified at my hearing. She summarized the findings of the July 1985 report by the National Network entitled, "To Whom Do They Belong? A Profile of America's Runaway and Homeless Youth and the Programs That Help Them." That report indicated a positive determination rate of 57 percent, that is, 57 percent of more than 50,000 youth who received services under the programs were either reunited with their families or placed in a safe living environment. But this same report indicated that only 22 to 25 percent of the runaway and homeless youth who need shelter and support are getting them due to a lack of beds and facilities.

Mr. President, I realize that budget constraints make it difficult to fund all the worthwhile programs in the Labor, HHS, Education appropriations bill. However, I feel that funding these programs which have proven successful in assisting homeless and runaway youth is more cost effective than funding programs for juvenile detention, alcohol and drug treatment, suicide prevention, and other problems directly attributable to their life on the street.●

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations will hold a hearing on Innovative State and Local Programs to Expand Choice in Education, on Tuesday, October 22, at 2 p.m. in room 342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Mr. President, I wish to announce for the information of the public that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations will be holding a hearing on October 31, 1985, in the auditorium of Laboure Hall at Providence Hospital, 1150 Varnum Street, NE., Washington, DC 20017, at 9:30 a.m., on the problem of infant mortality and on legislation (S. 1209) which would establish a National Commission to Prevent Infant Mortality. Those wishing additional information should contact Robert Harris 224-4067, or Lynn Blewett 224-3244, of the subcommittee staff.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, on Wednesday, October 23, at 9:30 a.m., the Committee on Governmental Affairs will hold a hearing on the following nominations:

William R. Barton to be Inspector General of the General Services Administration;

Julius W. Becton, Jr. to be Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and

James P. McNeill to be an Associate Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

For further information, please contact Carol Fox at 224-4751.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, RESERVED WATER AND RESOURCE CONSERVATION

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the Public Lands, Reserved Water and Resource Conservation Subcommittee of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee will conduct a hearing on Tuesday, October 29, 1985, at 10 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Senate Dirksen Office Building, Wash-

ington, DC. The subcommittee will receive testimony on the following bills:

S. 1107, to authorize the Society of the 3d Infantry Division to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

S. 1223, to authorize the erection of a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces of the United States who served in the Korean war.

S. 1379, to authorize the erection of a monument given to the American people as a gift of the Kingdom of Morocco, on public grounds in the District of Columbia.

Senate Joint Resolution 143, to authorize the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia at an appropriate site in Constitution Gardens.

Senate Joint Resolution 184, to authorize the Korean War Memorial, Inc. to erect a momorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

Those wishing to testify should contact the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Reserved Water and Resource Conservation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, room SD-308, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510. Oral testimony may be limited to 3 minutes per witness. Written statements may be longer. Witnesses may be placed in panels, and are requested to submit 25 copies of their testimony 24 hours in advance of the hearing, and 50 copies on the day of the hearing. For further information, please contact Tony Bevinetto or Patty Kennedy of the subcommittee staff at (202) 224-2878.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 16, in order to receive testimony concerning the following nominations:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Richard H. Battey, of South Dakota, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of South Dakota;

Jose Antonio Fuste, of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico;

John S. Rhoades, Sr., of California, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of California;

Lyle E. Strom, of Nebraska, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 16, in order to receive testimony concerning S. 1363, to prohibit the use of the mails to send dangerous martial arts weapons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 16, to conduct a hearing on phase II development of national intelligence strategy.

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 16, to conduct a hearing on international terrorism.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 16, 1985, in order to conduct a hearing to present the full committee with copies of the staff study on the DOD organization.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REFUGEES: A NEVER-ENDING STORY

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a constant theme in all the international problems and conflicts we have seen in recent decades is the movement of refugees—fleeing their lands and homes for all the reasons that lie behind the violence, conflicts, suffering and catastrophes that afflict our time.

As I have noted many times, Mr. President, refugee problems are of special concern to the United States, not only because of our country's long and proud humanitarian tradition in helping them, but because we know that refugees pose critical foreign policy problems that we and the international community cannot ignore. We know from recent history that massive movements of refugees can unbalance the world's peace and stability as much as any arms race or political or military confrontation.

This point is thoughtfully made in the current issue of the Foreign Affairs journal by Richard Smyser, the Deputy United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. He provides a thorough review of the global refugee crisis we face today, and outlines how dramatically the refugee problem has changed in recent years.

Not only have the numbers of refugees escalated, their location and length of stay have also changed—tragically, for the worse. Moreover, the frequency of refugee crises has increased, confronting the international community with more, and more difficult, refugee problems every year.

As he writes:

> The nature of the refugee issue has been transformed in very fundamental ways over four decades. It has grown from a continental to a global problem, from one that could be kept at a distance to one that may be very near. The world's refugee population has expanded manyfold. It has changed from a transient to a semi-static population. Assistance requirements have multiplied. Any crisis anywhere can now produce refugees everywhere.

Mr. President, I commend Mr. Smyser's article to the attention of the Senate, because he makes as thoughtful a case as I have read on the need to give greater priority and attention to the problems of the world's refugees. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From Foreign Affairs, Fall 1985]

REFUGEES: A NEVER-ENDING STORY

(By W.R. Smyser)

When Eleanor Roosevelt received the 1947 Nansen Award for her work with refugees in postwar Europe, she said she was depressed to know that 70,000 refugees still remained in camps. She and the other humanitarians of her times saw refugees as a transitory phenomenon caused by the great world wars, a problem that could and should be solved promptly with goodwill and appropriate resources.

Yet today, 38 years later, there are more refugees than ever, and the refugee problem has become a permanent factor of international affairs. Barely a month passes without yet another refugee flow clamoring for attention. Current concepts of refugee protection and assistance now face critical tests, as even long-term advocates of generous asylum and relief wonder whether the world will be able to care for all of its refugees and their seemingly interminable needs.

Refugees have existed throughout recorded history and probably since the dawn of the human community. In 1283 B.C., Pharaoh Ramses II sought the return of refugees to Egypt in a treaty with the Hittites. Greek antiquity left us both the concept of asylum and the word (from "asylon") that expresses it. Orestes was a refugee. So were Dante, Wagner, Einstein and innumerable other creative, political or religious personalities. So were whole nations or groups, such as the Huguenots of France or the Jews of Spain.

Most cultures have traditionally offered hospitality to the stranger in need. Before the existence of nation-states, religious faith or a sense of common experience gave birth to concepts such as Christian refuge, Islamic sanctuary in African brotherhood. Temples, pagodas, churches, sometimes entire free cities represented potential havens. With the establishment of the modern state system, national governments increasingly assumed the asylum responsibility. Asylum constituted one of the early doctrines of international law and passed in-

creasingly into practice to protect outcasts from forcible repatriation.

The second half of the twentieth century has witnessed an unprecedented explosion in the number and impact of refugees. The numbers since 1945 are estimated to be as high as 60 million, more than twice the number of the preceding 50 years and far beyond any historical experience. In many states, refugee arrivals have shifted population patterns, altered domestic politics and shaped or even determined foreign policy. No serious study of such diverse regions as central Europe, Southeast Asia, Africa or the Middle East could be undertaken without considering the impact of refugees—both on the regions themselves and on the attitudes of others toward them.

To deal with this challenge, especially as it first emerged in Europe after World War II, the international community has created a widespread system of refugee protection and assistance, centered around the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and based on two international agreements ratified by almost 100 states: the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol. These documents defined refugees as persons compelled to seek asylum abroad "owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted." The 1969 Refugee Convention of the Organization of African Unity expanded that definition, for African refugees, to include those fleeing "external aggression, foreign occupation, foreign domination, or events seriously disturbing public order." These agreements have provided a legal foundation on which refugees can base their appeals for asylum. Internationally coordinated assistance arrangements have helped refugees survive in exile, and have enabled asylum states to sustain the impact of mass refugee arrivals, overcoming the potentially destabilizing effects of refugee crises and later permitting refugees to reestablish themselves in normal lives.

Today, however, the system designed to cope with the refugees that emerged from the debris of war, although modified and expanded in the face of subsequent crises, is strained by the demensions of what has become an immense, tenacious and omnipresent phenomenon. The system was able to deal with one type of crisis—essentially a trans-European refugee flow—and even with many crises since, yet it is now laboring under a much wider burden, no different in its legal and humanitarian fundamentals but much broader and more complex in its dimensions and its demands.

II

Statistics reveal the basic extent of the problem. Some ten million refugees are now to be found on every continent and in virtually every country. They include not only exiled political figures, disaffected intellectuals, professionals and students, but millions of peasants, nomads, laborers and their families, fleeing for their convictions and often for their lives.

The largest single refugee population is four million Afghans, almost three million in Pakistan and over a million in Iran.

The next largest concentration is in the Horn of Africa, with perhaps a million and a quarter in Sudan, over half a million in Somalia and smaller but significant numbers in Ethiopia and Djibouti.

More than a million refugees are scattered over 15 countries in central and east Africa, from Cameroon to Kenya, from the Central African Republic to Lesotho. The largest groups are in Angola, Tanzania, Zambia and Zaire.

Southeast Asia's refugee population has been reduced to 150,000 as almost 1.5 million "boat people" and others who fled Indochina have moved to new homes in resettlement countries, but those who remain—and others who continue to arrive—still constitute a major problem for Thailand and other first asylum states.

Countries in Latin America harbor over 300,000 refugees, the largest groups having fled from several Central American states into Mexico, Honduras and Costa Rica.

Over a million refugees live in the United States and over 300,000 in Canada. Most are Indochinese intending permanent settlement in North America, but there are many from other parts of the world as well. In addition, there are tens of thousands of asylum seekers in North America.

Another million live in various other Asian and European countries of asylum or permanent settlement. There are major concentrations in Australia, Britain, China, France, West Germany and the Scandinavian countries. Virtually every one of those countries also faces major dilemmas dealing with new asylum seekers.

Significant groups of refugees have found temporary asylum in dozens of other countries in north and west Africa, Asia and the Middle East.

Omitted from this enumeration are the Palestinian refugees, numbering over two million. The United Nations and the international community at large have long considered the Palestinians as distinct from other refugee groups, and their fate has assumed significance far beyond their status as refugees.

Refugees are a reflection of our unsettled time. They spill forth out of the full range of foreign and domestic quarrels and upheavals, war, revolution, communal strife, the post-colonial struggle. Modern techniques of conflict and population control have driven more people than ever into exile because more feel or fear the effects of combat or repression. Stricter border delimitation and policing have meant that refugees now attract more attention and need more formal recognition than in the past. Refugees seem to have become an inevitable and often highly visible by-product of almost every conflict and every crisis.

The common drive that compels refugees to leave their homes is fear: fear for their lives, for their families, for their future. Their stories have a depressing, even numbing, sameness. They may have seen their houses, shops or land burned, seized, pillaged or invaded, their countrymen—often friends or relatives—taken away without explanation. They may have been expelled from their jobs or from their homes. Their lives may have been threatened. They may have been injured, raped or robbed in their escape, and that escape may have taken them over hundreds of miles and many borders. They may reach their country of refuge exhausted, emaciated or dying. They often care little what happens to themselves but will do anything to ensure a safe future for their children. They worry continuously about those they left behind.

III

What is most worrisome about the current refugee burden is not only the sheer number of refugees, however large it may be, but also the long periods of time that they have spent in asylum. The major exodus of the Indochinese refugees came in 1978 and 1979, but may still remain in camps. Most refugees in Pakistan and Iran fled between 1979 and 1981, as did those in Somalia. Major refugee groups in many other African asylum countries arrived in massive numbers as far back as the mid-1970s. Though new refugees constantly appear, the substantial majority of today's refugees have been in exile for five years or more. Most have little immediate prospect of going home or moving on.

The long-lasting refugee presence in many countries has fundamentally altered the nature of the global refugee problem. It has kept aid requirements at a continuously high level. In 1970, the annual budget of the U.N. High Commissioner was $8 million; by the mid-1970s, it had grown to around $50 million. Since 1980, the budget has consistently stood between $400 and $500 million. Other international organizations with significant refugee assistance programs, such as the World Food Program or the Intergovernmental Committee on Migration, have also seen their budgets grow. So have a number of voluntary agencies.

Efforts to find durable solutions continue, whether by returning refuges voluntarily to their countries of origin, settling them in countries of asylum, or resettling them in third countries. In the last five years, major refugee groups have been able to return to Argentina, Chad, Ethiopia, Uganda, Zimbabwe and elsewhere. Some limited repatriation has been possible in Southeast Asia. Many refugees, perhaps in the hundreds of thousands, have repatriated informally in the Horn of Africa.

Refugees have also in many instances settled permanently in their countries of first asylum, especially in Africa where numerous countries have generously offered land, permanent residence and even citizenship. Hundreds of thousands have settled in Burundi, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zaïre and Zambia. During the summer of 1985, for example, Tanzania formally accepted the settlement of 35,000 Barundi refugees in the highlands of western Tanzania at Mishamo, an agricultural project almost as large as the state of Rhode Island. Most Indochinese refugees have moved to resettlement countries in North America, Europe and Asia, and for other refugee groups there has also been some, though more limited, settlement in third countries.

These steps have not, however, reduced the total world refugee population because some of the largest groups have stayed in place and even grown, and new groups have appeared. From July 1984 to July 1985 alone, about 550,000 new refugees arrived in the Central African Republic, Papua New Guinea, Somalia, Sudan, Zaïre and Zimbabwe, with smaller groups or individuals arriving in dozens of other countries. The global number of refugees has thus remained constant at a very high level. As crisis has followed crisis, and as new conflicts have obscured old ones, the world has been unable fully to absorb the consequences of one refugee flow before being faced with yet another.

Around seven million refugees, the overwhelming majority, wait out their asylum in camps, where aid can be provided to large numbers of needy persons in a systematic manner. Yet an extended stay in a camp can have detrimental effects on refugees even if their protection, nutrition, medical and basic education needs are met.

Camp life disrupts normal patterns of existence, especially in traditional societies, disturbing or threatening established family and community roles. Men can no longer

work, trade, farm or otherwise provide. Women cannot take care of their homes and gardens. Professional persons cannot pursue careers. Children cannot practice their customarily assigned tasks, such as herding, chores or handicrafts. Refugees can suffer deeply from prolonged dependency; extended camp life robs human beings of the opportunity for purposeful activity for themselves and their families, the pride of being useful. From the visible emergency of flight, camp refugees pass to the invisible emergency of stagnation.

To escape from dependency, many male refugees leave the camps, sometimes abandoning their families for long periods or permanently. Some look for employment in neighboring villages or towns. Nomads take the remnants of their herds and flee to the open countryside, relying on the camp system only for essential supplies such as medicine and care for their families. Other refugees leave for educational opportunities or to try to reach other countries. They may even go home on a temporary and clandestine basis. A growing number of men do not come to camps in the first place but immediately attempt to find asylum in distant countries. Ultimately, only the most vulnerable and most dependent remain.

The effect of large, standing refuge populations on the response to new refugee crises can be as troubling as the effect on the refugees themselves. Donors the world over may turn their attention away from old problems and provide insufficient financial support and resettlement opportunities. With available resources already stretched tightly, they sometimes must meet new crises by reallocating funds from ongoing programs. In 1985, for the first time in memory, the High Commissioner has had to make major reductions in planned relief programs. for long-standing refugee populations because funds have not been available. Since existing resources have to be used to pay for basic survival needs, less can go toward enduring solutions. Dependency is only prolonged.

IV

Not only has the nature of the refugee problem changed, but also its location. The primary concentration has moved from Europe to the Third World. The overwhelming majority of refugees are now from developing countries and have found asylum in developing countries. Forty percent are in countries listed as "least developed" by the United Nations; these societies are ill-prepared to bear the shock of refugee arrivals, with their political, economic and ecological consequences. If refugees are unable to go home or to move on, those same countries must also bear the long-term effects of the refugee presence.

A visit to virtually any refugee camp or settlement area in such a country is a sobering experience. as one approaches, one enters an empty expanse of many miles—dusty in the dry season, slick with mud after the rains—where trees, shrubs and other vegetation have disappeared as refugees have scoured for firewood. Nearby hospitals or clinics may have many of their beds occupied by refugees while national citizens have to wait. Secondary schools are crowded with refugee children. Roads or tracks in the area are cracked and rutted by heavy trucks bearing relief supplies. The area and the people around the camps feel the impact of the refugees' presence in their daily lives. When there are many camps, entire provinces and even countries can be affected.

Prolonged refugee stays deepen the dilemma. The government of the asylum country and the local population might regard a large refugee presence, with its effect on their resources, as an acceptable burden over the short run. But, even if they originally welcomed the refugees, they begin to express serious concern if they sense that they themselves are being continually crowded out and disadvantaged. They see their environment ravaged. They fear that refugees will lower wages and raise prices. They are often envious of some of the care received by refugees, especially in medicine and special foods.

The presence of large long-term refugee populations in Third World countries generates four different but related types of demands:

The cost of refugee care in those environments is high. The asylum countries have little to share. Virtually all supplies must be brought in, often from far away and sometimes, in emergencies, by air. Food, tents, blankets, medicines, all basic necessities, have to come from abroad, because the asylum country either does not have them or they could not be made available through local markets without escalating prices. Even if the cost for each individual refugee is low, the total assistance requirement is vast. This has been a principal factor driving up refugee relief budgets over the past few years.

Substantial resources are needed to overcome damage to the local infrastructure. Governments of the African asylum countries during the second Conference on International Assistance to Refugees in Africa, held in Geneva in July 1984, presented a number of requests for various infrastructural projects to compensate for the presence of refugees. The projects included new or expanded hospitals, schools, roads and water systems, as well as reforestation and irrigation.

Projects for local settlement of refugees require considerable resources to get started. Although refugees need not be regarded as a permanent drain on asylum countries, since they are able as well as anxious to work once they get over the trauma of flight, they cannot become productive in developing countries without some services and infrastructure to permit them to work effectively.

As evidenced in the current African famine crisis, refugee populations cannot be helped in isolation when the surrounding population is also suffering. Local villagers have at times settled in large numbers around refugee camps to share refugees' food and water. They have blocked relief shipments to call attention to their own needs. Concerned that refugees were carrying epidemics, they have insisted on also obtaining medicines originally intended for refugees. Such requests cannot reasonably be denied.

Long-lasting refugee problems in developing countries, therefore, engender assistance requirements that are longer in duration as well as greater in scope and complexity than those known in Europe during the postwar era or those experienced in the briefer refugee situations of the past. But the requirements must be met if the refugees are to be accepted, to remain any length of time or to settle permanently. Moreover, the lines between aid to refugees and national development cannot be neatly drawn. Both the refugees and the nationals may need assistance, but these different forms of aid come from different sources, through separate channels, and according to a whole range of planning and implementation schedules. Coordination can be and has been a formidable problem.

V

The refugee problems in the Third World cannot, however, be confined and isolated there, with the industrialized donor nations providing aid and selecting qualified refugees for resettlement on an orderly basis while the vast bulk of the refugees remain in camps. With rapid communication and air travel, the refugee problems of the Third World are being visited on the industrialized democracies in a new and intrusive manner, in the form of a dramatic upsurge in the number of asylum applicants arriving directly from far away.

Over the last few years, and especially in 1984 and the first half of 1985, there has been a pronounced rise in the number of persons from the Third World applying for asylum in the West, particularly Western Europe. The level of asylum applicants in Western Europe had remained constant, between about 20,000 and 35,000, during much of the 1970s. It surged in 1979 and 1980, reaching a 1980 high of 150,000, largely because the world recession led a number of unemployed foreign workers to apply for asylum so as to avoid repatriation. After that peak, application numbers declined, although not to the previous level. In 1984 they leaped up again to 103,000 and have been running at an even higher level during the first six months of 1985. To help respond to the crisis, High Commissioner Poul Hartling called a special seminar on asylum seekers in Europe in May 1985.

The current applicants are not only greater in number but also different in origin from the past. Formerly, at least two-thirds of the asylum seekers in Western Europe came from Eastern or southeastern Europe. Now, two-thirds come from Asia, Africa and the Middle East, from Ethiopia, Ghana, Iran, Iraq, Sri Lanka, Syria and Zaire. In 1984, persons from almost 100 different countries sought asylum in France, Britain and Western Germany. Many applicants fly directly to major European airports from distant countries of origin or asylum. Once in Europe, they move on by train, car or ferry. They apply for asylum at airports or border entry points. Some attempt to make their way to North America, but few are able to afford the ticket and to obtain the documentation needed before they can get on a flight to Canada or the United States. North American asylum applicants still come predominantly from the western hemisphere, but pose problems similar to those faced by the West European asylum countries.

The number of new arrivals in Western Europe or North America is small compared to the number of refugees arriving in African and Asian countries over the same span of time, but it still far exceeds the capacity of Western countries even to process the flow, especially when asylum applicants have no documentation and come from distant places where the details of their claims are hard to investigate and even harder to substantiate. In recent times, for example, the backlog of applicants in West Germany was 100,000, in Switzerland 22,000 and in the United States 150,000.

Such backlogs only encourage further applications. Since refugees often lose everything in flight, many Western nations give asylum seekers special benefits, including temporary housing, modest living allow-

ances, work permits and freedom of movement while their applications are being considered. Those privileges were intended as minimum humanitarian compensation to persons who had nothing left. They now often appear, however, as a magnet for migrants—all the more powerful when backlogs delay processing. Migrants know that by applying for asylum they not only improve their chances for admission but can draw on various forms of support for a long time while they try to establish a permanent foothold, no matter what may be the final decision on their asylum claim.

There have been instances in which asylum applicants have arrived in whole planeloads, deliberately destroying their travel documents before arrival, or have attempted to travel from one asylum country to another on fraudulent documentation. Public opinion in the asylum countries resents these abuses of the asylum process, suspects commercial exploitation and begins to question the bona fides of all asylum applicants.

It is important to distinguish migrants from refugees. Migration has, in itself, been one of the major phenomena of the twentieth century. Since 1900 an estimated 150-175 million persons—other than refugees—have migrated, many of them permanently but many others as temporary foreign workers in the industrialized or industrializing countries. The migrant stream has helped fuel economic progress over the past 40 years in Western Europe, North America and the Middle East. Those regions long welcomed migrants as low-cost laborers willing to take jobs scorned by others.

With the economic slowdown in the late 1970s and early 1980s, however, many industrialized countries have accepted fewer migrants and temporary foreign workers, and some of the migrants have indeed tried to enter as refugees. Moreover, many refugees, like many migrants, want to settle in the industrialized democracies of the northern hemisphere because they hope to find a safe, free and promising future there. Unlike migrants, however, refugees leave their homes because of fear, not because of opportunity. Whereas migrants travel to escape stagnation and poverty, refugees travel to escape persecution, conflict, and perhaps death. Migrants seek opportunity. Refugees seek haven. A migrant does not *wish* to return home; a refugee does not *dare*.

In recognition of this difference, asylum countries have generally made careful distinctions between migrants and refugees, trying to ensure that asylum is granted to those who need it but not to others. They base their decisions on the information provided by the asylum seekers and on their own knowledge and perception of conditions in the asylum seekers' countries of origin. Entry procedures vary from country to country, but usually include a central office that decides on the criteria for regular immigrants as well as refugees. The authorities attempt to determine if the asylum seeker, in accordance with the refugee definition, cannot return to his or her country of origin because of a "well-founded" fear of being persecuted. They are deeply conscious of the example that they set and of the standards that they have helped to establish and propagate, since the asylum nations are among the founders of the current international system for protecting and assisting refugees. They normally try to give the benefit of the doubt to asylum applicants since forcible return can have the most serious consequences.

Nonetheless, as popular skepticism has grown, national authorities have been under intense pressure to curtail entry. Asylum officials also find it easier to be convinced that persons are really in danger when they come from countries near at hand, where conditions that might expose the applicants to persecution are broadly understood and appreciated, and when asylum applicants are from familiar nationalities. Judgments become more difficult, and more controversial, when asylum seekers come from far away. In this respect, the jet refugee is at a particular disadvantage.

Beyond migrants and traditional refugees, a third group has not begun to emerge clearly. They are persons who may not be specifically and personally targets of persecution under the terms of the 1951 convention, but who flee the random cruelties that war, civil disturbance and revolution inflict upon the innocent as well as the partisans. Such persons are often described not as refugees but as "humanitarian" cases, persons who may not be subject to the pointed fear of personal persecution but who are, indeed, at risk in the country from which they flee. Many of those persons are urban professionals, anxious to avoid the stultifying experience of a semi-permanent camp or dormitory existence while they await resettlement. They want to get directly into a Western country.

These three streams—migrants, refugees, and "humanitarian" cases—are now crossing and occasionally merging. It has become the solomonic task of overburdened immigration authorities, appeals boards and courts in the traditional asylum and resettlement countries of Western Europe and North America to establish what person fits properly into what stream and to take appropriate action.

The industrialized democracies are granting asylum to those persons who are clearly seen as victims of persecution. They are rejecting persons who are clearly seen as migrants, dismissing them by the oxymoron "economic refugees." With respect to the third category, the "humanitarian" cases, the asylum countries have reacted with some hesitation and in various ways. They may grant refugee status in specific hardship cases. They may refuse refugee status but permit the applicants to remain temporarily in a kind of legal limbo. They may deport applicants either to their countries of origin or to some other countries where the applicants stopped on the way. Since those transit countries often feel no particular responsibility to readmit the asylum seekers, the latter become "refugees in orbit," individuals or families shuttling from airport to airport and from one immigration counter to another, modern Flying Dutchmen searching for a place to rest.

Over the last 40 years, refugees have traveled farther and farther away from their countries of origin in geographic, cultural and ethnic terms. As they come from distant areas not in the public spotlight, the problems that they are fleeing are less known or are differently perceived. The "jet people" are not accepted as the "boat people" were. Countries that were and are willing to make considerable sacrifices to support refugees abroad or to select refugees for permanent settlement are reluctant to grant asylum to all those who come directly and from far away.

A long humanitarian tradition could be in jeopardy, even in nations that have been the most generous pillars of the international system for refugee support. All applicants for refugee status may not really need asylum, but they must at least be given a fair chance to state their case and to be sympathetically heard if international refugee conventions are to have any meaning. In the backlash against all foreigners, not only could refugees risk being returned to face persecution, but the world could risk losing global asylum concepts and practices that many states, organizations and individuals have over the years worked or suffered to achieve.

VI

The nature of the refugee issue has been transformed in very fundamental ways over four decades. It has grown from a continental to a global problem, from one that could be kept at a distance to one that may be very near. The world's refugee population has expanded manyfold. It has changed from a transient to a semi-static population. Assistance requirements have multiplied. Any crisis anywhere can now produce refugees everywhere. The resulting problems now need close and urgent attention.

Solutions to these problems cannot and will not be found quickly or easily, since they have arisen out of a combination of political, sociological and technical realities that are not likely to be altered or reversed soon, if at all. Therefore, currently available measures cannot solve the problem but they should at least offer some hope for alleviating human distress.

Among the steps to be taken are the following:

Making clear to concerned publics and governments how the refugee problem has evolved over the last several years. All agencies, whether private, official or international, need to make sure that their constituencies understand that long-standing refugee groups must not be consigned to oblivion by neglect or fatigue.

Organizing refugee assistance to cope simultaneously with emergencies, long-lasting refugee situations, and more concentrated efforts at durable solutions. Given the present budgetary environment in the donor countries, this must all be done in the most cost-effective manner.

Improving coordination between agencies involved in refugee relief and those involved in other forms of assistance, from emergency to development, within and outside the United Nations.

Expanding efforts for voluntary repatriation, local settlement or third country resettlement. As part of this effort, the proportion of assistance budgets devoted to such solutions should be increased.

Introducing more productive activities for refugees where such solutions are not available, in ways that support rather than undercut the economies of asylum countries.

Assigning highest priority to the processing of aslyum applications in all asylum countries, devoting the necessary resources and making decisions as rapidly as possible consistent with fairness and thorough consideration of each case. This should discourage spurious applications, enable truly needy asylum applicants to leave the state of uncertainty in which many now find themselves, and also reduce support costs for pending cases.

Examining the relationship between refugee status, as defined in internationally agreed conventions, and the status of those whose applications for asylum rest on "humanitarian" considerations. This should be done through continuous international consultations without altering the current refu-

gee definition that has served well. It must also be done in such a way that refugees from distant countries are not regarded as less deserving of asylum merely because they come from far away.

These steps cannot in themselves solve the global refugee problem. They can, however, reverse current trends and offer some confidence that we are moving in the right direction to help those in need and to avoid stagnation. Several steps are already under way, and others should follow.

The solutions also complement and reinforce each other because the problems are linked. Reducing long camp stays by instituting durable solutions sooner can help stem refugee flight to more distant asylum countries and can help to relieve public concern in the present asylum countries about the refugee presence. Assisting the poorer asylum countries to bear the infrastructural impact of refugees can help to promote local solutions and further reduce the number needing to look elsewhere for settlement. Helping public opinion in Western asylum countries to surmount current fears of being overrun by migrants posing as refugees should sustain the readiness of those countries and their people to assist refugees everywhere.

The entire system of refugee protection and support rests on a foundation of voluntary action and willing sacrifice. Assistance for refugees comes from voluntary funds, in part from private sources but now mainly from governments because of the immensity of the needs. Many agencies and persons from many countries and backgrounds work with refugees under grueling conditions in camps, villages, towns or settlements. Individuals, families and organizations—secular and religious—receive refugees, care for them and help to plead their cause. Young people just out of high school or college, as well as retired professionals such as administrators, doctors or dentists, reinforce the human touch that is essential in dealing with persons desperately worried about their future. The housewife in the station wagon who greets a Vietnamese refugee family in California or New Zealand, the camp worker in Pakistan or Sudan, the nurse in Thailand or Zaire, the volunteer relief assistant in France, Germany or Sweden, all form part of an extensive, undocumented but essential chain of welcome and care for refugees. It is vital that this chain not be broken.

The new characteristics of the refugee situation have not invalidated the basic principles by which refugees have historically been received and helped. Nations have in the past found ways to respect refugees and treat them fairly. Over the last few decades, a considerable structure for protection and assistance has developed to perform the traditional tasks in accordance with the requirements of our particular age. It did not develop during times of peace and prosperity but during times of crisis, fear and mass population movements as disturbing then as those we know today. The structure has to date accomplished its mandate. It has evolved as necessary. It can evolve further to meet present and future needs. What it cannot do, and must not do, is to abandon principles and policies that have served both stability and humanity.●

EXPORT CONTROL ENFORCEMENT

● Mr. GARN. Mr. President, section 12(a)(7) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 [EAA], as amended by the Export Administration Amendments Act of 1985, requires that the Secretary of Commerce publish in the Federal Register "procedures setting forth . . . the responsibilities of the Department of Commerce and the U.S. Customs Service in the enforcement of" the Export Administration Act. Such publication may also include procedures for the sharing of information. This information is to be published in the Federal Register within 90 days from enactment of the EAA authorization legislation.

Although 1 day late, such procedures were published in the Federal Register on October 11, and appear to be in accordance with the legal requirements in the EAA for sharing enforcement responsibility between these two agencies.

Mr. President, our export control enforcement efforts have been damaged in the past through lack of cooperation among Federal agencies. The amendments to the EAA passed by this Congress earlier this year, and the procedures recently published, if followed in practice, should bring about a significant enhancement of our export control efforts. I hope that the information sharing procedures outlined by Commerce will allow for a full and uninhibited sharing of information between the two agencies.

I compliment the Administration on meeting this first of many deadlines and requirements under the Export Administration Act, as it has been amended. I hope that this very fruitful beginning is a sign of things to come.●

NEW YORK METS AND NEW YORK YANKEES

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I had hoped to purchase the first ticket for the first subway series in New York City in 29 years. Disappointingly, neither the New York Yankees nor the New York Mets will participate in this year's World Series. New York baseball fans, however, cannot be long disappointed with the 1985 season. Both the Mets and the Yankees played with great skill, and were competitive until the season's very end.

Young Dwight Gooden of the Mets pitched masterfully, his skill and composure on the mound inspiring team and fans alike. Catcher Gary Carter's determination in the face of injury was matched by his performance when games hung in the balance. The efforts of these men and their teammates and the winning record their efforts produced have helped to continue the revival of baseball spirit in New York. A New York record 2,719,546 fans turned out to see the Mets this year, testimony to the enormous enthusiasm they have generated.

As for the Yankees, their doggedness was evident throughout the year. Given little chance at the American League East Championship at the year's beginning, they never gave up, and threatened the Toronto Blue Jays even into the final weekend. In the season's finale, the venerable Phil Niekro became the 18th pitcher ever to win 300 games, a feat accomplished earlier this year by the great Tom Seaver, most of whose 300 victories came during his cherished stay with the New York Mets.

Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the New York Mets and the New York Yankess on such fine seasons. In the immortal words of baseball fans everywhere, "Wait'll next year."●

THE ORGAN TRANSPLANTATION AND PROCUREMENT ACT

● Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, last year at this time Congress passed the Organ Transplantation and Procurement Act to aid those Americans whose lives depend on transplant surgery. This new law provided for the establishment of a Task Force on Organ Transplantation, a national network to match patients with donors, and authorized financial assistance for organ procurement organizations.

I cosponsored this bill and helped move it through the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. Additionally, I served on the conference committee between House and Senate Members and was very pleased it was signed into law by President Reagan because I believe this bill will make the difference between life and death for hundreds of waiting Americans.

In Oklahoma alone, I know of several children and adults who are waiting for the right organ, including 9-year-old Kimberly Fuller of Yukon, OK, who, if the right donor is found, would be the youngest recipient of a heart-lung transplant in the United States. Unfortunately, Kimberly has been waiting for over a year now.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to commend the Department of Health and Human Services and its Secretary, Margaret M. Heckler, for their efforts in administering the beginnings of this program and for attempting to raise national awareness of the critical need for more organ donors. On October 11, 100 high school students of the Connelly School in Potomac, MD, distributed posters to the offices of each Member of Congress as part of a community service project. These 20-inch by 16-inch posters, which were designed under Secretary Heckler's direction, featured 28 photos of children across the Nation needing transplant surgery and are meant to represent many other children throughout the United

States who are also waiting. With the able assistance of the thousands of members of the American Association of Critical Care Nurses, these posters also will be placed in hospital waiting rooms, emergency and critical care wards, and other appropriate locations to inform the public of the possibility of saving a life through donation of a body organ.

I might add that the critical care nurses deserve recognition for the vital role they have played in the effort to bring together patient and donor. They have instituted an informal program by which they circulate among their membership information about a patient when he or she has reached a critical stage in their waiting for a replacement organ in order to double efforts to locate an appropriate donor.

I encourage my colleagues to assist the Secretary in this lifesaving program by spreading the information they have received through newsletters and other forms of communication to their constituents.

The Secretary, her Department, the critical care nurses association, and the high school students who have delivered these posters all deserve to be recognized for their efforts in meeting the health needs of children in communities throughout the United States. Declared President Reagan about these important needs: "The most precious gift that one human being can bestow upon another is the gift of life. It can be given simply by making arrangements to donate our organs or those of our loved ones after death."●

CONGRATULATIONS TO SAINT XAVIER COLLEGE SCHOOL OF NURSING

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. President, this Saturday and Sunday, October 19 and 20, Saint Xavier College in Chicago, IL, will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the founding of its school of nursing.

In 1935, the Sisters of Mercy, who have made many memorable contributions to the city of Chicago, collaborated to design a program for the purpose of preparing college educated professional nurses. The nursing program was the first in the State of Illinois to be officially accredited by the National League for Nursing. Until this day, both the undergraduate and graduate nursing programs at Saint Xavier are fully accredited, having graduated more than 2,200 professionally trained nurses.

Mr. President, I feel confident that my colleagues join me in congratulating Saint Xavier College School of Nursing on the 50th anniversary of its founding.

I commend the Sisters of Mercy for all the good they have done, and I wish them and everyone else involved with Saint Xavier College many more productive, successful years.●

CONFERENCE ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

● Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to focus the attention of my colleagues on the important upcoming seventh National Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect, to be held November 10-13, at the Chicago Hilton and Towers in Chicago, IL.

The Nation's leading experts on the effect and prevention of child abuse will gather at the conference to present the most accurate and up-to-date information available on this terrible problem facing our society. Authorities and celebrities committed to ending the abuse and neglect of our young people, from Captain Kangaroo (Bob Keeshan) to actor Henry Winkler, will be featured speakers at the conference, entitled "Reaching for the Rainbow—A National Commitment To End Child Abuse."

The event will be jointly sponsored by the U.S. National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect [NCCAN] and the National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse [NCPCA], along with many other important cooperating organizations. More than 3,000 delegates representing various groups, including social service, law enforcement, education, the military, the legal community, and business, are expected to attend.

The conference organizers have asked me to invite my colleagues to attend or to send a staff representative.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join in this battle to educate our society on the problem of child abuse and neglect. The time has come for us to dedicate our resources to promoting awareness.

If my colleagues have any questions about the conference or would like to know more about its program, I advise them to call NCPCA at 312-663-3520.

Thank you.●

HONORING CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, October is the month in which Americans celebrate the most remarkable accomplishment of the great Italian explorer, Christopher Columbus—his voyage in 1492 to the New World.

Although he initially mistook the New World for the Orient, to which a westward passage was being sought, Columbus quickly came to appreciate the implications of his discovery. His contemporaries, however, failed to recognize the enormous contribution Columbus had made to the expansion of European civilization, and to the creation of a new one.

But we, who are the beneficiaries of his great achievement, each day enjoy the fruits of his discovery, and each year honor the man whose vision, courage, and commitment brought him to the shores of America.

As we reflect upon the accomplishments of Christopher Columbus, we are reminded of the many ways in which Americans of Italian descent, who followed Columbus' path to the America, have contributed to the growth of our Nation.

The story of the voyages of hundreds of thousands of Italians to America during the late 19th and early 20th century is a familiar one. Countless numbers of immigrants endured hardships and difficulties in search of a brighter future for themselves and for their children. Supported by a strong value system and a commitment to hard work, Italian immigrants used their special talents to make their vision of a better life a reality.

Today, we continue to benefit from the contributions of Italian Americans. Among the many accomplished Americans of Italian descent are Chrysler Corp. Chairman Lee Iacocca and former Congresswoman and Vice Presidential running mate, Geraldine Ferraro.

Lee Iacocca, with a keen sense of his Italian heritage, is a shining example of integrity and success. His ability to successfully tackle enormous problems, such has the revival of the Chrysler Corp., has inspired others to entend themselves in pursuit of excellence. I cannot think of a more appropriate individual to head the effort to restore the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island than Lee Iacocca.

Another Italian-American, Geraldine Ferraro, recently charted unexplored territory by becoming the first woman in American history to run for Vice President on the ticket of a major political party. Her courage and determination in that effort paved the way for the future election of women to high political office.

The outstanding characteristics of these two individuals are shared by many other Americans of Italian descent who continue to contribute to the growth of this country.

Like other immigrants, the Italians left behind them the hardships and inequalities which made life in their homeland intolerable. Among the things they brought with them to their new home, however, was their rich cultural heritage. That gift continues to enhance the quality of life of all Americans.

Just as the Italian culture provides a link for Italian-Americans to their homeland, so too can it provide a bridge for others seeking a better understanding of the Italian people and their past. Italian-Americans are anxious to share their heritage with

others, and are doing so through activities such as those sponsored by the Italian-American Cultural Society in Warren, MI.

As we prepare to celebrate the 500th anniversary of Columbus' voyage to America in 1992, we, as a nation, must also renew the effort to develop a keener appreciation for the Italian cultural treasures. With the help of Italian-Americans, we can derive new meaning and inspiration from them. In no other way can we truly demonstrate our profound gratitude for this eternal gift.●

IMPACT OF DEFECTS ON THE FUTURE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the more thoughtful economic writers in this Nation is Bill Neikirk of the Chicago Tribune.

He recently had a pointed column about the impact of the huge deficits on the future. Among other things, he said this:

Any hope that future politicians have of reviving moribund government programs will be crushed by the overwhelming debt burden.

He also points out that "the fastest-growing government program is interest on the public debt."

The reality is, if we continue to let interest rates escalate there will be no possibility of tax cuts from the conservative perspective, or for increased governmental assistance to education and health care and other things that those of us of more progressive bent favor.

I urge my colleagues to read the Bill Neikirk column, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The column follows:

LIBERALS' ECONOMIC AGENDA DROWNING IN REAGAN'S SEA OF RED INK

Washington—Democrats hoping to win points by attacking the exploding public debt under President Reagan may find any resulting successes at the polls to be extremely bittersweet.

Reagan not only has bequeathed gallons of red ink and billions of IOUs but also a conservative economic future for the country. Any hope that future politicians have of reviving moribund government programs will be crushed by the overwhelming debt burden.

This point is not too well perceived yet by many candidates, but slowly it will dawn on them as they ponder the fragility of the nation's public finances. It seems ironic that liberalism is dying because of spending and tax-cut excesses by one of the most conservative presidents of modern times.

When Reagan asked Congress last week to boost the federal debt ceiling to more than $2 trillion [double what it was when he took office], the handwriting should have been on the wall. The way things are going, the public debt will top $3 trillion by the time Reagan leaves office.

The fastest-growing government programs interest on the public debt. It is eating up any "fiscal dividend" that might accue because of economic growth.

"Whether the next president is Bush, Kemp, Cuomo or Kennedy, they are all boxed in by the deficit problem," said Larry Kudlow, economist at Rodman & Renshaw Economics Inc. Kudlow previously worked as a top aide to former Budget Director David Stockman.

The deficit problem has already inhibited Reagan in some ways. His effort to expand the miltiary budget has been trimmed back by Congress, and he has had to sign two tax-increase bills that he wasn't especially crazy about. Reagan's tax-overhaul plan is taking a back seat to the deficit and debt problem. Indeed, Reagan may have to violate his own campaign promise and raise taxes.

"I think it's going to dominate the economic policy scene for many years to come," Kudlow said, "It will prevent future spending increases. It may prevent tax cuts. . . We're talking about a 5- to 10-year period to work this out."

The deficit problem is the major reason why Democrats are having a difficult time developing something to be for. Many of them have become "neoliberals," but the liberal label is only a veneer. What they are preaching is basically conservative economics.

Some say that Rap. Jack Kemp [R., N.Y.], darling of the supply-side economics camp, will play down the deficit if he should be elected president. But Reagan's experience shows that a president does this at his own peril. Financial markets, domestic and international, are extremely sensitive to the deficit and debt issues, and any politician who minimizes it may find a financial crisis on his hands.

Some Democrats, including Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan [D., N.Y.], believe that Reagan's fiscal excesses were part of a deliberate political plot to extend conservative influence into the 1990s.

Kudlow denies it. "It was unplanned," he said. "At no time did anyone foresee that we would have this kind of deficit on our hands."

Another former Stockman aide, J. Gregory Ballentine, economist at De Seve Economic Associates, agrees but acknowledges that the administration decided to use the deficit aggressively this year in arguing for spending reductions. Reagan, in effect, turned the deficit issue on the Democrats, saying that raising taxes to close the gap would only condemn the nation to a high rate of spending for generations.

The ultimate test of the theory that the deficit is expanding conservative influence came during the 1981-82 recession, said Ballentine. Contrary to past recessions, there was not a major increase in federal spending.

Kudlow said one reason the deficit exploded was that the economy fell deeper than anyone thought, because of tight-money policies. He added that the President never got all the spending cuts he asked for, and the whole process of disinflation proved to be deeper and more prolonged than anyone expected.

Politicians finally are recognizing that the debt and deficit are slowly sapping the economy's strength, inhibiting the accumulation of real wealth. Even as business picks up in the United States, much of our income will flow overseas to repay foreigners who have invested in our public debt.

"Even if a liberal president is elected, he's going to be in a very difficult situation, Said Ballentine.

The deficit problem dogged Walter Mondale during his 1984 campaign. His previous association with big-spending programs and his advocacy of a tax increase turned off a public worried about the ultimate problem of the federal debt. Democrats haven't forgotten the Mondale lesson. They'll be more conservative in 1988.●

THE 1985 FARM BILL

● Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I have made very clear my intentions to hold up consideration of the 1985 farm bill until hearings are held on the condition of the Farm Credit System.

I was disappointed to learn late yesterday afternoon that the Senate Agriculture Committee had canceled the hearing on this subject which had been scheduled for tomorrow.

In late July, a group of farm State senators met with members of the Farm Credit System. We requested, at that time, that they be prepared to discuss the problem in depth and suggest possible legislative remedies by September 10. They did not hesitate to agree to be prepared. The next thing I knew, it was announced that they would not be ready until the end of September, then I heard it would be the first week in October. I understand that it sometimes takes longer than expected to come up with viable options, but it is crucial that we deal with this threatening situation in credit immediately.

It is my understanding that the legislative committee of the Farm Credit System is now prepared to testify as to the condition of the system and to discuss suggested legislative solutions. Now, I understand that the administration does not want the hearing to be held. Could it be that the administration does not like the suggested remedies? Or, could it be that the administration does not want everyone to know, before the farm bill is considered, how serious things really are? Maybe, it's both. In any event, I do not feel that it would be fair to any of our farmers to enact a farm bill without knowing the full extent of the problem confronting the Farm Credit System.

The most logical way to solve these credit problems is to increase farm income. There are some, however, who will argue that the only way to deal with credit problems is with financial instruments—that is, more credit or more flexible repayment schedules. One can give a farmer, or anyone for that matter, all the credit and flexible repayment schedules in the world, but if his or her income is not high enough to make the payments, that is just not sufficient.

Financial instruments are only one small part of the solution, as we should know by now from experience. When farm income dropped drastically in the midseventies and triggered financial problems for farmers, the Government responded, not by increasing

income, but by giving farmers more credit—more than they could ever hope to repay unless income rose steadily from then on. Income did not rise, and, in fact, began a drastic decline 5 years ago which has not been reversed yet. The massive amounts of credit and credit instruments used in the seventies have left farmers holding the bag, so to speak, in the eighties, merely awaiting foreclosure actions. In fact, many of the farmers facing foreclosure today are those who received Government "help"—in the form of credit—in the seventies. It's crazy, but there are still some who feel we need to do this all over again and solve farmers problems with credit instruments. We cannot afford to allow this to happen.

Mr. President, the farm bill gives us a prime opportunity to deal with the problems of farmers and additional problems confronting the Farm Credit System and other agricultural lenders. It would be so much cheaper in the long run and so much more worthwhile to invest in a plan to increase farm income than to be pennywise on farm income now and in the spring pay billions for a credit bailout which won't keep farmers in business and won't pay the local retailers.

I have heard some estimates that the Farm Credit System needs $10 billion in order to remain viable. Would it not be better to spend $5 billion to improve farm income and help everyone—not just the Farm Credit System? I believe it's not only wiser, but fairer as well.

Mr. President, again I reconfirm my intentions to delay action on the farm bill until hearings are held on a subject that is unquestionably linked to the makeup of the farm bill. It is my hope that hearings will immediately be rescheduled for early next week.●

KEITH AND SVETLANA BRAUN

● Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I would like to alert my colleagues to the plight of Keith and Svetlana Braun. Their first year as man and wife has been far from idyllic: they are forced to live apart from one another in a state of political exile. Keith is an American citizen. His bride, however, is a resident of the Soviet Union.

Svetlana Ilyinichna (Shteingardt) Braun was born in Orsk—Russian Republic—on June 3, 1963. The Brauns were united in a Soviet wedding ceremony in August 1984. The Soviets did not hinder their marriage. But since then, the Soviet Union has done everything to prevent the permanent union of Keith and Svetlana. It is profoundly ironic that the Brauns find themselves separated by the very ceremony they so fervently hoped would bring them together. The Soviets have repeatedly refused Svetlana's petitions to emigrate to the United States.

Mr. President, Mr. and Mrs. Braun's case is not unique. My distinguished colleague, Senator PAUL SIMON, is leading an effort to assist the Brauns and 23 other couples in similar situations in their search for unity and freedom. In each case, an American citizen is married to a Soviet resident who has been refused permission to leave on political grounds. Today, I join with Senator SIMON in urging you to assist us in our efforts to aid these refuseniks. I would solicit your signature on two letters, one to President Reagan, the other to Soviet Premier Mikhail Gorbachev. These letters urge the consideration of this matter during their upcoming summit talks.

The interest of the United States in the plight of these people does not represent any desire to interfere with Soviet domestic affairs. Rather, we seek to protect the interests of American citizens who are being affected by the Soviet's refusal to allow certain of their citizens to emigrate. The U.S.S.R. should be reminded that as a signatory to the Helsinki accords they are called to "work in a positive and humanitarian spirit with the applications of persons who wish to reunite with members of their family."

About his wife Keith Braun writes, "It is a shame to see someone so innocent begin to understand the way the world works." How much more of a shame it would be, Mr. President, if we in the U.S. Senate do not do all that we can to see that the world may work better, and to show these innocent victims the care they deserve.

VA MEDICAL CARE APPROPRIATION

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD a Dear Colleague letter from Senator CRANSTON and myself dated October 15, 1985. Senator CRANSTON and I plan to offer an amendment to H.R. 3038, the HUD/Independent Agencies appropriations bill, when it comes to the floor, to restore the Veterans' Administration medical care appropriation to the level established in the first concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1986. The Dear Colleague letter explains our position on the amendment.

The letter follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, October 15, 1985.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: We are writing regarding Veterans' Administration medical care appropriations in H.R. 3038, the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, FY 1986, reported by the Appropriations Committee on August 28 (S. Rept. No. 99-129), which is due to be considered by the Senate in the near future. On October 3, the Appropriations Committee voted to propose a $296 million reduction from the VA medical care level ($9,358,694,000) it had approved in markup on July 30 and included in its reported bill.

We do not agree with the Appropriations Committee's subsequent action. When the Senate takes up H.R. 3038, we will propose a funding level for the VA's medical care account that is consistent with the overall VA funding level provided for in the First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget. Our amendment would thus restore $166 million of the $296-million proposed cut in that account, which funds the provision of VA health-care services to our Nation's veterans.

The Appropriations Committee, on October 3, in an effort to bring total outlays under the HUD-Independent Agencies bill into line with certain assumptions under the FY 86 Budget Resolution, adopted cuts with an outlay impact in 17 "discretionary" accounts. The outlay impact of these cuts totaled $381 million—with $258 million, or 68 percent, coming from VA medical care. In contrast, the VA medical care account represents only 15 percent of total outlays under the bill (and only 50 percent of total outlays for discretionary accounts).

Based on information that has come to light since the Appropriations Committee's original recommendations for the VA were adopted almost 2½ months ago and in order to provide for VA appropriations to share appropriately in reductions needed to bring the appropriations bill in line with allocations under the Budget Resolution, we are proposing a VA medical-care appropriation of $9,228,694,000, which is $130 million less than the Appropriations Committee's original recommendation.

We wish to emphasize that the outlay level resulting from our amendment—$144 million over that now proposed by the Appropriations Committee—would bring the VA within the overall outlay levels for the VA under Function 700, Veterans' Benefits and Services, in the FY 1986 Budget Resolution (as calculated by the Budget Committee at the time of the Appropriations Committee's October 3 markup), taking into account the savings that would result from title XI of the FY 1986 reconciliation bill, S. 1730.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has recommended reconciliation legislation, currently pending (as noted above) in S. 1730, that will yield an estimated $1.3 billion in outlay savings over fiscal years 1986-88, which is $150 million more than required under its reconciliation instructions. This is in addition to the $1.6 billion in savings that have already been achieved in veterans' produced by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs during the past four years.

Thus, we believe it is clear that veterans' programs are bearing at least their fair share of the burden of reducing the Federal Government's enormous deficits for the current and upcoming years, which we agree are far too large and must be reduced. But the essentail effort to reduce the federal deficit should not be achieved by major reductions in health-care services to our Nation's veterans or damage to the VA health-care system.

If our amendment carries, we trust that the Appropriations Committee will produce further recommendations to reduce outlays by the $144 million needed to bring this bill in line with its allocation under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Attached is a description of how we intend that the $130 million BA/$114 million outlay reduction we propose from the levels in the reported bill be allocated—about three-fourths in specific areas and one-

fourth at the discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs—without reducing the medical care personnel level specified by the Appropriations Committee in its report and for which supplemental appropriations were specifically made in August (193,941 FTEE).

If you would like to join us in sponsoring this amendment or have any questions, please call Cathy McTighe (49126) for Senator Murkowski or Ed Scott (42074) for Senator Cranston.

Sincerely,

FRANK MURKOWSKI,
Chairman.
ALAN CRANSTON,
Ranking Minority Member.

Proposed reductions from VA medical care account appropriations in H.R. 3038 as reported to conform with Function 700 levels in FCR

	Millions
Federal employee health benefits (reduced cost of Federal share)	$16
Appropriations Committee add-on for advanced technology equipment	20
Community nursing home care (reduced per diem; no census reduction)	10
Annualization of fiscal year 1985 rescission (public affairs, printing, and consultancies)	3
Telephone improvements	20
Maintenance and repair of facilities	12
Net reconciliation savings in medical care account	19
Unspecified savings	30
Total appropriation reduction	130
Corresponding outlay reduction	114●

WORLD FOOD DAY

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Alfred Toynbee once said:

When history looks back on the twentieth century, the greatest development of the century will not be the discovery of nuclear or atomic energy. It will be the act of one of the great powers in the world, with no expectation of recompense, to lean down and help other nations of the world rebuild so that they might maintain their freedom.

Today, we are observing World Food Day for the fifth year. In communities around the country and throughout the world, activities have been planned to demonstrate our continued commitment to ending hunger and malnutrition worldwide.

And yet, famine still plagues the less fortunate in epidemic proportions. Still, every 3 days, as many people die from famine as died from the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. Still, the most afflicted group is the most defenseless group, the world's children. And still, the countries with the most famine are the countries with the fastest growing population.

None of us has the complete solution to continued hunger and famine throughout the world. But it is worth considering that, after World War II, when the Marshall plan was in full effect, the United States spent 2.9 percent of our GNP in order to help the poor beyond our borders. Today, we spend less than one-fifth of 1 percent.

There are a number of reasons for this downward trend in our aiding developing countries. But given the effects of the Marshall plan, is it still not in our Nation's best interest to aid developing countries? Today, we have allies throughout the world who benefited from the Marshall plan. They have rebuilt their cultures and regained their independence. These allies have proven the value of the Marshall plan.

Today, in Africa, and other developing countries, we are confronted with a similar situation to the one we faced after World War II. The nations who need our help today are vastly different from those who needed this help after World War II. But, the wisdom we used years ago is as useful today.

In the short term, I think we must increase efforts to aid those in need of food and proper medical care, We have this potential—farmers in Illinois and throughout the country are facing decreased grain prices due to their bumper crop. There is something intrinsically wrong with this being viewed as a crisis. Our great Nation should be able to help both our farmers and those facing hunger and starvation in the developing world.

But, we must start today to reexamine our long-term aid programs. We have to find the ways to make the developing world less dependent for their sake and ours. We must first learn to understand their culture, their values, and their hopes and dreams. With this understanding and our own human and financial resources, we must assume a greater responsibility for supporting these nations and these people as they move toward greater independence and self-sufficiency.

Over the past year, the international community has come together in unprecedented ways to help those facing starvation in Africa. It often seems that from crisis often comes good. Americans and those in developed countries throughout the world have a better understanding of the problems in developing countries and, I believe, are willing to put time, energy, and money into long-term solutions. On this, World Food Day, 1985, I hope my colleagues in the Senate will join me in recommitting ourselves to finding those long-term solutions that will help eliminate hunger and malnutrition throughout the world.●

WORLD FOOD DAY

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 172, designating October 16, 1985, "World Food Day." Since 1981, World Food Day has become an important vehicle in the drive to end hunger and malnutrition in the world. In each of the last 4 years, approximately 150 nations observed World Food Day. It is fitting that, on October 15, 1985, the U.S. Postal Service introduced, for the first time, a 22-cent postage stamp with the message: "help end hunger."

The means of physical sustenance is fundamental to the existence of all life. It is a basic human need which must be met before people can focus their efforts on ways of improving and nurturing their own lives, as well as the lives of those around them. It is because of our universal need to be nourished that today we take time to reflect seriously on the problem of world hunger and recommit ourselves to finding ways to combat it.

In 1985 the issue of food has received worldwide attention. Day after day, the expressionless faces of Africa's famine-afflicted children were brought into the homes of Americans through the nightly news broadcasts. In Ethiopia alone it is estimated that 8 million people were touched by famine this year. About 1,000 children die there each day from famine-related sickness. The malnourished children who do survive the effects of lack of food will forever carry the scars of malnourishment in the form of impeded brain development and disease susceptibility.

Worldwide hunger statistics are equally alarming. This year, it is estimated that 15 million children worldwide will die of malnutrition and related diseases. Each day, more than 42,000 children under the age of 5 die from hunger and malnutrition, and, in some poorer countries, as many as 40 percent of this same age group die each year from nutrition-related causes.

The problem of hunger transcends national boundaries and cultures. Despite our own vast resources, we still have not been able to eliminate hunger and malnutrition here at home.

The stake that America has in monitoring the world food situation is enormous. In addition to our moral and humanitarian concerns for the hungry and impoverished people of the world, the direct impact of world hunger on U.S. national security and the security of the world makes resolution of the world hunger crisis imperative. Indeed, the very existence of world peace is directly related to how we face up to the challenge of eliminating world hunger.

The generosity shown by the American people in providing short-term emergency aid to the famine victims in Ethiopia dramatically demonstrated the sense of responsibility felt by citizens of this country for the less fortunate people of the world. With the same determination shown in the past, we must now turn our efforts to pre-

venting or, at the very least, minimizing the effects of future hunger crises.

Experts say that, with worldwide political commitment, the worst aspects of death by hunger and starvation can be eliminated by the end of this century. Let us mark the fifth annual observance of World Food Day by committing ourselves to achieving that goal.●

FIRE PROTECTION

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, my distinguished colleagues have no doubt wondered why they were not consulted, or at least informed, about the new construction evident on The Mall, just south of the Air and Space Museum. The fact is that the block wall erected there is not part of some new Federal building. It is, rather, a dramatic statement of concern about the safety of much of the residential housing being constructed in the country today.

The wall remains unscathed after having been torched on October 1 to underscore the level of fire protection available in an increasingly common type of residential construction: Multiple dwellings of three stories or less. It is estimated that 500,000 dwelling units of this kind will be constructed in 1985 alone.

Most people assume that their apartments or town homes have firewalls as effective as the block wall on the mall. Like your assumption that the wall is new construction, this is plausible but incorrect. In fact, fire codes vary enormously from locality to locality. The requirement that firewalls be noncombustible has long since disappeared from building codes. Misguided efforts to restrain building costs at the expense of fire safety have resulted in a fire rating and testing system with no more relation to actual fire performance than EPA mileage figures have to driving experience—with the enormously important difference that no one requires the builder to publish a disclaimer.

Analysis of U.S. Fire Administration data on actual fire experience shows significant variation in the level of fire losses, depending on firewall material. The situation is illustrated even more starkly by insurance premium data. The National Loss Control Service Corp., a subsidiary of the Kemper Corp., reports that, for a 50-foot by 40-foot, three-story building in Illinois, with wood frame walls, floors, and roof, built to code, $200,000 of fire insurance coverage on the building and $50,000 on its contents costs $3,570.11 annually. For the same building with precast concrete roof and floors and 4-inch block, 4-inch brick walls, the premium is $239.32, a differential of 15 to 1. As you are aware, these rates are not hypothetical; they are based on actuarial experience.

The sponsors of the October 1 event, the National Concrete Masonry Association and the Expanded Shale, Clay, and Slate Institute are embarking on a national fire safety campaign through a series of public service announcements timed to coincide with National Fire Prevention Week. As their animated character, Tom E. Townhouse, fulfills his potential as the urban Smokey the Bear, we can expect to hear from our constitutents on this issue. As the International Association of Fire Fighters expresses its concern as a town home development is destroyed with firemen unable to fight the fire safely as walls and floors collapse, we will need to explain how it is possible that the buildings met relevant code requirements and were destroyed anyway.

As you are aware, Mr. President, I have long been a proponent of privation of standards. I am a firm believer in the ability of American industry to regulate itself through voluntary standards. The questions that have arisen in this area are troubling, indeed. The building industry needs to understand the significance of this test of its ability to be self-regulating.●

NOBEL LAUREATE FRANCO MODIGLIANI

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, for the 13th time in 17 years, an American has won or shared the Nobel Prize in economics. This year's distinguished recipient is Franco Modigliani, a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The winning of a Nobel Prize by an American is always a welcome occasion, and Professor Modigliani's honor is to be cheered. However, even at this happy time, the good professor sends us a sobering economic message that we ignore at our peril.

This morning's Toronto Globe and Mail carries a story by the Reuters news agency in which Professor Modigliani says that our Federal budget deficits have created:

> A tragedy much greater than I had expected. The longer this lasts, the poorer the future generations will be. The Government deficit is a disastrous policy which is going to be very costly—not to me because I am old, but to you who are very, very young.

Mr. President, our newest Nobel laureate has spoken wisely of the need to cut these ruinous budget deficits. Will he be heeded? I ask that articles about Professor Modigliani's well-deserved award be included in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Toronto Globe & Mail, Oct. 16, 1985]

NOBEL LAUREATE CRITICIZES REAGAN

CAMBRIDGE, MA.—The winner of the 1985 Nobel Prize for Economics criticized President Ronald Reagan's economic policies sharply yesterday and said massive federal budget deficits mean disaster for future generations.

Economist Franco Modigliani, a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, called the U.S. deficit and its impact on the world "a tragedy much greater than I had expected.

"The longer this lasts, the poorer the future generations will be," he told a press conference. "The Government deficit is a disastrous policy which is going to be very costly—not to me because I am old, but to you who are very, very young.

The spry, 67-year-old professor, who was born in Italy and became a U.S. citizen in 1939, leavened his somber remarks with humor, joking and laughing with reporters and obviously enjoying the spotlight.

He was joined at the press conference by economist Paul Samuelson, another MIT professor and Nobel economics laureate. The two drank a champagne toast.

Prof. Modigliani said he was awakened at 7 a.m. yesterday by a telephone call from the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences informing him of his selection by the Nobel Committee. "The best alarm clock I've had in a long time," he said.

He said that in his own household, his wife Serena makes all the major financial decisions.

"Frequently she lets me make my own, and I often wish she had made mine, too," he said.

Prof. Modigliani said he was puzzled that Mr. Reagan originally campaigned for the U.S. presidency on the platform of a balanced budget but, once elected, failed to come to grips with the deficit problem.

He said that, in the interests of a balanced budget, the U.S. Administration could cut military spending and "some fat" from other budget areas. "If there is nothing you can cut, then you must raise taxes," he added.

The Administration "stumbled into" a solution to the recently ended recession by employing Keynesian, rather than supply-side economic policies, he said.

Prof. Modigliani is known for two economic theorems: one concerns individuals' and nations' habits in putting money into savings; the other deals with corporate financing.

Prof. Modigliani is a consultant to the U.S. Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, the Bank of Italy and the Bank of Spain; honorary president of the International Economic Association; and a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 16, 1985]

A PROFESSOR AT M.I.T. WINS NOBEL IN ECONOMICS FOR WORK ON SAVING

(By Steve Lohr)

STOCKHOLM, Oct. 15.—Franco Modigliani, a 67-year-old professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, today won the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Science for his pioneering work in analyzing the behavior of household savers and the functioning of financial markets.

The five-member selection committee drew particular attention to the practical applications of Mr. Modigliani's work. His analysis of savings, they said, has been "extremely important" in determining the effects of different types of national pension programs. Moreover, Mr. Modigliani's work in the area of financial markets, they noted, has helped lay the foundation for the entire field of corporate finance.

13TH AMERICAN TO WIN HONOR

Mr. Modigliani was born in Rome in 1918. He earned a doctorate in law at the University of Rome in 1939. The next year he and his wife moved to the United States to escape the Mussolini regime. Mr. Modigliani added a doctorate in social science at the New School for Social Research in New York City in 1944. He is now an American citizen.

The selection of Mr. Modigliani is the 13th time since the Nobel economics prize was awarded in 1969 that an American has won or shared it. He is also the second M.I.T. economics professor to be chosen; Paul A. Samuelson won the prize in 1970. The prize carries a cash award of 1.8 million Swedish kronor, worth about $225,000.

In his work with financial markets, Mr. Modigliani analyzed the effect of any company's finanical structure on the stock market's view of its value. He and an associate, Merton Miller, concluded that the market value of a company had no genuine relationship to the size and structure of its debt. Instead, they found, stock market values are determined mainly by what enterprises are expected to earn in the future.

Today the notion that investors focus on the future and that profitability is a paramount consideration, with less attention paid to the kind of financing required to achieve high profits, is conventional wisdom in business schools, corporate board rooms and on Wall Street. But that was not the case in 1958, when the Modigliani-Miller findings were presented.

At first, the theory was considered to be somehow mistaken, said Assar Lindbeck, a professor at the University of Stockholm and a member of the Nobel selection committee. As years of accumulating evidence in the marketplace supported the theory, however, it became regarded as self-evident.

"That is the true test of a brilliant theory," Mr. Lindbeck said. "What first is thought to be wrong is later shown to be obvious."

Futhermore, the methods employed by Mr. Modigliani in the late 1950's for determining corporate values are, in refined form, used commonly today in business by everyone from executives plotting long-range strategy to corporate raiders looking for acquisition candidates. A key technique in Mr. Modigliani's 1958 analysis—a technique routinely used today—was figuring the value of expected future earnings.

"His work in the late 50's provided the basis for modern corporate finance," said Karl-Goran Maler, a professor at the Stockholm School of Economics and another member of the selection committee.

Mr. Modigliani's basic research in savings, called the life-cycle theory, was published in 1954. Like his work in financial markets, the savings theory was built on previous research but differed in significant ways. Mr. Modigliani was helped in his savings research by Richard Brumberg, a student of his who died several years later.

The life-cycle theory explains household saving by linking it to individual behavior, economic growth and demography. The theory holds that people save for their retirement—but only for their own old age and not for their descendants.

BUILDING UP WEALTH IN YOUTH

Accordingly, people and societies tend to build up a stock of wealth in youth that is consumed during old age. This helps explain why younger populations with a relatively long life expectancy generally have higher rates of saving than older populations. According to the life-cycle theory, an increase in the rate of economic growth entails a redistribution of income in favor of younger generations.

Mr. Modigliani's life-cycle work amplified research on savings done by the economists John Maynard Keynes, Simon Kuznets and Milton Friedman.

The Modigliani theory that people save only for their own retirement, Professor Lindbeck said, seems to be confirmed by a trend in Sweden. Over the last few decades, Sweden has established a comprehensive pension program financed by the Government. And since the 1960's the household savings rate in Sweden, as a percentage of disposable income, has gone from 7 percent to zero, according to Mr. Lindbeck. When Swedes no longer had to save for their old age, they no longer saved at all.

POLICY LEFT TO GOVERNMENTS

Mr. Modigliani's theory does not deal with the larger question of whether societies are better served if the state taxes individuals and provides them with pensions or if individuals save for their own retirement.

"It is a theory, so it does not tell you what to do," said Ragnar Bentzel, a professor at Sweden's University of Uppsala and a member of the Nobel selection committee. "Policy is up to the governments to decide."

The economics prize was established in 1968 as a memorial to Alfred Nobel, the Swede who invented dynamite, by the Swedish central bank to mark its 300th birthday, and was first awarded the following year.

Mr. Modigliani will receive a diploma and medal, along with the cash award, which is financed by the central bank. The Nobel prizes in physics, chemistry, medicine, literature and peace were established under the terms of Mr. Nobel's will and are financed from his legacy.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 16, 1985]

TRAILBLAZER AND TEAM PLAYER FRANCO MODIGLIANI

(By Eric N. Berg)

The choice of Franco Modigliani as winner of the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Science is a popular one among economists, a tribe often given to highly refined and sometimes vocal dispute. Yesterday congratulatory telephone calls and laudatory telegrams poured in to his office at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

"Economists all over the world are students, admirers and friends of Franco Modigliani," said Paul A. Samuelson of M.I.T., himself a Nobel laureate,

Like previous winners of the award, Professor Modigliani (pronounced "mo-deel-YAH-nee") is considered a consummate academic and an intellectual pathfinder. But unlike some others, whose work was either obscure or accessible only to specialists, his ideas have shaped generations of students.

"If you took finance at business school, if you studied economics, or if you studied corporations in law school, chances are you will have heard of Franco's propositions," said Eugene Flood, professor of finance at the Stanford Business School. He studied in graduate school under Professor Modigliani.

"His instincts are good, and he just throws off ideas," said Robert M. Solow, another economics colleague at M.I.T. "He is also happy to work with students."

Professor Modigliani is part of a small group of economists and finance professors at M.I.T. who together have contributed vital research over the last 20 years. Others in the group include Professor Solow, a specialist in macroeconomics, and Charles P. Kindleberger, a professor emeritus whose expertise is in international economics.

Professors Modigliani and Kindleberger are on the faculty of the Alfred P. Sloan School of Management at M.I.T.

The new Nobel laureate, a small, bouncy man with silver hair, fulfills the popular image of a professor. "His hair is usually in disarray, and his clothes are always out of control," an acquaintance said. "He is forgetful, and his office is stacked with books, articles and journals."

Associates describe Professor Modigliani as a man who quickly grasps complex issues and cuts to their core, pinpointing the assumptions upon which an academic argument is made. Professor Flood tells how, as one of Professor Modigliani's doctoral students in 1980, he visited his office to have a paper critiqued, one that had been submitted earlier to other scholars. "Right off the top of his head, Franco came up with such intricate and interesting and insightful comments," Professor Flood said. "They were a level above what other people had offered."

VIEWPOINT OF COLLEAGUES

For all that, his colleagues describe Professor Modigliani as a team player, someone who shows no hesitation about working in a group or sharing research ideas.

"There is something about him that lowers the feeling of anxiety," commented Robert L. Heilbroner, the economic historian.

Although Professor Modigliani won the 1985 Nobel award alone, his theory that individuals save heavily when their income is highest so as to smooth consumption throughout life was co-authored with a student, Richard Brumberg, who has since died. Similarly, the Modigliani theory on corporate finance, which stated that a company could not affect its market value by altering the percentage of shares or bonds in its balance sheet, was written with Merton Miller of the University of Chicago.

Franco Modigliani (he has no middle name) was born June 18, 1918, in Rome. His father was a physician, and his mother was a volunteer in social service organizations.

As a young man, he was urged to study medicine, but instead he chose law. Entering a nationwide essay contest on the topic of price controls, he won first prize and was urged by the judges to consider a career in economics. He began studying economics on his own.

Mr. Modigliani, a Jew, fled Italy and its Fascist regime at the outset of World War II. Arriving in New York City with his wife, Serena, they settled in an apartment on Central Park West. Two sons were born to them in this country—Andre, now a professor of social psychology at the University of Michigan, and Sergio, an architect in Brookline, Mass.

Soon after arriving here in 1940, Mr. Modigliani enrolled at the New School for Social Research in Manhattan, then a mecca for refugee intellectuals from Europe.

At the New School, he met Jacob Marschak, a leading macroeconomist. He studied under Professor Marschak. To this day, Professor Modigliani calls Professor Marschak one of the most important influences in his intellectual development.

"I recognized him as my most important teacher," Professor Modigliani said in a recent interview for a book on economists.

"We were warm friends, and I loved him very dearly."

It was Professor Marschak, in fact, who got Professor Modigliani his first teaching job after receiving his Ph.D. from the New School. The job was at the New Jersey College for Women.

After one year of teaching there, Professor Modigliani spent three years on the faculty of Bard College of Columbia University.

AT M.I.T. FOR PAST 23 YEARS

He then returned to the New School where he taught six years, spent one year each at the University of Chicago and the University of Illinois and eight years at Carnegie-Mellon University in Pittsburgh.

In 1962 he joined M.I.T. where he has been ever since. He now holds joint appointments to the departments of finance and economics and holds the title of institute professor at M.I.T.

MIT'S MODIGLIANI WINS NOBEL

(By John M. Berry)

Franco Modigliani, an ebullient professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, yesterday was awarded the Nobel Prize in economics for work on how people save and consume over their life-times and on how corporate assets should be valued.

Modigliani is among the most highly respected economists in the United States, both because of the seminal nature of his research and its extraordinarily wide scope. In addition to the work cited by the Nobel Committee, he is well known for his analysis of the role of money in the economy and as one of the creators of the short-term mathematical model used by the Federal Reserve for forecasting and analyzing the economy.

"I'm very, very pleased . . . that my work has been recognized. This is a nice way to crown my career," Modigliani said. "I will use [the prize money] in accordance with my own theories of how people behave—namely, distribute it over the rest of my life. I'm not going to go on a binge. I will use it gradually. That's what my theory says people do."

Modigliani, 67, was born in Rome and became a U.S. citizen in 1946. He still has close ties with Italy, and many of his articles have been written in Italian. Some of his research has focused on the Italian economy as well.

Some other prominent economists praised the Royal Swedish Academy's selection. James Tobin of Yale, one of the dozen American Nobel laureates in economics chosen since the award was begun in 1969, reacted with "jubilation. I am only wondering why it took them so long," Tobin declared.

Tobin described Modigliani as "a very versatile guy" whose work stretches back to the World War II period, when he wrote the first formal theoretical analysis that incorporated monetary factors into the theories of Lord Maynard Keynes on which so much of modern economic analysis has been based.

In the 1950s, Modigliani turned his attention to the issues of saving and consumption because, he said yesterday, "saving plays a very important role in economic life because it is what permits investment and capital formation, which is in turn what is behind growth and well-being.

"I have been studying why people accumulate or don't, and I have a view that is quite different from what used to be believed before," Modigliani said. "It is related to the notion that the major reason why people save is for retirement or for major expenditure."

The so-called life-cycle hypothesis, developed with the assistance of a student, the late Richard Brumberg, holds that individuals accumulate savings primarily in anticipation of retirement needs. Since its publication in 1954, the theory has been used as the theoretical basis for the study of pension and retirement systems the Royal Swedish Academy said.

"In particular, it has proved an ideal tool for analyses of the effects of different pension systems," the academy said, "Most of these analyses have indicated that the introduction of a general pension system leads to a decline in private saving."

The validity of the life-cycle theory has been challenged in recent years by economists such as Lawrence Summers of Harvard, partly on the difficult analytical issue of bequests of wealth not consumed during an individual's lifetime. Nevertheless, said Tobin, Modigliani's theoretical and empirical work on the subject has served as a point of departure for a great deal of additional research. "There has been a lot of discussion, but Franco is coming out pretty well," Tobin said.

Modigliani's other work for which he was honored was published in 1958 with Merton Miller of the University of Chicago. Together they provided what is known as the Modigliani-Miller theorem, which states that the value of a corporation is not dependent on the relative amounts of debt and equity used to finance it. Instead, it is the value of the underlying assets themselves, as shown by the market value of the company's shares.

Prior to that work, "people had used crude measures" that produced erroneous results in looking at how corporate assets should be valued, said Allan H. Meltzer of Carnegie-Mellon University, where Modigliani was teaching when the theorem's proof was published. Meltzer called the theorem "one of two main forces in the modern theory of finance," at least from the point of view of economics. The work in asset-price theory for which Tobin received his prize is the other, Meltzer said.

Modigliani's work "explains what we see and helps us understand the world," Prof. Assar Lindbeck, a member of the prize committee, said after the award was announced.

The Modigliani-Miller theorem has had important implications for the theory of investment decisions, the academy said, and represents "a decisive breakthrough for the theory of corporate finance."

The announcement marked the 13th time in 17 years that an American has won or shared the prize, known as the Alfred Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics. It was established in 1969 by Sweden's central bank, the Riksbank. The other Nobel prizes were begun in 1895 under terms of the will of Nobel, the inventor of dynamite.

Among the other American winners was Milton Friedman, widely known for his work linking changes in the money supply to changes in the economy. Friedman was honored for his "permanent-income" hypothesis, which holds that consumption in an economy does not respond completely to short-term fluctuations in income. In many ways, Friedman's permanent-in-come hypothesis represents a sort of averaging across an entire economy of the individual life-cycle behavior described by Modigliani.

Modigliani was born in Rome in 1918. He received a doctorate in jurisprudence from the University of Rome in 1939 and a doctorate in social science from the New School for Social Research in New York in 1944, and holds a half-dozen honorary degrees. He came to the United States in 1939 with his wife after fleeing the fascist regime of Benito Mussolini.

All the awards, including the memorial economics prize, carry a cash award this year set at 1.8 million Swedish kronor, about $225,000. It currently is tax free, but the Reagan administration's tax reform plan would make such awards taxable beginning next year.●

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

RECESS UNTIL 8 A.M.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, having conferred with the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that once the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 8 a.m. on Thursday, October 17, 1985.

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

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SIMPSON. Following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond 8:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for not more than 5 minutes each.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE AND RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN SENATORS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, at 8:30 a.m., it will be the intention of the majority leader to turn to the consideration of H.R. 3038, the HUD appropriations bill.

I further ask unanimous consent that at 12:30 p.m., there be special orders in favor of the following Senators for not to exceed 15 minutes each: WALLOP, QUAYLE, HATCH, and HELMS.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. SIMPSON. Then, at 1:30 p.m., the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 3038, the HUD appropriations bill, and also at some point during the afternoon the Senate will turn to S. 1730, the reconciliation measure. Votes will occur throughout the day on Thursday. However, no votes will occur prior to 11 a.m.

Mr. President, we are most appreciative of the fine skill with which the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. COCHRAN—the Cardinals must have done something in the top of the ninth. Well, truly there is joy in Mudville somewhere.

But I do commend the Senator from Mississippi for his excellent progress with the agriculture issue. He does a

very capable job and he is very skilled. He has produced another fine result, and we appreciate that very much. He is a very capable legislator.

RECESS UNTIL 8 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, there being no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 8 a.m. on Thursday, October 17, 1985.

The motion was agreed to, and at 6:32 p.m., the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Thursday, October 17, 1985, at 8 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 16, 1985:

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

James Curtis Mack II, of California, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, vice Anthony J. Calio.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in their active duty grades, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 531, 532, 533:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Charbonnel, Thomas, [redacted]
Pearl, William R., [redacted]

To be lieutenant colonel

Humm, Gayle, [redacted]

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Sutton, Stanley D., [redacted]

To be majors

Adams, James L., [redacted]
Aiken, Anthony C., [redacted]
Allen, Joseph T., [redacted]
Artz, Lyle R., [redacted]
Beaty, Edward T., [redacted]
Beck, William G., [redacted]
Blatterman, Alan L., [redacted]
Bratt, Gary M., [redacted]
Brencick, Matthew E., [redacted]
Brooks, James H., [redacted]
Brown, James E., [redacted]
Burns, Patrick, H., [redacted]
Buryk, Ronald H., [redacted]
Byrne, Clyde D., [redacted]
Calderon, Oscar, [redacted]
Calvert, John W., [redacted]
Case, Larry M., [redacted]
Cohen, Stephen R., [redacted]
Coleman, Michael E., [redacted]
Cotton, Jerry, [redacted]
Crago, Michael G., [redacted]
Crandell, Edward D., [redacted]
Critz, Walter J., [redacted]
Czekala, Daniel S., [redacted]
Davis, Charles H., [redacted]
Davis, James S., [redacted]
Deffer, Melinda E., [redacted]
Drifmeyer, Jeffrey, [redacted]
Druss, Raymond A., [redacted]
Duda, Frances C., [redacted]
Dunston, Samuel G., [redacted]
Eaton, Donald G., [redacted]
Edwards, Charles M., [redacted]
Edres Michael A., [redacted]
Fancher, Ronald D., [redacted]
Foxhall, Roger W., [redacted]
Galarza, Jose G., [redacted]
Geiger, Victor S., [redacted]
Giesige, Samuel M., [redacted]
Glaudel, Robert J., [redacted]
Goeders, Peter A., [redacted]
Goddard, Richard L., [redacted]
Hammel, George E., [redacted]
Hately, William W., [redacted]
Hatten, John A., [redacted]
Henderson, Doris H., [redacted]
Jimmerson, Vernon R., [redacted]
Jones, Richard O., [redacted]
Howes, John K., [redacted]
Jackson, Marjorie A., [redacted]
Kagawa, Gary K., [redacted]
Kennedy, Gordon T., [redacted]
Kennedy, Susan M., [redacted]
Kissane, Jonathan M., [redacted]
Kitsopoulos, John G., [redacted]
Kohler, James C., [redacted]
Kussman, Richard L., [redacted]
Lacy Edward L., [redacted]
Langlois, James M., [redacted]
Lantis, James R., [redacted]
Makarsky, Joseph G., [redacted]
Matthews, Larry W., [redacted]
Masi, George V., [redacted]
McIntosh, Harold B., [redacted]
McNabb, Ronald L., [redacted]
Menard, Dennis L., [redacted]
Miller, David D., [redacted]
Mueller, Michael W., [redacted]
Nathanson, Jon E., [redacted]
Nichols, William M., [redacted]
O'Keefe, Hugh J., [redacted]
Parry, Richard A., [redacted]
Patterson, Virgil J., [redacted]
Pelton, Douglas A., [redacted]
Perez, Reynaldo M., [redacted]
Platoff, Gennady E., [redacted]
Prentiss, James T., [redacted]
Quebbeman, Harry J., [redacted]
Quick, Roy D., [redacted]
Uinlan, Sherman L., [redacted]
Quinn, Mark A., [redacted]
Remund, Daniel D., [redacted]
Reznik, Richard T., [redacted]
Rinehart, Douglas S., [redacted]
Robbins, Orville C., [redacted]
Roberson, Kelley C., [redacted]
Robertson, John T., [redacted]
Shin, Sung H., [redacted]
Wilson, Edward B., [redacted]
Wolf, Perry L., [redacted]
Wyssling, Philip W., [redacted]

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Serpeingold, Brooke, [redacted]

To be majors

Ackerman, Steven C., [redacted]
Aubin, Brian A., [redacted]
Berry, David G., [redacted]
Blankemeier, William, [redacted]
Bonnie, Don W., [redacted]
Brown, Judson S., [redacted]
Carnahan, Michael L., [redacted]
Chartoff, Betty J., [redacted]
Clapper, Wayne E., [redacted]
Conder, Kathryn M., [redacted]
Connors, Erlinda D., [redacted]
Dobbins, Darrell G., [redacted]
Farkas, Rene M., [redacted]
Galeas, Brenda L., [redacted]
Garver, Jenny B., [redacted]
George, Linda, [redacted]
George, Pam I., [redacted]
Goldberg, Cynthia A., [redacted]
Griffith, Raymond W., [redacted]
Hartz, Kenneth I., [redacted]
Hass, Jeanette S., [redacted]
Hernandez, Henry, [redacted]
Higgins, Catherine, [redacted]
Hill, Glenda, [redacted]
Hines, Joseph F., [redacted]
Hinson, Kathleen M., [redacted]
Hooper, Susan J., [redacted]
Housing, Therese M., [redacted]
Jackson, Barbara A., [redacted]
Jones, Vicki L., [redacted]
Kochansky, Christeen, [redacted]
Long, Ray E., [redacted]
Lund, Monica M., [redacted]
Machman, Marian J., [redacted]
Maroun, Cynthia A., [redacted]
Martin, Susan J., [redacted]
Mason, Teresa A., [redacted]
McAnnany, Doyle J., [redacted]
Nhambure, Linda A., [redacted]
Nichols, Debra J., [redacted]
Oxley-Yedo, Linda C., [redacted]
Parham, James W., [redacted]
Pfander, Nancy A., [redacted]
Przykucki, Jean M., [redacted]
Reynolds, Paula J., [redacted]
Riley, Christina E., [redacted]
Robb, Renee V., [redacted]
Robinson, Gale E., [redacted]
Scott, Timothy J., [redacted]
Sherer, Stephen I., [redacted]
Snow, Debra A., [redacted]
Swan, Wendy S., [redacted]
Talentino, Carolyn, [redacted]
Taylor, Andrea C., [redacted]
Valdez, Jesse S., [redacted]
Wagner, Francis M., [redacted]
Waltman, Josephine, [redacted]
Weir, Patricia J., [redacted]
Wilber, Jennifer T., [redacted]

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be colonels

Hartwick, Ann M., [redacted]
Garfield, Mary M., [redacted]

To be majors

Berg, Brigitte T., [redacted]
Bush, Kenneth W., [redacted]
Coffin, Jane T., [redacted]
Dettori, Joseph R., [redacted]
Gutierrez, Rosendo, [redacted]
Rapoza, Carolyn P., [redacted]
Rossi, Norren M., [redacted]
Thornton, Mary I., [redacted]
Westphal, Kathleen, [redacted]

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Bronstein, Alan, [redacted]
Cole, Thomas R., [redacted]
Porter, William, [redacted]
Stanton, Steven, [redacted]
Swistak, Gary P., [redacted]

To be captain

Sandifer, Alan D., [redacted]

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for permanent promotion in the U.S. Army in accordance with the appropriate provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

Aadland, Anders B., [redacted]
Abraham, George, Jr., [redacted]
Acker, Richard B., [redacted]
Adams, Stephen F., [redacted]
Addy, William M., [redacted]
Ahern, James P., [redacted]
Ahern, Michael F., [redacted]
Albright, Earl R., Jr., [redacted]
Aldrich, Thomas H., [redacted]
Aldrich, William F., [redacted]
Aldridge, A.D., Jr., [redacted]
Aldridge, George W., [redacted]
Alexander, Billie J., [redacted]
Allard, Carl K., Jr., [redacted]

Allen, Thomas J., [redacted]
Allen, William W., [redacted]
Allin, George R., III, [redacted]
Allman, James W., Jr., [redacted]
Ambrose, Walter J., Jr., [redacted]
Amigh, John R., [redacted]
Ancker, Clinton J., III, [redacted]
Anderson, Israel P., [redacted]
Anderson, John L., [redacted]
Anderson, William F., III, [redacted]
Angerman, William C., [redacted]
Anton, William T., [redacted]
Appling, Alvin R., [redacted]
Armeli, Thomas F., [redacted]
Arment, Raymond F., III, [redacted]
Armour, Arthur A., [redacted]
Armstrong, William, Jr., [redacted]
Armstrong, William S., [redacted]
Arnold, Archibald, V., III, [redacted]
Artis, Walter W., [redacted]
Ashhurst, Kenneth R., [redacted]
Askew, Alphonso R., [redacted]
Atchison, Joseph S., [redacted]
Austin, James J., Jr., [redacted]
Austin, Joe N., Jr., [redacted]
Aykroyd, Douglas S., [redacted]
Babcock, Robert T., [redacted]
Babicke, Robert G., Jr., [redacted]
Bach, Bruce F., [redacted]
Backman, Rodney J., [redacted]
Baddeley, Clayton E., [redacted]
Baer, John R., [redacted]
Baggott, Robert G., [redacted]
Bailey, Charlton G., Jr., [redacted]
Bailey, Steven S., [redacted]
Bailey, Tommy F., [redacted]
Baker, Charles E., [redacted]
Baker, David C., [redacted]
Baker, Donald C., Jr., [redacted]
Baker, Leonard M., [redacted]
Baker, William V., Jr., [redacted]
Balkus, William G., [redacted]
Ball, Calvin E., [redacted]
Baltimore, Perry F., II, [redacted]
Banis, Felix G. II, [redacted]
Bankirer, Harold, [redacted]
Barb, Paul F., Jr., [redacted]
Baribeau, Stephen R., [redacted]
Barker, Billy R., Jr., [redacted]
Barlow, Kenneth A., [redacted]
Barnes, Dave E., [redacted]
Barnes, John J., Jr., [redacted]
Barnes, John W., Jr., [redacted]
Barth, Wayne M., [redacted]
Barton, Stephen P., [redacted]
Batchelor, Hardy E., Jr., [redacted]
Bates, Barry D., [redacted]
Bates, Michael R., [redacted]
Batizy, Botond G., [redacted]
Baugh, Milton, III, [redacted]
Bauman, Robert A., [redacted]
Bays, Eddie L., [redacted]
Beahm, Richard S., [redacted]
Beard, Lawrence D., [redacted]
Beaver, Charles S., Jr., [redacted]
Beckmann, Ellen C., [redacted]
Beck, Ronald G., [redacted]
Beebe, Richard A., [redacted]
Behrens, William A., [redacted]
Belich, William A., Jr., [redacted]
Bell, Donald W., [redacted]
Bell, Kenneth V., Jr., [redacted]
Bell, Stephen P., [redacted]
Bennett, Bernard T., [redacted]
Bennett, Clifford, [redacted]
Bennett, William C., [redacted]
Benoit, Michael L., [redacted]
Benway, Kenneth J., [redacted]
Berdy, Andrew R., [redacted]
Berger, Floyd K., [redacted]
Berger, Fred M., [redacted]
Berns, David G., [redacted]
Berriman, Howard J., [redacted]
Berry, Kenneth S., [redacted]
Beto, Mark D., [redacted]
Betts, Ronnie W., [redacted]
Bighia, Michael E., [redacted]
Binkley, John E., III, [redacted]
Bird, James R., [redacted]
Bird, John S., Jr., [redacted]
Bishop, William G., [redacted]
Blagg, Clyde S., [redacted]
Blevins, Russell R., [redacted]
Blische, Charles L., Jr., [redacted]
Block, James L., [redacted]
Bodkin, Richard A., [redacted]
Boehman, Robert J., [redacted]
Boehm, William W., [redacted]
Boessen, Joseph F., [redacted]
Boggs, Ronald H., [redacted]
Bohlen, Paul N., [redacted]
Bohn, William H., [redacted]
Boies, Michael A., [redacted]
Boles, John K., III, [redacted]
Bollen, Lawrence A., Jr., [redacted]
Bolton, John S., [redacted]
Bonn, John H., [redacted]
Booth, John L., [redacted]
Booth, Lance E., III, [redacted]
Borel, John E., [redacted]
Boren, James R., Jr., [redacted]
Bosley, James M., [redacted]
Bossi, Harry D., II, [redacted]
Boston, James D., III, [redacted]
Bourque, Michael B., [redacted]
Boutelle, Steven W., [redacted]
Bowen, Joseph C., [redacted]
Bowers, Leland C., [redacted]
Bowra, Kenneth R., [redacted]
Boyd, David G., [redacted]
Boyd, Lawrence D., [redacted]
Boykin, Ronald R., [redacted]
Boyle, Vincent A., [redacted]
Bradley, John P., [redacted]
Bradshaw, Arthur L., Jr., [redacted]
Branch, William R., [redacted]
Brandt, Drew M., [redacted]
Braymiller, Charles J., [redacted]
Bray, Robert M., [redacted]
Brecher, Harold J., [redacted]
Breier, John A., [redacted]
Brink, James E., [redacted]
Brink, Thomas L., [redacted]
Broadwater, Colby M., I., [redacted]
Brocious, Albert P., [redacted]
Brock, Terrence A., [redacted]
Broderick, Clifton J., [redacted]
Brokenburr, Jesse L., [redacted]
Brou, Phillip E., Jr., [redacted]
Brouillette, Douglas S., [redacted]
Broussard, Glenn, J., [redacted]
Brower, David L., [redacted]
Brower, Robert K., [redacted]
Browers, Richard L., [redacted]
Brown, Beverly C., [redacted]
Brown, Bryan D., [redacted]
Brown, Chris E., [redacted]
Brown, Clarence R., [redacted]
Brown, Douglas B., [redacted]
Brown, Douglas K., [redacted]
Brown, Dougals M., [redacted]
Brown, Eber E., Jr., [redacted]
Brown, James E., Jr., [redacted]
Brown, Richard L., [redacted]
Brown, Robert H., [redacted]
Brown, Tommie C., [redacted]
Brown, William D., [redacted]
Bruce, Samuel B., [redacted]
Bruce, William A., [redacted]
Brueckman, James A., [redacted]
Brunk, Rodney L., [redacted]
Bruse, Herbert W., [redacted]
Bryant, Albert E., [redacted]
Bryant, Calvin Jr., [redacted]
Bryant, George T., [redacted]
Bryant, James K., [redacted]
Bryant, John M., Jr., [redacted]
Bryant, Robert V., [redacted]
Bryson, Ralph J., [redacted]
Buechele, Leroy J., Jr., [redacted]
Buehler, Ricahrd T., [redacted]
Bugert, Judith R., [redacted]
Bulisco, Gerald L., [redacted]
Bungard, Albert G., [redacted]
Bunyea, Walter L., [redacted]
Burch, John C., [redacted]
Burckard, Albert P., Jr., [redacted]
Burke, William M., Jr., [redacted]
Burkett, Frederick J., [redacted]
Burns, John J., Jr., [redacted]
Burns, Michael A., [redacted]
Burrows, Gary D., [redacted]
Burton, Richard E., [redacted]
Burton, Ronald P., [redacted]
Busch, Conrad H., Jr., [redacted]
Bush, James D., [redacted]
Bush, James D., [redacted]
Butler, William O., III, [redacted]
Cachero, Francisco, S., Jr., [redacted]
Cain, Thomas J., [redacted]
Calame, Peter L., [redacted]
Calhoun, Charles B., [redacted]
Calhoun, John P., [redacted]
Callen, Jan E., [redacted]
Calnan, Michael B., [redacted]
Calvert, Ronald M., [redacted]
Campbell, Brian C., [redacted]
Campbell, Bryan D., [redacted]
Campbell, Charles C., [redacted]
Campbell, Charles J., [redacted]
Campbell, David L., [redacted]
Campbell, James O., Jr., [redacted]
Campbell, Phillip T., [redacted]
Campen, Timothy A., [redacted]
Canada, Arnold J., [redacted]
Candler, David M., [redacted]
Cannaday, Gerald D., Jr., [redacted]
Cantey, Samuel E., Jr., [redacted]
Cantrell, Alvin D., [redacted]
Capestany, Pedro L., [redacted]
Capka, Joseph R., [redacted]
Capouya, David M., [redacted]
Caprio, John A., [redacted]
Captain, George J.V., [redacted]
Cardin, Robert L., [redacted]
Carlos, Benjamin A., [redacted]
Carlson, Edwin T., [redacted]
Carlson, Steven H., [redacted]
Carmichael, Clifford, [redacted]
Carmichael, Paul D., [redacted]
Carrithers, David A., [redacted]
Carroll, Richard L., [redacted]
Carr, David M., [redacted]
Carr, Terry R., [redacted]
Carson, Concetta L.S., [redacted]
Carson, John C., Jr., [redacted]
Carson, John L., Jr., [redacted]
Cartagena, Luis A., [redacted]
Carter, Jack W., Jr., [redacted]
Carter, James H., [redacted]
Carter, James R., [redacted]
Cary, Richard D., [redacted]
Castillo, Oscar G., [redacted]
Castle, Richard G., [redacted]
Castonguay, John F., [redacted]
Cavanaugh, John P., [redacted]
Cereghino, Larry M., [redacted]
Chambers, Jackson E., [redacted]
Chancellor, Charles D., III, [redacted]
Chapman, Raymond M., Jr., [redacted]
Charest, Geoffrey B., [redacted]
Charland, John J., [redacted]
Charlton, Donald G., [redacted]
Chase, Donald T., Jr., [redacted]
Chitty, Daniel R., [redacted]
Chopin, Theodore G., Jr., [redacted]
Christ, Patrick J., [redacted]
Christ, Stephen, [redacted]
Chrzanowski, Stanley R., [redacted]
Churchill, Ralph B., [redacted]
Church, Michael V., [redacted]
Ciccarello, Nicholas J., [redacted]

Clapp, Edwin L., [redacted]
Clark, Harry J., [redacted]
Clowery, Stephen M., [redacted]
Clow, Kenneth H., [redacted]
Coates, Byron C., [redacted]
Cobb, Henry C., Jr., [redacted]
Cochran, Ronald R., [redacted]
Cofer, Charles R., Jr., [redacted]
Coffey, William T., [redacted]
Cogswell, Charles H., [redacted]
Colacicco, John H., [redacted]
Coleman, William D., Jr., [redacted]
Colkett, David S., [redacted]
Collignon, Larry J., [redacted]
Collins, Joseph J., [redacted]
Collins, William P., [redacted]
Colliver, Keith W., [redacted]
Colon, Raul, [redacted]
Comeaux, Ronald W., [redacted]
Comstock, Norman G., [redacted]
Conard, Frederick W., II, [redacted]
Conboy, Gary J., [redacted]
Connelly, Donald B., [redacted]
Connolly, William F., [redacted]
Connor, Lee O., [redacted]
Conte, Robert D., [redacted]
Conway, Robert J., [redacted]
Coodey, Donald J., [redacted]
Cook, Gregory L., [redacted]
Cook, Robert W., Jr., [redacted]
Cook, Stephen K., [redacted]
Cook, Weston F., Jr., [redacted]
Copeland, Wesley B., [redacted]
Corathers, Michael G., [redacted]
Corbett, John W., [redacted]
Cordero, Virgil N., III, [redacted]
Corker, Harold T., [redacted]
Corley, Michael A., [redacted]
Corliss, Robert J., [redacted]
Corneil, Terry C., [redacted]
Cornwell, Mark E., [redacted]
Correia, James R., Jr., [redacted]
Costello, Thomas M., [redacted]
Cover, Winston A.L., [redacted]
Cowardin, Clinton L., [redacted]
Cowden, Sammy J., [redacted]
Cowley, David E., [redacted]
Cox, Charles S., [redacted]
Cox, James A., [redacted]
Cox, Loring B., Jr., [redacted]
Cox, Randall L., [redacted]
Craig, Jay A., [redacted]
Crampton, Richard W., [redacted]
Craven, James M., [redacted]
Crawford, Brian E., [redacted]
Crawford, Douglas M., [redacted]
Crawford, Hunt D., Jr., [redacted]
Crawford, James W., Jr., [redacted]
Crawford, Steven L., [redacted]
Crawford, William B., [redacted]
Creech, Johnny A. [redacted]
Crighton, Gordon C., [redacted]
Cripps, Dennis L., [redacted]
Crockett, Justin D., [redacted]
Crosbie, Philip A., [redacted]
Crossfield, Ermal J., [redacted]
Crouch, Sammy E., [redacted]
Crowe, Dennis W., [redacted]
Crow, Charles L., [redacted]
Crumling, Harry W., Jr., [redacted]
Crutchley, Robert E., Jr., [redacted]
Cummings, Daniel N., [redacted]
Cummings, Donald L., [redacted]
Curasi, Richard M., [redacted]
Curl, Louis J., III, [redacted]
Curley, James E., [redacted]
Curtin, Lawrence M., [redacted]
Curtis, Barbara G., [redacted]
Curtis, Phillip L., [redacted]
Cushing, Frank N. [redacted]
Cutting, John D., [redacted]
Czech, Norbert E., [redacted]
Danish, Clement, Jr., [redacted]
Daugherty, Stephen, [redacted]
Davenport, Clifford Jr., [redacted]
Davis, Benjamin M., III., [redacted]
Davis, Brian C., [redacted]
Davis, Claiborne W., [redacted]
Davis, Gregory M. P., [redacted]
Davis, Paul R., [redacted]
Davis, Richard S., [redacted]
Davis, William A., [redacted]
Day, Daniel D., [redacted]
Day, William S., [redacted]
Dayton, Keith W., [redacted]
Deaver, Ronald Eugene, [redacted]
Delagarza, Agapito, Jr., [redacted]
Delaney, Richard P., [redacted]
Deluca, Thomas A., [redacted]
Demaria, Matthew A., [redacted]
Demby, Joe H. V., [redacted]
Demers, Robert P., [redacted]
Denbeste, Edwin J., [redacted]
Dent, James H., [redacted]
Desannoy, David A., Jr., [redacted]
Devera, Emmanuel V., [redacted]
Devlin, Daniel D., [redacted]
Devoti, David F., [redacted]
Dey, Harold A., [redacted]
Dickenson, Charles R., [redacted]
Didonato, Louis M., [redacted]
Dieffenbach, James A., [redacted]
Dinsmore, David R., [redacted]
Ditoro, Peter, Jr. [redacted]
Dixon, Paul J., [redacted]
Dixon, Thomas W., Jr., [redacted]
Dizon, Robert O., [redacted]
Doesburg, John C., [redacted]
Domeck, Robert C., [redacted]
Donald, James E., [redacted]
Donaldson, Jeffrey M., [redacted]
Donnellon, John S. [redacted]
Dopita, Alois, [redacted]
Dopson, Hugh P., [redacted]
Dormeyer, Michael J., [redacted]
Doucette, Kenneth A., [redacted]
Downes, Robert E., [redacted]
Doyle, George L., [redacted]
Dragoo, Lynn F., [redacted]
Draughon, James E., [redacted]
Dregne, James M., [redacted]
Drickey, Michael L., [redacted]
Drinkwater, John P., [redacted]
Driscoll, Robert F., [redacted]
Dubik, James M., [redacted]
Duet, Louis J., Jr., [redacted]
Duncan, Neil R., [redacted]
Duncan, Norman L., [redacted]
Dundas, John W., [redacted]
Dunegan, Michael W., [redacted]
Durham, William L., [redacted]
Duvall, Douglas W., [redacted]
Dyson, Gregory W., [redacted]
East, Paul B., [redacted]
Ebbinga, Clarence T., [redacted]
Echols, William T., [redacted]
Eckles, George P., [redacted]
Eckrich, Gilbert H., [redacted]
Ecks, Forrest W., Jr., [redacted]
Edmondson, Earl R., Jr., [redacted]
Edwards, Marion E., Jr., [redacted]
Edwards, Roy L., [redacted]
Edwards, Steven R., [redacted]
Eisman, Robert S., [redacted]
Ekman, William J., [redacted]
Elder, William J., [redacted]
Elley, Ben L., [redacted]
Elliott, Alfred H., III, [redacted]
Elliott, David C., Jr., [redacted]
Ellis, Glynn T., Jr., [redacted]
Ellis, Van S., [redacted]
Elton, Gordon C., [redacted]
Emanuele, Andrew R., [redacted]
Emerson, Michael F., [redacted]
Emory, Derald E., [redacted]
Enfiejian, Terry E., [redacted]
Engel, Richard A. [redacted]
Engram, Bartlett J., Jr., [redacted]
Engstrom, Charles L., [redacted]
Ennis, Charles W., Jr., [redacted]
Enyart, John D., [redacted]
Erale, Ronald D., [redacted]
Erickson, Karl J., [redacted]
Erkie, Norman R., [redacted]
Etchechury, James, [redacted]
Etsell, Stephen C. [redacted]
Eubanks, Rayford M., [redacted]
Evans, Clyde L., [redacted]
Evans, Joseph W. [redacted]
Evans, Lloyd A. [redacted]
Evans, Richard A. [redacted]
Evans, Stanley L., [redacted]
Fackner, William P., Jr., [redacted]
Fagan, James F., [redacted]
Faint, Donald R., [redacted]
Fardink, Paul J., [redacted]
Faulkner, Ronald W., [redacted]
Faure, Charles W., [redacted]
Faver, Patrick L., [redacted]
Fedak, Louis C., [redacted]
Felling, Richard L., [redacted]
Fender, Keith M., [redacted]
Feneis, Ralph W., [redacted]
Fenty, Alan D., [redacted]
Ferguson, Grady J., [redacted]
Ferrell, David S., [redacted]
Fetig, James L., [redacted]
Fetterolf, Charles F., III, [redacted]
Feuge, Larry E., [redacted]
Feyk, William C., [redacted]
Fielden, Terry S. [redacted]
Filbey, Robert C. [redacted]
Finnicum, William R., [redacted]
Firebaugh, John M., [redacted]
Firster, Lawrence D., [redacted]
Firth, John E., [redacted]
Fisher, Jerry W. [redacted]
Fitzpatrick, James T., Jr., [redacted]
Fletcher, David D., [redacted]
Fleumer, Matthew H., [redacted]
Floyd, Arthur L. [redacted]
Fluharty, Richard D., Jr., [redacted]
Foley, David W., [redacted]
Foster, Steven C., [redacted]
Foster, Thomas L., [redacted]
Fox, Theodore C., III, [redacted]
Foye, John D., [redacted]
Francis, Webster E., Jr., [redacted]
Franco, Jess J., Jr., [redacted]
Franklin, George L., [redacted]
Fraser, James E., [redacted]
Frayne, William L., [redacted]
Frazier, Richard T., [redacted]
Fredericks, Steven C., [redacted]
Freedman, Gary M., [redacted]
Freeman, David Z., [redacted]
Freeman, John E., [redacted]
Freeman, Richard L., [redacted]
Freund, John W. [redacted]
Frey, Terry C., [redacted]
Friedrich, Andreas L., [redacted]
Graffin, Donald T., [redacted]
Gafford, William R., [redacted]
Gagan, Patrick J., [redacted]
Gaither, Larry W., [redacted]
Gallenbeck, Curtis E., [redacted]
Grandy, Gregory K., [redacted]
Ganz, Gerald F., [redacted]
Garbis, Dennis J., [redacted]
Garcia, Albert B., [redacted]
Gard, Paul T., III, [redacted]
Gardner, Jerry W., [redacted]
Garfield Jefferson, James, [redacted]
Garity, Rudolph E., [redacted]
Garman, Robert L., [redacted]
Garnett, Thomas E., [redacted]
Garrett, Earl T., [redacted]
Garrett, Sol M., III, [redacted]
Garrett, Stephen F., [redacted]
Garwood, Paul A., [redacted]
Gatanas, Harry D., [redacted]
Gatlin, Robert B., [redacted]

Gatti, John S., [redacted]
Gaultney, Emory H., [redacted]
Gault, Jeffrey W., [redacted]
Gautreaux, Colbert T., [redacted]
Gavin, Frank C., [redacted]
Gaylord, Robert E., [redacted]
Gehrki, Frank J., III, [redacted]
Gehr, George W., [redacted]
Gentile, Michael E., [redacted]
Gentry, Thomas W., [redacted]
Gerard, Thomas A., [redacted]
Gerber, Marion D., [redacted]
Gesell, Robert A., [redacted]
Gibbs, Harold N., [redacted]
Gibb, Harry B., [redacted]
Gibson, Elizabeth L., [redacted]
Gibson, Grover L., [redacted]
Gibson, Lee P., Jr., [redacted]
Gillio, Benjamin P., [redacted]
Giordano, Stephen, [redacted]
Girlando, Joseph G., Jr., [redacted]
Glann, George W., Jr., [redacted]
Glasier, John A., [redacted]
Glenn, Thomas A., [redacted]
Gliatta, Leonard, [redacted]
Glick, James R., [redacted]
Glicoes, Laurence A., [redacted]
Gloukhoff, Theodore, [redacted]
Godfrey, Linda K.C., [redacted]
Gonski, Anthony F., [redacted]
Goodier, Kerry M., [redacted]
Goodman, Gil M., [redacted]
Goodwin, Lewis P., III, [redacted]
Goodyear, Richard L., [redacted]
Gookins, Michael R., [redacted]
Gorecki, Michael E., [redacted]
Gore, Edward H., Jr., [redacted]
Gorley, Richard L.J., [redacted]
Gortney, Roy C., [redacted]
Gossard, Marion J., [redacted]
Gottardi, Larry D., [redacted]
Govoni, Richard A., [redacted]
Grable, Bruce W., [redacted]
Grabowski, Michael K., [redacted]
Grace, John P., [redacted]
Graf, William J., [redacted]
Grammer, Allen K., [redacted]
Grange, David L., [redacted]
Grant, Kenneth E., [redacted]
Gray, Gary O., [redacted]
Greenawald, William E., [redacted]
Greenwalt, John M., [redacted]
Gregory, Frank B., [redacted]
Gresham, Larry D., [redacted]
Grieco, Ralph N., [redacted]
Griese, Dwayne L., [redacted]
Griffard, Mark E., [redacted]
Griffin, Benjamin S., [redacted]
Griffin, Gary B., [redacted]
Griffith, Randall F., [redacted]
Groom, Charles H., [redacted]
Grossman, Charles D., Jr., [redacted]
Grubb, Ronald A., [redacted]
Grugin, James C., Jr., [redacted]
Grunden, John B., [redacted]
Gund, Walter D., [redacted]
Gunlicks, James B., [redacted]
Gutbrod, Kenneth W., [redacted]
Guthrie, Michael C., [redacted]
Hack, Stephen E., [redacted]
Hagemeister, Charles C., [redacted]
Hagenbeck, Franklin L., [redacted]
Haislip, William A., Jr., [redacted]
Halbrook, Craig L., [redacted]
Hall, Donald E., [redacted]
Hall, Finley, L., [redacted]
Hall, Gregory V., [redacted]
Hall, Richard W., [redacted]
Hallock, Scott A., [redacted]
Hallstrom, Gregory A., [redacted]
Halstrom, James G., [redacted]
Hamilton, Don B., [redacted]
Hammell, John M., [redacted]
Hand, William L., [redacted]
Hand, William M., [redacted]
Handley, Phillip W., [redacted]
Hanks, Marvin L., [redacted]
Hanna, Leeroy P., Jr., [redacted]
Hansen, Paul A., [redacted]
Hansen, Randolph M., [redacted]
Harback, Herbert F., [redacted]
Hargadine, Rex A., [redacted]
Harper, Joseph N., Jr., [redacted]
Harper, Robert L., [redacted]
Harris, James R., [redacted]
Harris, Robert L., Jr., [redacted]
Harris, Samuel E., [redacted]
Harris, Wayne C., [redacted]
Harrison, Harold H., Jr., [redacted]
Harshman, Max M., [redacted]
Hartmann, John J., Jr., [redacted]
Hartman, Joseph B., [redacted]
Hartz, Daniel K., [redacted]
Harvey, Ben, III, [redacted]
Harvey, Thomas N., [redacted]
Hashimoto, Ted W., [redacted]
Hasse, John J., [redacted]
Hawkins, James M., [redacted]
Hayes, Arthur J., [redacted]
Hayes, Glenn M., Jr., [redacted]
Hayes, James P., [redacted]
Hayford, Richard M., [redacted]
Haylett, Frank W., [redacted]
Hayne, John A., Jr., [redacted]
Head, John B., [redacted]
Heaney, Michael F., [redacted]
Hearn, Charles C., [redacted]
Heckman, Glenn W., [redacted]
Hedick, James M., III, [redacted]
Heller, Sander H., [redacted]
Helms, Richard O., [redacted]
Helm, Flash G., [redacted]
Helsing, Roy M., [redacted]
Henderson, George F., Jr., [redacted]
Henderson, James W., [redacted]
Hendley, Albert J., III, [redacted]
Henk, Daniel W., [redacted]
Henly, Larry L., [redacted]
Henn, Joseph E., [redacted]
Herbaugh, Marvin O., Jr., [redacted]
Herbert, John C., [redacted]
Hermes, Anthony C., [redacted]
Herres, Fred W., III, [redacted]
Herring, John O., [redacted]
Herron, Robert B., [redacted]
Hesselgesser, Gary R., [redacted]
Hesson, John E., [redacted]
Hethcoat, George L., [redacted]
Hethcox, Richard E., [redacted]
Hibbs, Jack A., [redacted]
Hicks, Kenneth D., [redacted]
Hildebrandt, Siegfried, II, [redacted]
Hilderbrand, Terry N., [redacted]
Hill, Dorsey O., [redacted]
Hill, Jerry O., [redacted]
Hill, Mark W., [redacted]
Hill, Terry C., [redacted]
Hilliard, Robert E., [redacted]
Hinds, Fredric C., III, [redacted]
Hines, John H., Jr., [redacted]
Hinkle, Kenneth W., [redacted]
Hinrichs, Ralph W., Jr., [redacted]
Hinson, Alan L., [redacted]
Hinton, James F., [redacted]
Hipp, Robert G., [redacted]
Hobbs, Quincy C., Jr., [redacted]
Hochberg, Richard C., [redacted]
Hodge, Thomas W., [redacted]
Hodges, Edwin M., Jr., [redacted]
Hodges, James W., Jr., [redacted]
Hoffman, Camillus W. D., [redacted]
Hoffman, Samuel G., [redacted]
Hoff, Randy E., [redacted]
Hogg, James L., [redacted]
Hogue, Stuart L., [redacted]
Hoke, Terry L., [redacted]
Holladay, Joseph W., [redacted]
Holland, Bobby L., [redacted]
Holland, Charles A., III, [redacted]
Holland, Curtice E., Jr., [redacted]
Holland, George C., [redacted]
Holmes, John W., [redacted]
Holtz, Richard L., [redacted]
Holt, Richard L., [redacted]
Horacek, Larry B., [redacted]
Hordych, Joseph J., [redacted]
Horn, William W. V., [redacted]
Hornaday, James D., [redacted]
Horton, Thomas A., [redacted]
Hoss, Anthony J., [redacted]
Hostettler, John R., [redacted]
Houck, Michael C., [redacted]
Houghtaling, Terry J., [redacted]
Hough, Fredric G., [redacted]
Houser, Chester W., [redacted]
Houseworth, Ronald I., [redacted]
Huddleston, Louis D., [redacted]
Huff, David B., [redacted]
Huff, William, H., III, [redacted]
Hughes, Donald W., [redacted]
Hughes, Edmund E., III, [redacted]
Hughes, Michael A., [redacted]
Huke, Henry R., III, [redacted]
Hunn, James C., [redacted]
Hunt, David W., [redacted]
Hunt, Kenneth I., Jr., [redacted]
Hunt, Robert D., [redacted]
Hunter, Robert B., [redacted]
Huston, Michael L., [redacted]
Hutchinson, Charles W., [redacted]
Hutchison, Edward K., [redacted]
Hutchison, John M., [redacted]
Huval, Danny J., [redacted]
Huyck, Jere I., [redacted]
Hyatte, Ronald D., [redacted]
Hyder, William, R., [redacted]
Illing, Thomas R., [redacted]
Indellicate, John A., [redacted]
Inge, Danny A., [redacted]
Intlehouse, Jackson, [redacted]
Irick, Edward F., III, [redacted]
Irish, Richard A., [redacted]
Ishee, George E., [redacted]
Ison, Mark A., [redacted]
Iten, Thomas J., [redacted]
Jablonski, Edward S., [redacted]
Jachmann, Bruno H., [redacted]
Jackson, Mary E., [redacted]
Jackson, Michael H., [redacted]
Jackson, Phillip F., [redacted]
Jacobson, Victor M., [redacted]
Jacobs, Jimmy O., [redacted]
Jacobs, Mark G., [redacted]
Jaggers, Thomas R., [redacted]
Jaissle, William F., [redacted]
Janak, Lawrence J., [redacted]
Janke, Alexander A., [redacted]
Janssen, Arwin J., Jr., [redacted]
Jaracz, Thad V., II, [redacted]
Jarvis, Robert L., [redacted]
Jeanes, Bill F., [redacted]
Jeffery, Charles F., [redacted]
Jelinski, Barry J., [redacted]
Jenkins, Joseph E., III, [redacted]
Jensen, Carl P., [redacted]
Jimenez, Michael J., [redacted]
Johnson, Alan D., [redacted]
Johnson, Carolyn L., T., [redacted]
Johnson, Charles L., [redacted]
Johnson, Darryl A., [redacted]
Johnson, James G., [redacted]
Johnson, Mitchell C., [redacted]
Johnson, Nelsonperkins, Jr., [redacted]
Johnson, Terry L., [redacted]
Johnston, Charles E., [redacted]
Johnston, David S., [redacted]
Johnston, Joseph W., [redacted]
Jones, Anthony R., [redacted]
Jones, Bobby W., [redacted]
Jones, Charles B., [redacted]
Jones, Elwood A., [redacted]
Jones, George A., [redacted]

Jones, John P., [redacted]
Jones, Michael L., [redacted]
Jones, Ronald E., [redacted]
Jones, Ronald G., [redacted]
Jones, Vincent P., [redacted]
Jorgensen, Robert E., [redacted]
Joslyn, Richard J., Jr., [redacted]
Jowers, Gus E., [redacted]
Judd, Dastel N., [redacted]
Jurchenko, Daniel A., [redacted]
Jurgensen, Charles E., [redacted]
Justice, James C., [redacted]
Justice, John E., [redacted]
Kahalekai, Leslie H., A., [redacted]
Karrick, Charles E., [redacted]
Keenan, Robert A., [redacted]
Keesee, Dwight D., [redacted]
Kehoe, John F., [redacted]
Keirsey, Jim D., [redacted]
Keith, David A., [redacted]
Keldsen, Donald L., [redacted]
Kellam, Edwin E., [redacted]
Kellar, Vera G., [redacted]
Keller, Roland A., [redacted]
Kelley, Lonnie R., [redacted]
Kelly, Michael D., [redacted]
Kendall, Richard I., [redacted]
Kennedy, James C., [redacted]
Kennedy, Jean C., [redacted]
Kent, David B., [redacted]
Kerr, Donald L., W., [redacted]
Kershaw, Dean A., [redacted]
Kidd, Judith A., [redacted]
Kiely, Robert W., Jr., [redacted]
Kiewra, Edward A., [redacted]
Killam, David W., [redacted]
Kimmel, Lawrence J., [redacted]
Kincaid, James R., Jr., [redacted]
Kinder, Stephen P., [redacted]
King, James R., [redacted]
King, Michael L., [redacted]
Kingseed, Cole C., [redacted]
Kinnamon, Wayne L., [redacted]
Kirby, William M., [redacted]
Klemski, James H., [redacted]
Knapp, George C., Jr., [redacted]
Knighten, Larry W., [redacted]
Knight, Kirk M., [redacted]
Knight, Michael C., [redacted]
Knight, Odious O., Jr., [redacted]
Knight, William E., [redacted]
Knowlton, Charles D., [redacted]
Knowlton, William A., Jr., [redacted]
Knudsen, Stephen A., [redacted]
Kogle, Mark L., [redacted]
Kokolakis, James H., [redacted]
Kolb, Karl G., [redacted]
Kollenberg, James L., [redacted]
Kornacki, Robert J., [redacted]
Korzeniewski, Joseph G., [redacted]
Koss, Robert J., [redacted]
Kouchi, Roger, [redacted]
Kovacic, Robert W., [redacted]
Kraeer, Thomas A., [redacted]
Krause, Raymond W., [redacted]
Kreger, Thomas D., [redacted]
Kreps, Ruth A., [redacted]
Kresho, Mark, [redacted]
Krize, Terrence E., [redacted]
Krueger, Gary L., [redacted]
Krug, Samuel R., [redacted]
Kubiak, Stephen, III., [redacted]
Kuhl, David J., [redacted]
Kuhn, Gary L., [redacted]
Kukich, Robert N., [redacted]
Kurtzman, Jackson R., [redacted]
Kwist, Dana F., [redacted]
Labrecque, Norman W., [redacted]
Lach, Michael S., [redacted]
Lacoste, Gene M., [redacted]
Lafleur, Ronald R., [redacted]
Lahnstein, Joseph S., [redacted]
Laird, Robert E., [redacted]
Lamond, Gregory S., [redacted]
Lamonica, Manuel J., [redacted]
Lamothe, Douglas R., [redacted]
Lancaster, William F., [redacted]
Landrus, William F., [redacted]
Lane, Ernest E., III, [redacted]
Lane, Howard M., Jr., [redacted]
Lane, William D., [redacted]
Lanier, James R., [redacted]
Lawton, Johann R., [redacted]
Layton, Daniel H., [redacted]
Lazor, John D., [redacted]
Lazor, Joseph A., [redacted]
Leary, Robert N., [redacted]
Ledoux, Roger C., [redacted]
Lee, Brian F., [redacted]
Lee, Danwill A., [redacted]
Lee, Ronald N., [redacted]
Legere, Robert A., [redacted]
Lehmann, Miles R., [redacted]
Leigh, Joseph J., Jr., [redacted]
Lemaster, Robert E., Jr., [redacted]
Lemons, Michael W., [redacted]
Lennon, Leo A., [redacted]
Lennox, William J., Jr., [redacted]
Lenox, Thomas A., [redacted]
Leopold, Mark E., Jr., [redacted]
Lepenske, James A., Jr., [redacted]
Lester, John W., Jr., [redacted]
Lewis, Mark R., [redacted]
Lewis, Robert H., [redacted]
Lewis, Roger A., [redacted]
Lewis, Roy D., [redacted]
Lewis, Timothy D., [redacted]
Lilley, John F., [redacted]
Lindhorst, Joseph R., [redacted]
Lind, Craig R., [redacted]
Lingvai, James R., [redacted]
Linke, Carl E., [redacted]
Linn, Phillip J., [redacted]
Linn, William J., [redacted]
Livingston, Raymond L., Jr., [redacted]
Lloyd, Glenn D., Jr., [redacted]
Lobdell, Bryan C., [redacted]
Lockhart, Henry D., III, [redacted]
Lockhart, Stephen C., [redacted]
Lodwig, Steven H., [redacted]
Long, Christopher F., [redacted]
Long, Clifford K., [redacted]
Long, John W., [redacted]
Lopez, Alfred A., Jr., [redacted]
Lord, Harold W., Jr., [redacted]
Lots, James V., [redacted]
Lott, Ronnie D., [redacted]
Lovelace, James J., Jr., [redacted]
Lovett, Michael L., [redacted]
Love, Geoffrey T., [redacted]
Lowe, Robert S., [redacted]
Lowman, Charles J., [redacted]
Lublin, William D., [redacted]
Lucia, Arthur C., [redacted]
Luckenbill, Richard J., [redacted]
Lugo, Roberto O., [redacted]
Luik, John J., [redacted]
Lundy, Jack E., [redacted]
Lurey, Charles D., [redacted]
Luttrell, Gerald E., [redacted]
Lyle, Robert N., Jr., [redacted]
Lynch, Daniel J., [redacted]
Lynch, Daniel M., [redacted]
Lynch, William L., Jr., [redacted]
Lyng, James P., [redacted]
Lynn, Milton N., [redacted]
Lyons, Wickie L., [redacted]
Mabe, Thomas L., [redacted]
Maca, Bronislaw R., [redacted]
Macia, Thomas E., [redacted]
Maciver, Thomas D., [redacted]
Mackey, Bruce D., [redacted]
Machland, Larry B., [redacted]
MacLean, Edward W., [redacted]
MacPherson, Charles W., [redacted]
Maddox, William T., [redacted]
Maertens, Thomas B., Jr., [redacted]
Maestas, Alan H., [redacted]
Maggio, Robert M., [redacted]
Mahan, Michael W., [redacted]
Maier, Wolfgang, [redacted]
Major, Oscar L., [redacted]
Malkemes, William C., [redacted]
Maloney, James P., [redacted]
Mance, Howard E., III, [redacted]
Mancino, Michael, Jr., [redacted]
Mancuso, Joseph M., Jr., [redacted]
Mansur, Thomas D., [redacted]
Manuel, Philip K., [redacted]
Mapes, James A., [redacted]
Margrave, Thomas E., C., [redacted]
Markham, Rodney S., [redacted]
Mark, William Y., Jr., [redacted]
Marr, James D., [redacted]
Marshall, Arthur R., Jr., [redacted]
Marshall, Eric R., [redacted]
Marshall, Michael W., [redacted]
Marshall, Robert A., [redacted]
Marshment, Kelvin C., [redacted]
Marsh, Robert D., Jr., [redacted]
Martel, Andre R., [redacted]
Martinez, Ruperto N., [redacted]
Martin, J.T., [redacted]
Martin, Larry G., [redacted]
Martin, Richard D., [redacted]
Martin, Roger L., [redacted]
Martin, Ronald S., [redacted]
Martin, Terry E., [redacted]
Martin, William G., [redacted]
Marx, Lowell E., [redacted]
Masch, Donald G., [redacted]
Maslowski, Daniel F., [redacted]
Mason, Robert E., [redacted]
Massey, Raymond E., [redacted]
Massmann, Peter W., [redacted]
Masterson, John T., [redacted]
Mataxis, Theodore C., [redacted]
Mattox, Philip M., [redacted]
Maxwell, Sean E., [redacted]
Mayer, Martin A., [redacted]
Mazaleski, Michael C., [redacted]
McAteer, Charles F., III, [redacted]
McCabe, Tommy L., [redacted]
McCain, Bruce C., [redacted]
McCane, O.B., Jr., [redacted]
McCarron, Francis P., [redacted]
McCary, Douglas C., [redacted]
McCaslin, Charles A., [redacted]
McClary, James F., [redacted]
McClinton, Nathaniel, [redacted]
McCormick, Thomas W., [redacted]
McCreight, Richard D., [redacted]
McCrory, James C., Jr., [redacted]
McDonald, Patrick D., [redacted]
McDonnell, Patrick J., Jr., [redacted]
McDowell, John D, Jr., [redacted]
McDowell, Paul R., [redacted]
McElwee, Jerry W., [redacted]
McFetridge, Charles D., [redacted]
McGilvray, David H., [redacted]
McGoey, Kevin, [redacted]
McGraw, Gary E., [redacted]
McGrew, William A., [redacted]
McGuire, George T., [redacted]
McKan, James, [redacted]
McKiernan, David D., [redacted]
McKinney, Joseph W., [redacted]
McKitrick, Jeffrey S., [redacted]
McLinn, John G., Jr., [redacted]
McMahan, Daniel L., [redacted]
McManus, Wade H., Jr., [redacted]
McMillan, Gary A., [redacted]
McMillan, Howard W., [redacted]
McNamara, Thomas J., Jr., [redacted]
McNett, John E., [redacted]
Measner, Richard D., [redacted]
Meeker, John R., [redacted]
Mehaffey, Michael K., [redacted]
Meier, Jimmy A., [redacted]
Menard, Robert L., [redacted]
Menendez, Angel S., [redacted]
Mentis, Peter L., [redacted]

Meranda, Mark E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mercer, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Merchen, Lee A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Merz, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Messenger, Leroy T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Metteemccutchon, Ila, xxx-xx-xxxx
Meuleners, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Meuli, Gus M, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Meyer, Henry W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Meyer, Kurtis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Michaelis, Marc, xxx-xx-xxxx
Middlemiss, Ivan R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Middleton, George S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Milam, Kardyn B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Milewski, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Millard, Robert H, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Millar, Roy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Calvin W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Curtis P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Gary G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Geoffry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Kathleen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Walter R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mills, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Minger, Bruce R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mitarotonda, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mitchell, Bryan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mitchell, Caryl A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mitchell, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mitchell, Clarence B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mitchell, Eddie, xxx-xx-xxxx
Mitchell, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mitchener, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miyamoto, Stanford N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moberly, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moeller, Delane F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moench, Frederick J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Mohl, Sladen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Monaco, Francis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Monahan, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moody, Steven J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mook, Wallace C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moon, George B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moore, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moore, Harold D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moore, Jack S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moore, Lee A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moran, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morgan, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morgridge, Ralph L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morris, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morris, Robert G., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Morris, Russell O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morrison, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morrison, Reginald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moss, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mowery, Samuel H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mudd, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mullis, Anne B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mullis, Varon B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Munch, Paul G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mundie, William L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murdoch, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murdock, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murfin, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murphy, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murphy, Edward J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Murphy, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murphy, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murphy, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murphy, Stanley J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murrah, Edmund J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murray, James K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murtha, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Muse, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mustain, Olen W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mutz, Warren F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Myers, Anthony E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Myers, Norman J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Myers, Roger A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Myers, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nakai, Leland A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nakashima, Miles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Napierala, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nash, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Navarrete, Eutimio S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nebeling, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nell, Paul E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nell, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nelsen, John T., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Nenninger, Alan H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Newman, Bruce T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Newman, Dan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nichols, Daniel A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nichols, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nicholson, Tom M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nickle, Robert E., O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nidel, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nimblett, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nitta, Alan S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nixdorff, James B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nolde, Barry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Noren, Gareth D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Norton, John, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Novak, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nowak, Eugene D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nowak, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nowlin, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Noyes, Paul M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nuttall, Edward R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nyberg, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Connor, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Connor, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Enning, Lester C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Gilvie, Raymond W., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Hlinger, Brian J., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Keeffe, Edward C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Leary, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Olesak, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Oliver, Alan P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Olsen, Carl V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Olson, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Olson, Russell V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Olson, Wallace B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Ormes, Ashton H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Orrison, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Oshea, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Osullivan, John V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Osweiler, Betty J.P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Outchcunis, Christy, xxx-xx-xxxx
Owens, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Owen, David V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Owen, Ewell M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pacheco, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Page, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paige, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paluska, Aloys J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pankey, Laney M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pantier, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paquette, Donald F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paradise, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parker, Harry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pascoe, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pasierb, Edward G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paske, Charles H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Pasko, Chester E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Passaro, Paul V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patch, Harry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patrick, Timothy R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patrie, James R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patten, Norman B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patterson, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patterson, William N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patzer, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pavlovsky, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peden, Robert M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pekny, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pelton, Johnny R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pembrook, Wayne R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pepper, James D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perea, Valerie J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pereira, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peresich, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perez, Ovidio E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perla, Livio G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pernell, Mark S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perry, Chatry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perry, Howard S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Peterman, Arnold W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peters, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peters, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peterson, Raymond W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peterson, Roy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Petoskey, Peter L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peyton, Paul P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pfeiffer, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phelps, Lawrence F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, Ruth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillis, John K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Piatt, Albert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Picco, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pieffer, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pierce, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Plant, Thomas O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Plummer, Douglas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pezak, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Poggemeyer, Ronald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Polk, Elmer J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Polster, Wayne M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Porter, Charles O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Porter, Dennis D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Potter, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Powers, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prescott, Daniel M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Price, Forrest R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Price, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prichard, Stanley R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pritchard, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Privratsky, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prondzinski, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prout, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prybyloski, Clemens C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Puffer, Glenn R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Purdin, Calvin O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pusey, Edward S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pylant, Louis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Quesenberry, Gordon S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Quimby, Donovan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Quinn, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Radeke, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Radnoti, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ramey, Darrell L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rank, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Raphael, Victor G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Raseta, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rasmussen, Stephen C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ratcliff, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ratzlaff, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Raupp, Lloyd N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rawley, Vondra R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Raymond, Dennis K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Raymond, Philip, xxx-xx-xxxx
Readman, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Read, Joyce L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reckling, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Redden, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Redding, G.A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reed, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reese, John N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reichler, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reid, Pamela S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reid, Ronald T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reimold, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reineke, Kurt B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reisenweber, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reitz, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reuss, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx
Revelle, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reyna, Martin, xxx-xx-xxxx
Rhoads, Ronnie D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rhylander, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ricer, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rice, Harry K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rice, Randolph V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richard, Philip W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richards, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richards, James G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richardson, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richardson, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richardson, William V., xxx-xx-xxxx

51-059 O-86-22 (Pt. 20)

Richey, Richard G., [redacted]
Ricketts, Roger A., [redacted]
Rickman, John C., [redacted]
Ricks, Charles W., [redacted]
Riedel, Peter E., [redacted]
Reider, John E., [redacted]
Rigby, John G., [redacted]
Riley, Michael O., [redacted]
Riley, Stephen P., [redacted]
Riney, Dan C., [redacted]
Riordan, Charles H., [redacted]
Ritter, Paul D., [redacted]
Riverasanchez, Miguel A., [redacted]
Rixon, Gregory A., [redacted]
Roach, Paul W., II, [redacted]
Robarge, Edward J., [redacted]
Roberts, L. J., [redacted]
Robinson, Russell N., [redacted]
Roche, James J., III, [redacted]
Rodda, Peter H., [redacted]
Rodgers, Jerry D., [redacted]
Rodgers, Stephen J., [redacted]
Rodgers, Thomas A., [redacted]
Roeber, Thomas J., [redacted]
Roe, Carl G., [redacted]
Rold, Ronald L., [redacted]
Rolf, Lynn W., Jr., [redacted]
Roling, Michael A., [redacted]
Rollins, Harry W., Jr. [redacted]
Romanus, Charles F., [redacted]
Rooney, Laurence J., Jr., [redacted]
Rose, Leslie A., [redacted]
Ross, Peter A., [redacted]
Ross, Robert J., [redacted]
Ross, Steven L., [redacted]
Rossi, John J., [redacted]
Rovansek, Joseph S., Jr., [redacted]
Rowley, Cleveland M., Jr., [redacted]
Rozman, Thomas R., [redacted]
Rule, Ronald J., [redacted]
Runyan, John M., [redacted]
Russo, Charles A., Jr., [redacted]
Ruth, Henry C., [redacted]
Rutledge, Richard L., [redacted]
Rutledge, Terry E., [redacted]
Rutler, Randall C., [redacted]
Ryan, Harry M., III, [redacted]
Ryan, Robert F., III, [redacted]
Rynearson, William B., [redacted]
Sabia, Giacomo R., [redacted]
Salatti, Nicholas A., [redacted]
Saltness, Gerald D., [redacted]
Samuel, Taliaferro L., [redacted]
Satterwhite, Larry W., [redacted]
Saunders, James L., [redacted]
Sauter, Louis F., III, [redacted]
Sawdey, Steven R., [redacted]
Saxby, Robert E., [redacted]
Scarborough, James W., Jr., [redacted]
Scearce, Robert W., [redacted]
Schaner, Theodore L., [redacted]
Schattauer, Frederick C., [redacted]
Schatz, Kurt F., [redacted]
Schenck, Alfred A., [redacted]
Schlegel, John E., [redacted]
Schleicher, Juergen H., [redacted]
Schmalhofer, George A., [redacted]
Schmidt, Dennis H., [redacted]
Schmidt, Thomas C., [redacted]
Schmitt, John K., [redacted]
Schmus, Richard J., [redacted]
Schnabel, Mark M., [redacted]
Schneider, Ronald D., [redacted]
Scholtes, Wayne H., [redacted]
Schorr, Daniel A., [redacted]
Schucker, Michael B., [redacted]
Schuessler, Paul R., [redacted]
Schulz, Donald W., [redacted]
Schulz, Rainer, [redacted]
Schumann, Edward D., [redacted]
Schutsky, William R., [redacted]
Schwab, John S., III, [redacted]
Schweppe, John E., [redacted]
Scianna, Philip P., [redacted]
Scotello, Frank J., [redacted]
Scotka, Ronald L., [redacted]
Scott, Bruce K. [redacted]
Scott, Tommy L., [redacted]
Scullary, James R., [redacted]
Scurzi, Robert J., [redacted]
Seay, Donald C., [redacted]
Seifert, Harold J., [redacted]
Sell, Mark F., [redacted]
Selves, Michael L., [redacted]
Senter, John T., III, [redacted]
Sewell, Bert W., [redacted]
Seymour, John F., [redacted]
Shadburn, Robert P., [redacted]
Shadid, Theodore M., Jr., [redacted]
Shadis, Thomas A., [redacted]
Shadoan, Robert P., [redacted]
Shaffer, Ronald C., [redacted]
Shannahan, Patrick M., [redacted]
Sharpe, Kenneth W., [redacted]
Shatzer, Wilson A., Jr., [redacted]
Shaw, David L., [redacted]
Shaw, Earle A., Jr., [redacted]
Sheldon, John J., [redacted]
Sheon, Jesse P., Jr., [redacted]
Sheppard, David A., [redacted]
Shera, James M., [redacted]
Sherrer, Frederick T., [redacted]
Sherwood, Byrne N., Jr., [redacted]
Sherwood, Richard I., [redacted]
Shirey, Robert H., Jr., [redacted]
Shoemaker, Mark R., [redacted]
Shoesmith, James., Jr., [redacted]
Shuey, Dan A., [redacted]
Shuler, Ronald M., [redacted]
Shupack, Stephen L., [redacted]
Sidio, Jerome B., [redacted]
Siepielski, Robert E., [redacted]
Siler, John D., [redacted]
Silva, John L., Jr., [redacted]
Silvernail, Kenneth, L., [redacted]
Simmons, Ronald J., [redacted]
Simons, Charles H., [redacted]
Sims, Paul N., [redacted]
Singleton, Eddie L., [redacted]
Sinnott, William Q., [redacted]
Sittler, Wayne L., [redacted]
Skees, Joseph B., Jr., [redacted]
Skeldon, Daniel J., [redacted]
Skinner, William S., Jr., [redacted]
Slaughter, Willard A., [redacted]
Smalls, Silas C., [redacted]
Smalser, Robert L., [redacted]
Smith, David C., [redacted]
Smith, Douglas I., Jr., [redacted]
Smith, Edward F., Jr., [redacted]
Smith, Edwin K., III., [redacted]
Smith, Jack E., Jr., [redacted]
Smith, Richard S., C. [redacted]
Smith, Ronald C., [redacted]
Smith, Ronald R., [redacted]
Smith, Stephen F., [redacted]
Smith, Thomas E., [redacted]
Smyre, Lee R., [redacted]
Snider, James R., [redacted]
Snow, William B., III., [redacted]
Snowden, Frederick C., [redacted]
Sobul, Anthony W., Jr., [redacted]
Sowa, Peter W., [redacted]
Spain, Robert F., [redacted]
Sparks, Charles F., [redacted]
Sparrow, Jack L., [redacted]
Spaulding, David E., [redacted]
Spears, Jarrell R., [redacted]
Speck, Daniel J., [redacted]
Speer, Gary D., [redacted]
Spencer, Robert D. Jr., [redacted]
Sperberg, Robert J., [redacted]
Spracher, William C., [redacted]
Stafford, Michael R., [redacted]
Stahl, Benjamin F., III, [redacted]
Stallings, Walton D., [redacted]
Stancil, Larry B., [redacted]
Stanek, Joseph F., Jr. [redacted]
Stanfield, Stephen L., [redacted]
Stapler, John G., Jr. [redacted]
Starner, Steven G., [redacted]
Starr, Kenneth J., [redacted]
Stcyr, Frank J. [redacted]
Stdenis, Richard H., [redacted]
Stecco, Johnny M. [redacted]
Steele, Gary R., [redacted]
Steele, Kenneth A., [redacted]
Steimle, Gary T., [redacted]
Stein, Frederick P., Jr. [redacted]
Stephens, Gary R., [redacted]
Stern, Clifford H., Jr., [redacted]
Stevens, Shelby T., [redacted]
Steward, Stephen A., [redacted]
Stewart, Lawrence J., Jr., [redacted]
Stewart, Michael R., [redacted]
Stewart, Robert M., [redacted]
Storey, Barry D., [redacted]
Stormer, William P., [redacted]
Stouder, Richard L., [redacted]
Stovall, Michael E., [redacted]
St. Pierre, Normand L., [redacted]
Stratton, Gary W., [redacted]
Streb, Gary T., [redacted]
Street, Bernard H., Jr. [redacted]
Strobel, Dennis A., [redacted]
Strom, Stephen H., [redacted]
Strube, Richard L., Jr., [redacted]
Strutzel, Timothy D., [redacted]
Sudler, John C., [redacted]
Suggs, William J., III, [redacted]
Sullivan, Daniel J., [redacted]
Sullivan, Mark S., [redacted]
Sullivan, Michael L., [redacted]
Sullivan, Thomas J., [redacted]
Sultan, Steven A., [redacted]
Sun, Peter F., [redacted]
Suozzo, Michael A., [redacted]
Sutton, Charles K., [redacted]
Swank, David W., [redacted]
Sweigart, Leslie G., [redacted]
Szabo, Michael, [redacted]
Szeliga, Edward J., [redacted]
Szymanski, William R., [redacted]
Tallas, John C., [redacted]
Tarter, Donald W., [redacted]
Tatum, Darcey T., III, [redacted]
Taylor, Edward L., [redacted]
Taylor, Fred C., [redacted]
Taylor, Jerry A., [redacted]
Taylor, John W., [redacted]
Taylor, Marvin C., [redacted]
Taylor, Michael S., [redacted]
Taylor, Ronald G., [redacted]
Tercy, Michael J., [redacted]
Terry, Phillip E., [redacted]
Tetreault, Gerry E., [redacted]
Teufert, William R., [redacted]
Tharrington, Michael F., [redacted]
Thomas, Florence K., [redacted]
Thomas, Gary., [redacted]
Thomas, James A., Jr., [redacted]
Thomas, Joseph T., [redacted]
Thomas, Rodney G., [redacted]
Thomas, Ronald D., [redacted]
Thompsen, Charles R., [redacted]
Thompson, Robert P., [redacted]
Thompson, Russell S., [redacted]
Thom, Brian L., [redacted]
Thrash, Terry K., [redacted]
Thurman, Edward E., [redacted]
Tichenor, Arthur H., III, [redacted]
Tillery, George G., Jr., [redacted]
Timmerberg, James R., [redacted]
Tio, Alberto W., [redacted]
Titunik, Steven M., [redacted]
Todd, Loren L., [redacted]
Tolman, Scott B., [redacted]
Tompkins, James R., [redacted]
Tomsich, Michael F., [redacted]
Tonelli, Robert M., [redacted]
Toops, David H., [redacted]
Topping, Edward O., [redacted]

Torpey, William T., [redacted]
Townsend, Tommy D., [redacted]
Townsley, Harry M., [redacted]
Town, Barrie A., [redacted]
Trammell, Louis B., [redacted]
Treneman, Bayard A., [redacted]
Trinidad, Antonio, [redacted]
Tripp, Bruce M., [redacted]
Trudell, Richard M., [redacted]
Trumble, Roy R., III, [redacted]
Tucker, Michael P., [redacted]
Tucker, Ronnie W., [redacted]
Tufts, Thomas E., [redacted]
Turner, Gerald W., [redacted]
Twitero, David T., [redacted]
Tyo, Joseph M., Jr., [redacted]
Tyree, Ronald W., [redacted]
Underhill, Carl J., [redacted]
Unterseher, James E., [redacted]
Unterweger, Peter M., [redacted]
Urban, Richard S., [redacted]
Urben, Edward A., [redacted]
Urick, Dennis O., [redacted]
Valette, Paul A., [redacted]
Vanairsdale, Michael J., [redacted]
Vanantwerp, Robert L., Jr., [redacted]
Vanbrederode, Henry L., [redacted]
Vannatter, Dan M., [redacted]
Vanvliet, John H., III, [redacted]
Vanvoorhis, Victor V., [redacted]
Varsolona, Frank L., [redacted]
Vass, Charles R., [redacted]
Vega, Benjamin, Jr., [redacted]
Veiga, Edgar N., [redacted]
Velasquez, Jose G., [redacted]
Velez, Carlos R., Jr., [redacted]
Velky, Lawrence J., [redacted]
Velten, Lee H., [redacted]
Velten, Michael E., [redacted]
Veltum, Lee D., [redacted]
Vershine, John K., [redacted]
Verity, James E., [redacted]
Vermillion, John M., [redacted]
Vernon, Michael H., [redacted]
Viehl, Phillip C., [redacted]
Vincent, Elridge J., Jr., [redacted]
Vinson, Donald E., [redacted]
Virgin, Michael E., [redacted]
Vongonten, Jimmie L., [redacted]
Voorhees, Delloyd, Jr., [redacted]
Wade, Steven J., [redacted]
Wager, Stephen J., [redacted]
Wagner, Ernest W., [redacted]
Wagner, Warren C., [redacted]
Wait, Neill W., [redacted]
Waldron, Michael L., [redacted]
Walker, Larry B., [redacted]
Walker, Robert M., [redacted]
Wallace, David R., [redacted]
Wallace, James B., Jr., [redacted]
Wallace, John D., [redacted]
Walls, Russell K., Jr., [redacted]
Walsh, Thomas L., [redacted]
Walters, Glenn L., [redacted]
Walton, Robert A., [redacted]
Ward, Frank E., Jr., [redacted]
Ward, James R., [redacted]
Ward, Robert L., II, [redacted]
Ware, James H., Jr., [redacted]
Warne, Douglas E., [redacted]
Warren, Barry G., [redacted]
Washburn, Thomas D., [redacted]
Washington, Don L., [redacted]
Watkins, Paul A., Jr., [redacted]
Watson, Jesse L., III, [redacted]
Watson, Norman B., [redacted]
Wattendorf, William J., [redacted]
Watts, Charles P., [redacted]
Wax, Richard R., [redacted]
Weatherford, William D., [redacted]
Weaver, Malcolm G., [redacted]
Webb, Johnie E. Jr., [redacted]
Webb, Russell E., [redacted]
Webber, Gavin G., [redacted]
Weber, William D., III, [redacted]
Webster, James M., Jr., [redacted]
Weien, Glen F., II, [redacted]
Welch, Alan R., [redacted]
Welch, John O., [redacted]
Wellisch, Lawerence R., [redacted]
Werner, Thomas E., [redacted]
Wertz, Lewis E., Jr., [redacted]
Wesley, Benjamin H., [redacted]
Wetzel, William J., [redacted]
Whaley, Charles D., [redacted]
Wheeldon, Carroll B., [redacted]
Wheller, Christopher S., [redacted]
Whitaker, Clarence P., Jr., [redacted]
Whitehead, Roy J., Jr., [redacted]
White, David D., Jr., [redacted]
White, David M., [redacted]
White, Paul A., [redacted]
Whitfield, Donald D., II, [redacted]
Whitley, Thomas H., [redacted]
Whitson, John A., [redacted]
Whittaker, James F., [redacted]
Whittenberg, Michel E., [redacted]
Whittenberg, Stephen E., [redacted]
Wicklander, Eugene R., [redacted]
Wilbanks, Thomas D., [redacted]
Wilbert, William E, II, [redacted]
Wilbon, Roderick L., [redacted]
Wildman, Lowell D., [redacted]
Wilhelm, Frederick R., J., [redacted]
Wilkerson, Richard L., [redacted]
Wilkes, Gerald J., [redacted]
Wilkes, Randell L., [redacted]
Wilkins, Albert G., [redacted]
Wilkins, Lawrence B., [redacted]
Willard, Robert T., [redacted]
Willetts, James F., [redacted]
Willhouse, Donald, E., [redacted]
Williams, Arthur, C., Jr., [redacted]
Williams, Bristol W., Jr., [redacted]
Williams, Donald E., [redacted]
Williams, Edward L., [redacted]
Williams, Fred R., [redacted]
Williams, Gary L., [redacted]
Williams, James L., [redacted]
Williams, James R., [redacted]
Williams, Joe A., [redacted]
Williams, Joseph L., Jr., [redacted]
Williams, Lee E., [redacted]
Williams, Michael B., [redacted]
Williams, Michael S., [redacted]
Williams, Richard K., Jr., [redacted]
Williams, Robert C., [redacted]
Williams, Stephen J., [redacted]
Williamson, Bobby W., [redacted]
Williamson, John S., [redacted]
Williamson, Robert L., [redacted]
Willie, James F., [redacted]
Wilson, Crofton B., [redacted]
Wilson, John W., [redacted]
Wilson, Joseph K., Jr., [redacted]
Wilson, William H., [redacted]
Wimberly, Marion D., Jr., [redacted]
Wingo, Kenneth J., Jr., [redacted]
Wink, Freddie V., [redacted]
Winn, Dennis H., [redacted]
Winter, Felix D., [redacted]
Wirth, Donald E., [redacted]
Wise, Douglas H., [redacted]
Wise, Roger E., [redacted]
Wojtkun, Gregory, [redacted]
Woloski, John C., [redacted]
Wong, Patton S., L., [redacted]
Wong, Sanford, [redacted]
Wood, David P., [redacted]
Woods, Robert W., [redacted]
Woodson, Edward R., III, [redacted]
Workman, Don K., [redacted]
Wren, Kenneth A., [redacted]
Wright, Charles E., [redacted]
Wright, Garry R., [redacted]
Wright, James E., [redacted]
Wright, Mary M., M., [redacted]
Wright, Roger A., [redacted]
Wright, William R., [redacted]
Wrinkle, John R., [redacted]
Wyks, Edward E., [redacted]
Wyllie, Gordon D., [redacted]
Wyman, Richard H., [redacted]
Wynn, John E., [redacted]
Yancey, Robert V., [redacted]
Yasuda, Edward T., [redacted]
Yates, Atlas R., [redacted]
Yates, Gary E., [redacted]
Yenchesky, Roy A., [redacted]
York, Arthur L., [redacted]
Young, Robert M., [redacted]
Young, Robert S., [redacted]
Young, Sammie G., [redacted]
Young, Terry J., [redacted]
Young, William B., [redacted]
Yule, James C., [redacted]
Zahorsky, Michael, Jr., [redacted]
Zimon, Henry A., [redacted]
Zola, Ronald G., [redacted]
Zore, Geraldina, [redacted]
Zurcher, Robert E., Jr., [redacted]
727X
643X
655X

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Abshier, John D., [redacted]
Aitkin, James M., [redacted]
Amos, Paul D., [redacted]
Banks, William F., Jr., [redacted]
Bartosh, Edward T., Jr., [redacted]
Beach, Johnston, [redacted]
Beauchemin, Richard R., [redacted]
Beene, Jerry D., [redacted]
Bennett, Charles T., [redacted]
Bennett, Gary L., [redacted]
Blake, Herbert A., [redacted]
Block, Harold G., [redacted]
Blum, Barry N., [redacted]
Blythe, Raymond E., [redacted]
Bodie, George A., [redacted]
Booth, Van R., [redacted]
Bradford, Ralph E., [redacted]
Brenner, Paul F., [redacted]
Briggs, Ronald S., [redacted]
Brooks, Franklin R., [redacted]
Brown, Frederick W., [redacted]
Browning, William C., [redacted]
Bruss, Donald J., [redacted]
Bryant, Gordon V., Jr., [redacted]
Brywka, Michael Jr., [redacted]
Bullerman, Wayne A., [redacted]
Burden, Raymond T., Jr., [redacted]
Cadwallader, Ralph E., [redacted]
Caldwell, Jerry W., [redacted]
Callaghan, John A., [redacted]
Caputo, Frank V., [redacted]
Cheatham, Ronald R., [redacted]
Chesnutt, James H., Jr., [redacted]
Cho, Gordon W., [redacted]
Clement, Dennis L., [redacted]
Clouse, Stephen P., [redacted]
Cloutier, Marc G., [redacted]
Coley, Herbert A., [redacted]
Collins, Clarence R., [redacted]
Collins, Dean A., [redacted]
Coolbaugh, Gerald A., [redacted]
Cooley, William L., [redacted]
Corley, James H., [redacted]
Cramblet, Peter B., [redacted]
Crissey, James E., [redacted]
Crumrine, Martin H., [redacted]
Crutchfield, Michael P., [redacted]
Davis, Brian K., [redacted]
Davis, Keith L., [redacted]
Day, Rodney G., [redacted]
Dicks, Louie A., [redacted]
Dilly, Brechenridge C., [redacted]
Dohanos, Dennis W., [redacted]
Drost, Leonard S., [redacted]
Duvall, Garry D., [redacted]

East, Virgil R., [redacted]
Emery, Homer C., [redacted]
Fitzgerald, William J., [redacted]
Fox, Alan J., [redacted]
Frame, Robert V., [redacted]
Frost, Charles F., [redacted]
Furbish, Bruce G., [redacted]
Gemmill, Robert H., [redacted]
George, David T., [redacted]
Gifford, Robert K., [redacted]
Gingrich, John B., [redacted]
Gisin, George J., [redacted]
Goeringer, Fred, [redacted]
Gonzales, Joseph P., [redacted]
Greenfield, Gary R., [redacted]
Grill, Dennis J., [redacted]
Griswold, Richard H., [redacted]
Gunn, Bruce A., [redacted]
Hamlin, Elwood R., II, [redacted]
Hapner, Arthur W., [redacted]
Harlan, Harold J., [redacted]
Harrison, Thomas G., [redacted]
Hatcher, Robert W., [redacted]
Haugen, Lawrence A., [redacted]
Heim, Franklin C., [redacted]
Hiller, Frank W., Jr., [redacted]
Huebner, Michael F., [redacted]
Huether, Ronald A., [redacted]
Hussey, Robert T., [redacted]
Jackson, Duane L., [redacted]
Jackson, Terry G., [redacted]
Jaeger, James J., [redacted]
Kautzman, Dennis J., [redacted]
Keller, Raymond L., [redacted]
Kershner, Ronald C., [redacted]
Kirby, Bruce L., [redacted]
Kreger, Harold A., Jr., [redacted]
Kremenak, Kenneth J., [redacted]
Krieger, Donald A., [redacted]
Lake, Douglas A., II, [redacted]
Lamy, Joel R., [redacted]
Landry, Alfred J., Jr., [redacted]
Lankford, John M., [redacted]
Lanway, Merle S., [redacted]
Ledford, Kenneth, Jr., [redacted]
Lineweaver, James E., Jr., [redacted]
Liter, Melvin E., [redacted]
Long, William C., [redacted]
Love, Alan L., [redacted]
Love, James E. Jr., [redacted]
MacDonough, Tomi S., [redacted]
Maertens, Kenneth R., [redacted]
Magill, Samuel W., Jr., [redacted]
Manning, Johnnie R., [redacted]
Mantia, William M., [redacted]
McClelland, Howard A., [redacted]
McQueen, Samuel G., [redacted]
Minkley, Thomas E., [redacted]
Monroe, Anthony M., [redacted]
Moore, Robert E., [redacted]
Naehr, Lawrence S., [redacted]
Newborn, Jesse P., [redacted]
Newman, James M., [redacted]
O'Brien, John C., Jr., [redacted]
Parker, Raymond A., [redacted]
Parrett, Ethan E., [redacted]
Perkins, Peter V., [redacted]
Pierce, Phillip E., [redacted]
Pinkson, Reuben G., [redacted]
Piotrowski, Stanley L., [redacted]
Poux, Robert J., Jr., [redacted]
Proctor, Michael I., [redacted]
Rakickas, Ronald J., [redacted]
Ray, Reginald D., [redacted]
Reid, Michael J., [redacted]
Rembold, John M., [redacted]
Richardson, James C., [redacted]
Rickett, Daniel L., [redacted]
Ristroph, Joseph D., Jr., [redacted]
Roach, Thomas W., [redacted]
Roberts, Chester R., [redacted]
Roberts, Lyman W., [redacted]
Robinson, George S., [redacted]
Rogers, Michael J., [redacted]
Schroeder, David L., [redacted]
Seidel, Frederick J., [redacted]
Sewell, Benjamin C., II, [redacted]
Siedor, Christopher M., [redacted]
Sittingdown, Quincy D., [redacted]
Smith, Peter P., [redacted]
Smith, Robert F., [redacted]
Smith, William R., [redacted]
Stephens, Elwood L., [redacted]
Sternal, Thomas M., [redacted]
Stropko, Andrew J., [redacted]
Swingler, Ralph S., Jr., [redacted]
Szurek, John L., [redacted]
Tanaka, Robert Y., [redacted]
Thiel, Brian P., [redacted]
Thies, Paul R., [redacted]
Thompson, Garold K., Jr., [redacted]
Thornton, Dale E., [redacted]
Thornton, William H.J., [redacted]
Waddell, Thomas R., [redacted]
Waibel, Klaus J., [redacted]
Watson, Douglas L., [redacted]
Wells, Dawn L., [redacted]
Whiddon, Robert G., Jr., [redacted]
Whisenant, Allen D., [redacted]
Whiting, Robert E., [redacted]
Wigger, James R., Jr., [redacted]
Wilcox, John T., [redacted]
Wilkinson, Gene C., [redacted]
Wilson, James P., [redacted]
Wingate, James C., [redacted]
Witte, Carlton R.V., [redacted]
Wozniak, Arthur, [redacted]
Wright, David V., [redacted]
Yaryan, Robert A., [redacted]
Yasalonis, John W., [redacted]
Young, Charles, [redacted]
Zielmanski, Kenneth P., [redacted]
Zolock, David T., [redacted]

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Ambrose, Lona K., [redacted]
Anderson, John E., [redacted]
Daigle, Wade W., [redacted]
Gehlhausen, Grace A., [redacted]
Hobson, Karen P. V., [redacted]
Miller, Carol P., [redacted]
Neveux, Catherine J., [redacted]
Patterson, Richard F., [redacted]
Reed, Judith A., [redacted]
Ritter, Richard C., Jr., [redacted]
Rose, Madeleine S., [redacted]
Smutok, Michael A., [redacted]
Sosa, Gilbert, [redacted]
Woerman, Allyn L., [redacted]
Wolf, Rita J., [redacted]
Wright, Adulia T., [redacted]

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Agnew, Eugene W., Jr., [redacted]
Bartz, Curtis R., [redacted]
Boyle, Dale D., [redacted]
Hanna, Gary D., [redacted]
Hoedebecke, Edward L., [redacted]
Hoyt, Robert F., Jr., [redacted]
Jaax, Nancy K. D., [redacted]
Johnson, John B., Jr., [redacted]
McNamee, George A., Jr., [redacted]
Morrill, John C., [redacted]
Rice, Robert M., [redacted]
Sherman, Stephanie J. G., [redacted]
Venard, Thomas G., [redacted]

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Adams, Carolyn E., [redacted]
Addison, Shirley G., [redacted]
Allen, Judith M., [redacted]
Allen, Susanne M., [redacted]
Amendolair, Darlene M., [redacted]
Amidon, Janice M. D., [redacted]
Anderson, Patricia J., [redacted]
Aureli, Dinah L., [redacted]
Baird, Margaret M., [redacted]
Baker, Beverly J., [redacted]
Ball, Bettye H., [redacted]
Bassett, Sally A., [redacted]
Beaty, James M., [redacted]
Belew, Beverly A., [redacted]
Bird, Carita A., [redacted]
Booker, Roslyn D., [redacted]
Brace, Brenda L., [redacted]
Bradshaw, Troy W., [redacted]
Brown, Margaret J. L., [redacted]
Bulliner, Carolyn R., [redacted]
Callahan, Michael F., [redacted]
Capps, Erie D., [redacted]
Carle, Marcia L., [redacted]
Carter, Arlene M., [redacted]
Celio, Mary P., [redacted]
Cheney, Virginia R., [redacted]
Christensen, Donald G., [redacted]
Christian, Shelby J., [redacted]
Cobb, Jean M., [redacted]
Coffey, Shirley E., [redacted]
Collins, Susan F., [redacted]
Combs, Maureen W., [redacted]
Cooke, Paulette A., [redacted]
Criswell, Mary L. H., [redacted]
Crompton, Melenna J., [redacted]
Curry, Laura L., [redacted]
Curry, Patricia L., [redacted]
Daniels, Nancy M., [redacted]
Deangelis, Richard, [redacted]
Deardorff, Mary T., [redacted]
Deweese, Paul M., [redacted]
Dolenar, Daniel J., [redacted]
Dunn, Linda J.T., [redacted]
Dvorchak, Barbara T., [redacted]
Evans, Rosalie K., [redacted]
Evans, Suzanne S., [redacted]
Faupel, Mary F., [redacted]
Firth, Joan M., [redacted]
Fitzgerald, Donna K.M., [redacted]
Fitzgerald, Patricia A., [redacted]
Florine, James E., [redacted]
Frank, Mary E.V., [redacted]
Funk, Donna K., [redacted]
Funk, Margaret A., [redacted]
Garefino, Margaret M.G., [redacted]
Gifford, Karen A., [redacted]
Gilbert, Deri H., [redacted]
Goyne, June I.S., [redacted]
Granberg, Jeannine W., [redacted]
Graski-Backs, S.L., [redacted]
Gruner, Betty S., [redacted]
Gwaltney, George A., [redacted]
Hagey, Antionette, [redacted]
Hamparian, Phyllis B., [redacted]
Hayward, Carole D., [redacted]
Heil, Elizabeth A., [redacted]
Henricson, Lawrence K., [redacted]
Heresa, Sadonyia J., [redacted]
Holliday, Beverly V., [redacted]
Hughes, Harold P., [redacted]
Jeanpierre, Patricia L., [redacted]
Jenkins, Pamela R.C., [redacted]
Jessup, James W., [redacted]
Johnson, Mary B.W., [redacted]
Jones, Carol A., [redacted]
Keeler, Jill R., [redacted]
Kelly, Shelley H., [redacted]
Kemp, Elizabeth F., [redacted]
Kendall, James J., III, [redacted]
Kildea, John, Jr., [redacted]
King, David A., [redacted]
King, Mary M.P., [redacted]
Kinsinger, Daniel H., [redacted]
Kossman, Marcia L., [redacted]
Krom, Frances A.K., [redacted]
Lambert, Mary H., [redacted]
Lashlee, Jo L., [redacted]
Lee, Vivian Z.W., [redacted]
Level, Dennis F., [redacted]
Levinson, Carolyn H., [redacted]
Lewis, Jane L., [redacted]
Marsh, Frances L., [redacted]

Marsh, Linda J., [redacted]
Mathis, Donald L., [redacted]
Mauro, Kathleen B., [redacted]
Maynard, Georgia G.H., [redacted]
McBride, Patricia B., [redacted]
Mehling, Beverly A., [redacted]
Miller, Dwayne E., [redacted]
Miller, Janet J., [redacted]
Mizell, Doris M., [redacted]
Moore, Barbara S., [redacted]
Moran, Margaret L. C., [redacted]
Mull, Ellen A., [redacted]
Mustelier, Christine J., [redacted]
Naleski, Gary J., [redacted]
Nett, Kathleen M., [redacted]
Odom, James D., [redacted]
O'Niel, Mary K., [redacted]
Parry, Barbara A. P., [redacted]
Peacock, Benjamin A., Jr., [redacted]
Penn, Barbara K., [redacted]
Phillips, Jolynn S., [redacted]
Prentiss, Patricia C., [redacted]
Probst, Cynthia B. J., [redacted]
Purdom, Jean M., [redacted]
Rak, Doris J., [redacted]
Ramsey, Barbara J., [redacted]
Rea, Ruth E., [redacted]
Reeder, Jean M., [redacted]
Robertson, Katherine E., [redacted]
Robinson, Sylvia P., [redacted]
Robison, Gary D., [redacted]
Robison, Patricia, [redacted]
Roscow, John C., [redacted]
Ross, Patricia A. W., [redacted]
Ross, Susan W., [redacted]
Rupkalvis, Carol A., [redacted]
Russo, Joan D. F., [redacted]
Salacinski, Lynnda W., [redacted]
Sandberg, Julie K., [redacted]
Sarnecky, Mary T., [redacted]
Sautter, Dawn P., [redacted]
Schade, Elsie R., [redacted]
Scheidt, Kathryn B., [redacted]
Schodt, Dana P., [redacted]
Schwaier, Sandra L., [redacted]
Sealy, Mary L., [redacted]
Shank, Joyce G., [redacted]
Shelton, Lanette M., [redacted]
Shepard, Rosamond R., [redacted]
Sikes, Patricia A. H., [redacted]
Skowronski, Eileen F., [redacted]
Slimowicz, Carolyn M., [redacted]
Smeltzer, Lola K. F., [redacted]
Smith, Eddy A., [redacted]
Smith, Lonnie R., [redacted]
Stark, Dianne M., [redacted]
Stegura, Frank H., [redacted]
Stepanik, Dianna S., [redacted]
Stone, Mary A., [redacted]
Stowe, Harvey O., [redacted]
Sullivan, Elizabeth A., [redacted]
Swafford, Catherine G., [redacted]
Tobiasson, Michael E., [redacted]
Treiber, Maureen S., [redacted]
Troop, Michael P., [redacted]
Vandell, Donna L., [redacted]
Vanhook, Thomas J., [redacted]
Wacks, Gloria J.S., [redacted]
Wanersdorfer, Elizabeth M., [redacted]
Ward, Mary H., [redacted]
Washburn, Theresa A., [redacted]
Watkins, Betty L.S., [redacted]
Waxdahl, Karen A., [redacted]
Wells, Susan E., [redacted]
West, Janet A., [redacted]
White, Brenda L.J., [redacted]
Wiegand, Joyce L., [redacted]
Williams, Paulette L., [redacted]
Wilson, Margaret M., [redacted]
Wynohrad, Julia E.S., [redacted]
Zuelke, Lorene E., [redacted]
Zunino, Jeannette M., [redacted]
Zwerner, Darlene A., [redacted]

THE JUDICIARY

James L. Buckley, of Connecticut, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit vice Edward Allen Tamm, deceased.

John T. Noonan, Jr., of California, to be U.S. circuit judge for the ninth circuit vice a new position created by Public Law 98-353, approved July 10, 1984.

Glenn L. Archer, Jr., of Virginia, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Federal circuit vice Jack R. Miller, retired.

Jane R. Roth, of Delaware, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Delaware vice Walter K. Stapleton, elevated.

Albert I. Moon, Jr., of Hawaii, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Hawaii vice a new position created by Public Law 98-353, approved July 10, 1984.

Patrick A. Conmy, of North Dakota, to be U.S. district judge for the district of North Dakota vice Bruce M. Van Sickle, retired.

Lynn N. Hughes, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Texas vice Robert O'Conor, Jr., resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 16, 1985:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Donald James Quigg, of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert B. Sims, of Tennessee, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Richard Kennon Willard, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

COPYRIGHT ROYALTY TRIBUNAL

J.C. Argetsinger, of Virginia, to be a Commissioner of the Copyright Royalty Tribunal for the term of 7 years from September 27, 1984.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

William Barclay Allen, of California, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 1990.

Mary Joseph Conrad Cresimore, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 1990.

Leon Richard Kass, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 1990.

Kathleen S. Kilpatrick, of Connecticut, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 1990.

Robert Laxalt, of Nevada, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 1990.

James V. Schall, of California, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 1990.

George D. Hart, of California, to be a member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 1990.

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

Susan Meredith Phillips, of Iowa, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for the term expiring April 13, 1990.

Susan Meredith Phillips, of Iowa, to be chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Larry L. DeVuyst, of Michigan, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1991.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

The following-named persons to be the Representative and Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the 29th session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency:

Representative:

Danny J. Boggs of Kentucky.

Alternate Representatives:

Richard T. Kennedy of the District of Columbia.

Nunzio J. Palladino of Pennsylvania.

Bruce Chapman of Washington.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Leo C. McKenna, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Jean Broward Shevlin Gerard, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be Representatives and Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the 40th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Representatives:

Vernon A. Walters of Florida.

Herbert Stuart Okun of the District of Columbia.

Daniel A. Mica, U.S. Representative from the State of Florida.

Gerald B.H. Solomon, U.S. Representative from the State of New York.

John Davis Lodge of Connecticut.

Alternative Representatives:

Patricia Mary Byrne of Ohio.

Hugh Montgomery of Virginia.

Joseph Verner Reed of New York.

Robinson Risner of Texas.

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

Elliott Abrams, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Foundation for a term expiring September 20, 1990.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

Mark L. Edelman, an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation for a term expiring September 22, 1991.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Marshall Jordan Breger, of the District of Columbia, to be chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States for the term of 5 years.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Elizabeth Flores Burkhart, of Texas, to be a member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for the term of 6 years expiring April 10, 1991.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Patricia Mary Byrne, of Ohio, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Deputy Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Hugh Montgomery, of Virginia, to be the Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Herbert Stuart Okun, of the District of Columbia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be the Deputy Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Bill D. Colvin, of Virginia, to be inspector general, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

U.S. SENTENCING COMMISSION

Stephen G. Breyer, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 2 years, subject to the conditions prescribed by Public Law 98-473 of October 12, 1984, as amended.

Paul H. Robinson, of New Jersey, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 2 years, subject to the conditions prescribed by Public Law 98-473 of October 12, 1984, as amended.

Michael K. Block, of Arizona, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 4 years, subject to the conditions prescribed by Public Law 98-473 of October 12, 1984, as amended.

Helen G. Corrothers, of Arkansas, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 4 years, subject to the conditions prescribed by Public Law 98-473 of October 12, 1984, as amended.

George E. MacKinnon, of Maryland, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 4 years, subject to the conditions prescribed by Public Law 98-473 of October 12, 1984, as amended.

Ilene H. Nagel, of Indiana, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 6 years, subject to the conditions prescribed by Public Law 98-473 of October 12, 1984, as amended.

William W. Wilkins, Jr., of South Carolina, to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission for a term of 6 years, subject to the conditions prescribed by Public Law 98-473 of October 12, 1984, as amended.

William W. Wilkins, Jr., of South Carolina, to be chairman of the U.S. Sentencing Commission.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Roger Dale Semerad, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

James M. Stephens, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring August 27, 1990.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Roger William Jepsen, of Iowa, to be a member of the National Credit Union Administration Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 2, 1987.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Lawrence J. Jensen, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Jennifer Joy Manson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Craig C. Black, of California, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for a term expiring May 10, 1990.

Charles L. Hosler, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation, for the remainder of the term expiring May 10, 1988.

William J. Merrell, Jr., of Texas, to be an Assistant Director of the National Science Foundation.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

L. William Seidman, of Arizona, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of 6 years.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

THE JUDICIARY

Ralph B. Guy, Jr., of Michigan, to be U.S. circuit judge for the sixth circuit.

Stephen H. Anderson, of Utah, to be U.S. circuit judge for the 10th circuit.

Ferdinand F. Fernandez, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California.

Glen H. Davidson, of Mississippi, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Mississippi.

Robert B. Maloney, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Texas.

David Bryan Sentelle, of North Carolina, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of North Carolina.

Brian B. Duff, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

Edmund V. Ludwig, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

Stephen V. Wilson, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California.

David Sam, of Utah, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Utah.

David A. Nelson, of Ohio, to be U.S. circuit judge for the sixth circuit.

James L. Ryan, of Michigan, to be U.S. circuit judge for the sixth circuit.

Henry T. Wingate, of Mississippi, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Mississippi.

Alan H. Nevas, of Connecticut, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Connecticut.

Paul N. Brown, of Texas, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Texas.

Alan A. McDonald, of Washington, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Washington.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Brian P. Joffrion, of Louisiana, to be U.S. Marshal for the western district of Louisiana for the term of 4 years.

Stephen M. McNamee, of Arizona, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Arizona for the term of 4 years.

Patrick M. McLaughlin, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years.

William A. Maddox, of Nevada, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Nevada for the term of 4 years.

Roger Hilfiger, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officer for appointment as Vice Chief of Naval Operations pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5085:

Vice Adm. James B. Busey IV, [redacted]/1310, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer having been designated for command and other duties of importance and responsibility within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 601, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving:

Vice Adm. James B. Busey IV, [redacted]/1310, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be admiral

Adm. Lee Baggett, Jr., [redacted]/1110, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Arthur S. Moreau, Jr., [redacted], U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be admiral

Adm. Sylvester R. Foley, Jr., [redacted]/1310, U.S. Navy.

The following-named commodore of the line of the Navy for promotion to the permanent grade of rear admiral, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 624, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

RESTRICTED LINE—SPECIAL DUTY OFFICER (CRYPTOLOGY)

Charles Francis Clark.

The following-named captains of the U.S. Navy for promotion to the permanent grade of commodore, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 624, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Lewis Mantel.

SUPPLY CORPS

James Edward Miller.
James Elton Eckelberger.
William Egbert Powell, Jr.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Alvin Berthold Koeneman.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Benjamin Franklin Montoya.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment in the U.S. Air Force to the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 624, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Stuart E. Barstad, [redacted]FR, U.S. Air Force, chaplain.

To be brigadier general

Col. John P. McDonough, [redacted]FR, U.S. Air Force, chaplain.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named Army Medical Service Corps officer for appointment in the U.S. Army to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 611(a) and 624:

To be permanent brigadier general

Col. Walter F. Johnson III, [redacted], Medical Service Corps, U.S. Army.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Richard A. Miller, [redacted] 1310, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711, to be reassigned in his current grade to be senior Navy member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations and to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

Vice Adm. Donald S. Jones, [redacted] 1310, U.S. Navy.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 601, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under title 10, United States Code, section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Joseph B. Wilkinson, Jr., [redacted] /1310, U.S. Navy.

The following-named captains of the Reserve of the U.S Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commodore in the line and staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5912:

UNRESTRICTED LINE OFFICERS

John William Gates, Jr.
Stephen Gordon Yusem.
Richard Squier Fitzgerald.
Samuel Edward McWilliams.

ENGINEERING DUTY OFFICER

Paul Keith Arthur.

MEDICAL CORPS OFFICERS

Robert Layman Summitt.
Robert Conrad Nuss.

SUPPLY CORPS OFFICER

James Hock Mayer.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1370:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Thomas R. Kinnebrew, [redacted] /1110. U.S. Navy.

IN THE ARMY

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the Adjutant General's Corps, Army National Guard of the United States, Reserve of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Edward D. Baca, [redacted]
Brig. Gen. Alfredo J. Mora, [redacted]
Brig. Gen. Ernest R. Morgan, [redacted]
Brig. Gen. Nathaniel G. Troutt, [redacted]

IN THE AIR FORCE

Air Force nominations beginning Theodore M. Sahd, and ending James M. Kinsella, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Air Force nominations beginning Charles D. Ables, and ending Kenneth W. Welsh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Air Force nominations beginning Maj. Dennis M. Anderson, and ending Maj. John H. Elledge, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Air Force nomination of James M. Kinsella, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Air Force nominations beginning Raymond A. Abole, and ending Daniel R. Zink, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Col. Richard O. Covey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 11, 1985.

Air Force nominations beginning Maj. John M. Lounge, and ending Maj. James D. Vanhoften, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 20, 1985.

IN THE ARMY

Army nominations beginning William F. Norris, and ending Loraine G. Goodman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Army nominations beginning Johnny R. Abbott, and ending Donald B. Zamora, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Army nominations beginning Marc A. Abramowitz and ending Henry J. Zielinski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 16, 1985.

Army nominations beginning William F. Reade and ending James L. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 17, 1985.

Army nominations beginning Jon W. Day, and ending Gary B. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 20, 1985.

Army nominations beginning Henry W. Adams, and ending Joseph A. Seigel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 20, 1985.

Army nominations beginning Giorgio S. Tureila and ending William J. Howard III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 20, 1985.

IN THE COAST GUARD

Coast Guard nominations beginning Thomas P. Vieten, and ending Neal D. Shadix, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 16, 1985.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Marine Corps nominations beginning Paul D. Allen, Jr., and ending Robin F. Wirsching, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 30, 1985.

Marine Corps nomination of James M. Johnson, which were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Marine Corps nominations beginning Harold D. Jones, and ending Wellington Y. Wheaton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

IN THE NAVY

Navy nominations beginning Robert P. Burroughs, and ending Walter F. Threlkeld, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Navy nominations beginning Nicholas Sabalos and ending George J. Thielemann, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Navy nominations beginning Orlando A. Alfred, and ending James W. Crawford, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1985.

Navy nominations beginning Donald Jacob Beyer, Jr., and ending Edwin Frank Zupinski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 11, 1985.

Navy nominations beginning Robert A. Fabrini, and ending Lewis L. Ware, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 2, 1985.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

401(k) PLANS SHOULD BE PRESERVED

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress continues to study and debate tax reform, I rise to strenuously object to the Treasury Department's latest tax proposal which would eliminate the 401(k) savings plan, and urge my colleagues who serve on the Ways and Means Committee to reject this aspect of tax reform.

President Reagan's tax reform plan has three objectives: First, simplification; second, economic growth; and third, fairness. I share these goals, and hope a bipartisan effort can be sustained to achieve a meaningful reform package.

But the President's package is flawed in some respects, Mr. Speaker, not the least of which is the proposal to eliminate 401(k) savings plans.

The Johnson Companies, a corporate constituent from Newtown, PA, is one of the country's leading pension and benefits consulting firms and administers hundreds of 401(k) plans.

The Johnson Companies has surveyed 480 firms around the country which have 401(k) plans to determine employee sentiment regarding their savings and pension goals.

The findings indicate high employee participation in 401(k) plans, and importantly, participation by employees of all income levels. A 401(k) plan has so many advantage for working men and women—advantages which make it clearly preferable to an individual retirement account, for example—that in many retirement plans administered by the Johnson Companies, 80 percent or more of employees participate. In fact, one concern I visited myself, Ferag, Inc., of Bristol, PA, with 130 employees, has 100 percent participation.

And contrary to Treasury Department objections concerning withdrawal features of 401(k) and other employee-sponsored savings plans, the figures compiled in the Johnson survey show that less than 2 percent of all participants have withdrawn money from the plans during the last 3 years. Over 80 percent of these withdrawals have been for home purchases, education, and medical expenses, statistics which indicate employees are utilizing the hardship withdrawal provisions in a responsible manner. The important point is that for an employee, the withdrawal option for an emergency is there. This feature, rather than being objectionable, actually promotes retirement savings and encourages employees to commit themselves to saving for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Trisha Brambley, a constituent and an account executive at the Johnson Companies, has been kind enough to provide me with a memorandum summarizing the advantages of 401(k) plans, and the support for these savings plans expressed by participants.

I would like to share with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, Ms. Brambley's memo, and I ask that it be reprinted at this point in the RECORD:

MEMO

To: Rep. Peter H. Kostmayer.
From: Trisha Brambley.

A few years ago, The Johnson Companies, a benefit consulting firm, offered me the opportunity to communicate 401(k) Salary Reduction plans to employees. At that time, 401(k) was little more than a great idea—only a handful of companies had adopted a plan. My task was to give the average employee enough information so he/she could decide if the plan was right for them. My initial thinking was that, as with IRA's, only relatively high paid workers would choose to defer income, and that employees would make frequent hardship withdrawal requests. The good news is that I was wrong. 80 to 90% of eligible employees of all salary and age levels do participate, and withdrawals are minimal. The bad news is that our government officials want to drastically stifle the growth of this plan which encourages people to do something for themselves.

I believe that government representatives are under the same misconceptions I had before I had the experience of talking to thousands of workers about 401(k) plans. The Johnson Companies has assisted hundreds of companies in adopting a plan. I think you should hear what our clients and their employees have to say about the proposed legislation.

ON SAVING FOR THE FUTURE

"This is the best benefit our company provides. I would never have this much saved without this plan. I would have spent the money who knows where."—Mechanic, Age 42, Pontiac dealership

I have seen the plan welcomed and accepted by people in all walks of life—factory workers, welders, bank tellers, nurses, etc. Payroll deduction, company matching contributions and tax deferrals make the plan attractive to virtually every worker. Many smaller corporations (those under 500 employees) cannot afford the expense of a pension plan. Their 401(k) plan represents their primary source of retirement income.

ON HARDSHIP WITHDRAWALS

"I'm planning to use my 401(k) savings for retirement, but if something really serious comes up, it's nice to know I can withdraw enough to cover the hardship without penalty; can't do that with an IRA. That's why I don't have an IRA."—Secretary, Age 31, law firm.

The Johnson Companies' survey of 650,000 participants proved that less than 2% of plan participants have requested a hardship withdrawal. Clearly, this privilege is not being abused. The misconception that these are short term savings plans needs to be corrected.

Ideally, all funds would be used for retirement. Realistically, young employees need to know they can withdraw funds for a serious reason or for a future financial burden. In order to achieve high participation from the younger employees, while encouraging retirement savings, I suggest that 25% or 50% of the account balance be available for hardship, and the balance be subject to a penalty if distributed before age 59½ and not rolled over.

ON THE FUTURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY

"I'd rather depend on my own savings than rely on Social Security."—Bank Teller, Age 27, area savings bank.

Many employees, particularly those under age 45, have expressed skepticism toward the possibility of getting any benefits from Social Security. Historically, adequate retirement income levels come from three sources: company contributions in a qualified plan, Social Security, and the employee's own savings. As reliance on Social Security decreases, reliance on a convenient, pretax method of individual savings must be encouraged.

ON REDUCING CONTRIBUTION AMOUNTS

"If they severely limit the amount the company's decision makers can put aside, they aren't going to decide to adopt a plan they can't use. Everybody loses."—CFO, communications firm.

Proposals to drastically reduce the dollar amount that can be contributed is equivalent to lowering the deferral percentage for management. Many of our clients have expressed anger, and feel they are being discriminated against.

There is an expense to a company to adopt and administer a plan. While some maximum amount is necessary, if benefits to management are little or nil, it is unlikely that these expenses can be justified. A maximum deferral of 10%, rather than a dollar amount, would be fair to employees of all salary levels.

ON CHANGING THE DISCRIMINATION TESTS

"We spent money and time to develop the computer system to calculate the discrimination test. Now they want to change it? We'd rather spend our time on projects that are more productive to our company."—President, mid-sized company.

The Actual Deferral Percentage (ADP) testing is quite complex. Corporations and recordkeeping systems have incurred considerable expense in order to comply with these regulations. The current ADP test prevents abuse, makes it impossible for the plan to favor the highly compensated, and ensures participation from all salary levels. There is no valid reason for changing what is already accomplishing non-discrimination.

401(k) plans are a social and economic benefit. The Johnson Companies, our clients, and approximately 25 million participants (voters) urge you to take action to encourage the continuation of the country's most highly perceived benefit plan.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member of the Senate on the floor.
Boldface type indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to reject tax proposals which would destroy the 401(k) concept. These employer-sponsored savings plans are good for working men and women and their families, and good for the country.

DON'T ARM THE ARABS

HON. THOMAS J. MANTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure and the privilege of meeting Mr. David Bar-Illan. Mr. Bar-Illan, a world-renowned concert pianist, is a founding member of Artists and Writers for Peace in the Middle East. He is also an active member of the Council for a Secure America, a bipartisan group concerned about America's energy future and America's support for Israel.

An editorial by Mr. Bar-Illan entitled is "Don't Arm the Arabs," appeared in the New York Times on October 14. Mr. Bar-Illan makes a compelling argument against the sale of additional sophisticated military hardware to Jordan or Saudi Arabia.

As a strong supporter of Israel, I believe the administration's proposal to allow Jordan to purchase $1.9 billion in advanced military weapons would seriously jeopardize Israel's ability to exist. I strongly urge my colleagues to read the editorial which follows. The United States has no greater friend and ally in the Middle East than Israel. We must not allow Israel's security to be weakened in any way.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 14, 1985]

DON'T ARM THE ARABS

(By David Bar-Illan)

Despite overwhelming Congressional disapproval—73 Senators have co-sponsored a resolution opposing the sale of arms to Jordan and 64 have co-signed a letter objecting to the sale of arms to Saudi Arabia—the Administration has proposed a $1.9 billion package of advanced weaponry for immediate sale to Jordan and is seriously considering a similar sale to Saudi Arabia.

Such sales would be politically counterproductive and militarily senseless. They would vitiate American credibility in the region and enhance the prospects of another war.

Two reasons are forwarded for such sales—that they are needed for the defense of "moderate" Arab regimes against radical antagonists, and that they will encourage these regimes to join the peace process.

The first argument, about Arab defense needs, disregards the realities of the region. Jordan may justifiably fear a Syrian move to annex it, but no amount of weaponry can appreciably change the balance of power between them. Only a strong Israel can serve as a deterrent to such an attack, as it did in 1970 and in 1980, when it prevented a Syrian invasion of Jordan.

Saudi Arabia needs such weapons even less. Iran, bogged down in war, is no longer menacing. There is no other external threat in sight, and the Saudi military cannot efficiently absorb equipment it already has. It is more likely that these arms are intended for use, directly or by proxy, against Israel. Though called moderate, both Jordan and Saudi Arabia have participated in every major war against Israel.

The second contention, that arms sales advance the peace process, is belied by the record. In 1981, President Reagan set specific conditions for selling AWACS planes to Saudi Arabia: Deliveries would take place only if peace initiatives were "sucessfully completed or significant progress toward that goal has been accomplished with the substantial assistance of Saudi Arabia." These conditions have not been met.

The Saudis are still in the state of war with Israel and refuse to recognize its legitimacy. They continue to wage economic war against it by boycotting companies dealing with Israel. They disseminate anti-Semitic propaganda of unmatched virulence and support rejectionist Syria and the Palestine Liberation Organization with handsome stipends. They have refused to join the peace process. In August, at the Pan-Arab Conference in Morocco, they failed to support talks between King Hussein, the Palestinians and Israel.

Unlike the Saudis, King Hussein speaks the language of moderation, but shows a discouraging disinclination to match word to deed. In return for American arms and support for his claim to Judea and Samaria, Jordan was expected to disavow violence and identify Palestinian leaders who would negotiate directly with Israel. Instead, Hussein has parroted Yasir Arafat's insistence on an international conference with Soviet participation and allowed Palestinian terrorists, banished from Jordan since 1970, to return to its soil. Under these circumstances, the sale of sophisticated arms can only be interpreted as a reward for intransigence.

True, if we do not sell arms to these countries, our European allies undoubtedly will, thus beating us to a tidy sum of petrodollars. But deplorable as such sales may be, they do not deal as severe a blow to Israel's security as American sales would. It is not only the superiority of American arms that makes them dangerous in the hands of Israel's enemies, but also that they are identical to Israeli arms. If Arab pilots, technicians and soldiers become familiar with the capabilities of the most sophisticated weapons in Israel's arsenal, Israel's qualitative edge—the only kind it can hope to maintain—will vanish. There is, too, the danger that in this totally unpredictable region of the world, the next upheaval will cause these advanced American weapons to fall into Soviet or P.L.O. hands.

Courting Arab regimes with arms sales in the hope that "just one more sale" will bring them to the conference table would be futile and would not serve American interests. The least we can do is demand that after 37 years of Arab wars against Israel those who wish to buy our deadliest conventional weapons first contribute to bringing peace and stability to the region by renouncing belligerency and negotiating directly with Israel.

EMBASSY ROW; ONE OF THE TOUGHEST IMAGE PROBLEMS IN TOWN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one role of an ambassador in a foreign country is to promote a positive image of his native country in the country to which he is assigned. This is an ambassadorial duty which ordinarily does not receive too much attention in the press. Recently, however, I ran across an interesting article about the efforts of Rodrigo Lloreda, Colombia's Ambassador to the United States, to promote a positive image of his country in the United States. As my colleagues know, Colombia is a principal source of the supply of marijuana and cocaine to the United States. While not meaning to minimize the impact of the flow of narcotics from Colombia to America, I want to alert my colleagues to the steps which Ambassador Lloreda is taking to enhance the image of Colombia in the United States.

The article entitled "Embassy Row; One of the Toughest Image Problems in Town" from the August 30, 1985, edition of the New York Times states "Still, he contends that not enough credit is given for his country's progress in the last 2 years against drug trade. More important, he complains that Colombians and Colombian organizations tend to be singled out by United States law enforcement agencies for harassment and suspicion." To support his statement Mr. Lloreda says "I just got a call today from Atlantic City. Of the 10,000 illegal aliens in the city, the district attorney decided to crack down on the 500 Colombians. He didn't do anything about the Europeans, the Asians, the Africans. Just the Colombians because they're supposedly all drug dealers."

Another case cited by Ambassador Lloreda is that of a Boeing 747 owned by Avianca, the Colombian airline, that was seized earlier this year. The Ambassador reported that "United States Customs officials found cocaine in the nightly shipment of flowers from Bogota, and even though the Colombian police had alerted Customs that the narcotics were on the plane, they impounded the plane anyway, forcing Avianca to give Customs the right to revoke its flying rights here if another case occurred."

A more pleasant task for Ambassador Lloreda was to announce a $1-billion loan by a syndicate of 200 private banks, led by Chemical Bank of New York, to develop oil and coal facilities in Colombia. "It was one of the largest extensions of new credit by American banks to a Latin America country in 2 years, and Colombia could get that much credit because it had subjected itself to some very close monitoring and austerity measures recommended by the International Monetary Fund."

Mr. Speaker, based on my visit to Colombia and other South American nations in August 1985, I am convinced there is a new awareness of the problems associated with drug use and drug trafficking among the leaders of South America. Most importantly, these leaders are now prepared to work with us to curtail the continuous flow of narcotics to American drug users. This changed attitude on the part of the leaders of some of the world's major drug-producing countries is a most welcome development. I take the time to bring this matter to the attention of my colleagues and the public, because amidst an ever-increasing supply of foreign drugs, Colombia is making a start in curtailing illicit drug production and traffic and this should not be overlooked.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article from the New York Times of August 30, 1985, entitled "Embassy Row; One of the Toughest Image Problems in Town" into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. The article follows:

EMBASSY ROW; ONE OF THE TOUGHEST IMAGE PROBLEMS IN TOWN

It is a fact of ambassadorial life that much time is spent polishing the image of one's country. But for some on Embassy Row, that is a harder task than just attending state functions and being seen with the right people.

Rodrigo Lloreda, Colombia's Ambassador to the United States, acknowledges that his country has an image problem. Mention Colombia, and pictures of drug traffickers, bales of marijuana and cocaine factories spring to mind.

Mr. Lloreda despairingly concedes that this is rightly so, for Colombia is a major source of drugs in the international market. Still, he contends that not enough credit is given for his country's progress in the last two years against drug trade. More important, he complains that Colombians and Colombian organizations tend to be singled out by United States law enforcement agencies for harassment and suspicion. As a result, he says, he regularly is called upon to settle minor political crises throughout the 50 states.

At least one United States official defends the stance on Colombia.

"We're not just picking on Colombians or Colombian airlines," said Dennis Murphy, a spokesman for the Customs Service. "We're going to stop drugs coming in from any country. And it will continue."

Whatever the case, Mr. Lloreda (pronounced your-RAY-dah) has embarked on what amounts to a public relations campaign to tell the "positive story" of Colombia in this country and try to persuade middle-level law enforcement officials to avoid immediate suspicion toward everything Colombian.

He says results do not seem to be immediately forthcoming.

"I just got a call today from Atlantic City," he said the other day in discussing the image problem. "Of the 10,000 illegal aliens in the city, the district attorney decided to crack down on the 500 Colombians. He didn't do anything about the Europeans, the Asians, the Africans. Just the Colombians because they're supposedly all drug dealers."

Such diplomatic fires, both big and small, have often been Mr. Lloreda's lot in his nine months in Washington, as he races to the scene as Colombia's top diplomatic official to work out an amicable solution. Perhaps it is good training for a man who admits he would like to be President of Colombia and might well have a chance.

Indeed, a number of Colombia's recent presidents have held the position as Ambassador to the United States. And Mr. Lloreda, having served as a Senator, Minister of Education, Foreign Minister and Vice President, is well positioned for higher office when he returns to Colombia, State Department officials say.

But the Ambassador is vexed by what he sees as a pattern of bias against his country. Take the case, he said, of the Boeing 747 owned by Avianca, the Colombia airline, that was seized earlier this year.

United States Customs officials found cocaine in the nightly shipment of flowers from Bogota, and even though the Colombian police had alerted Customs that the narcotics were on the plane, "they impounded the plane anyway," Mr. Lloreda said, forcing Avianca to give Customs the right to revoke its flying rights here if another case occurred.

"Now where in the world do you see that happening?" he said in objecting to the severity of the restriction. "It was just the need on the part of the Customs agents to show the American public they were being tough on Colombian drugs."

Today the Customs Service again showed a tough arm, fining Eastern Airlines more than $1 million after finding nearly a ton of cocaine on Colombia-Miami flights.

Continuing his argument, the Ambassador said, "I saw a TV spot recently that the United States wiped out 432,000 marijuana plants. Well, last year, we killed 9 million plants, and we didn't get any TV for that."

He recalled another incident this spring when the United States Attorney's office for the Southern District of New York froze on a Friday afternoon all the accounts of Colombia's Banco Cafetero in New York because three transactions had been traced to suspected money-laundering operations in Panama. "But why did they shut down the whole bank?" he asked. "What if they found the same transactions at Citibank or Chemical? It's absurd."

As a result of such incidents, Mr. Lloreda is trying to convince United States law agencies that Colombia is cooperating with drug eradication efforts. "The top officials know we are doing a good job," he said. "It's the middle level people who think they need publicity that give us the hardest time."

As a step, he held a news conference last week in New York to announce a $1 billion loan by a syndicate of 200 private banks, led by Chemical Bank of New York, to develop oil and coal facilities in Colombia.

It was one of the largest extensions of new credit by American banks to a Latin American country in two years, and Colombia could get that much credit because it had subjected itself to some very close monitoring and austerity measures recommended by the International Monetary Fund. But again, Mr. Lloreda complains about the treatment Colombia received from the American banks.

A BLANKET POLICY

"All through the debt crisis, we continued to pay our principle and interest," he said. "But the banks adopted a blanket policy for all Latin American countries. They treated us just as if we were in default."

Mr. Lloreda is keenly aware of the effects of negative and positive publicity. For eight years, he was the editor in chief of El Pais, the largest newspaper in his hometown of Cali.

Still, for all his country's image problems in the United States, the Ambassador's tasks sometimes have a lighter side.

"I've been working on apples lately," he said, explaining that in exchange for Colombian exports to the United States, Colombia has agreed to certain imports from this country, among them apples.

"When too many apples end up in Bogota, I'm the one who get the calls," he said

GEORGIA JONES AYERS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, eight outstanding south Floridians received the coveted Miami Herald Spirit of Excellence Award. The final selections were made by an independent, distinguished panel of judges representing a wide range of community leadership. One of the recipients was Georgia Jones Ayers, a longtime friend and resident of the 17th Congressional District. I believe they could not have chosen a more worthy honoree.

Georgia and I go back many years, and we worked together long before I was elected to Congress. She served the community as director of the Community Action Agency in Brownsville, where she proved that she is a "doer" of extraordinary ability.

Most of all, I remember Georgia Jones Ayers in the streets during the riots of the late 1960's and early 1970's. She was a commanding presence and a calming voice in the midst of the storm. Without her, as bad as it was, our community would have been a lot more devastated.

Georgia is an achiever who can cut through redtape and bureaucratic doubletalk. She never takes no for an answer when she knows she's right. She is a bedrock of strength, truth, and perseverance who has a profound impact on our community and everyone she touches.

I would like to share with my colleagues a recent newspaper article which further describes the work of this remarkable leader:

[From Tropic Magazine, Sept. 22, 1985]

THE BEST AND THE BRIGHTEST—GEORGIA AYERS, CIVIC ACTIVIST

(By Joel Achenbach)

Georgia Jones Ayers accosts one of her clients outside a courtroom.

"What do you do in your spare time?" she says in her preacher voice.

"Church. Singin' group," the man says, hangdog.

"How long you been in the church?"

"Since I was 9 years old."

"If you'd been going to church since you were 9 you wouldn't've committed all them crimes."

"Everybody backslides some," he mumbles.

"When was the last time you had a drink?"

"Well . . . Friday night. . . ."

"No more alcohol! No more Friday nights! How can you talk about the Lord on Sunday and drink on Friday?"

Sheepish, the man promises to do better. She tells him that she has made a deal with a judge and a prosecutor, and that he has to take a lie detector test to prove he hasn't committed any crimes in the past five years. Otherwise the state is going to throw him in jail on a 5-year-old attempted murder charge. He nods vigorously.

"I tell you, you better walk tall," Ayers says. "Don't you mess up."

She leaves him and goes down the escalator on her way to the jail. She says to a reporter, "If he blows it, my credibility's on the line. All I got is my name and my word."

Even by themselves the name and the word of Georgia Jones Ayers are formidable assets. She is simultaneously feared and respected, earning in a week enough enemies and friends to fill a cellblock. She roams the corridors of the criminal justice system, where she has lobbied for two decades to give another chance to the accused, where she has labored to turn bent and twisted lives on a straight path.

Ayers, 57, is an old-style black activist—fiery, militant, charismatic. She is extraordinary in her self-possession, her clarity of vision; to be in her presence is to witness a fully realized personality. She believes. She *knows*. She goes to bed with no confusion, rises with her mind made up. Her occupation is utterly out of step with the conservative mood of the '80s—she tries to keep people *out* of jail—but no critic would stand a chance against her in a staring match.

"I don't take no for an answer," she says as she corsses the street toward the jail. "If I believe in something, if I believe it's right, I'm going to do it."

A native Miamian, her will was forged in the heyday of racism, in segregated schools, in segregated neighborhoods, in a society run by and for white people. A white police officer exposed himself to her and some fellow schoolchildren when she was 13; she hasn't forgotten. In 1947 her family and her neighbors were forcibly evicted by white police from the black Railroad Shop neighborhood to make way for a white school and city park. In 1970 she was dispatched by the county manager to Liberty City to try to help quell a growing riot, only to be arrested by white police officers who she says had a grudge against her. The disorderly conduct charges were dropped. To this day, Ayers maintains that many people charged with crimes are flatly innocent.

A mother of six and life insurance saleswoman by trade, she became a courthouse gadfly in the late 1960s, an advocate for blacks who she felt had been wrongly accused or treated. In 1982 she managed to turn her passion into a profession, gaining funding from the county to start a program called Alternatives to Incarceration, under the umbrella of Transition, Inc. Her budget, now funded by the state, is at $200,000. Her salary recently jumped to $30,000 a year, but she claims she saves taxpayers many times that by keeping men and woman out of prison and returning them to productive lives. Ayers admits that she doesn't have the manpower to keep an eye on all the people she accepts into her program, but she claims that only 5 percent of her clients return to jail.

That's where she goes every day—to the county jail, where she is such a well-known and intimidating character that she barges in with her purse tucked under her arm, even though that's against the rules and gets the guards agitated. They trust her, and besides, she's got that purse in a vise grip. No one wants to pick a fight with Georgia Ayers.

"How's your son doing?" an infirmary nurse says to Ayers inside the jail.

"Fine, where he is," Ayers replies. Her son, Cecil Jones, 37, is in prison in Immokalee. She says he was convicted of selling cocaine, then got out, only to get in trouble again with drugs. She says she personally went to court to have his probation revoked. "Drugs ruined my son," she says.

She spots another client, a burly career criminal whose latest rap is robbery. He's been in jail awaiting trial for 34 months, and his kidneys don't work. He requires dialysis treatment three times a week or he'll die. Ayers is trying to get him into a halfway house.

Without a guard, Ayers leads the man into a closet-sized cell with bench seats. They face each other, knees almost touching. He's wearing pajama bottoms, sandals, a sleeveless shirt and a hair net. He has a goatee and a weathered face.

"You do have a long record. It ain't pretty," Ayers says to him.

"I'm innocent," he says, and he goes into a long explanation about how he is suing his public defender for not representing him adequately.

"You're spinning your wheels," Ayers tells him. "You're going to antagonize the system toward you."

He persists, talks about going to the Florida Bar, and she gets angry, says, "If I think you're going to do that, I'll leave your ass right where it is."

She goes up to the eighth floor and gives the guard a name, then waits in another small room. In a moment a thin 19-year-old kid comes in, looking groggy, in a T-shirt, cords and slippers. He sits down and stares at the floor, hands clasped tight, lids half mast.

"Willie. Did you know they had a shooting in the South End last week?"

"Nnnnn." Neither a yes or a no.

"Are you ready to change your company?"

"Yeah," he says, barely audible.

"I'm gonna have a talk with your mother," Ayers says sternly. "I know your family background. I know what your mother wants you to do. You have violated everything you were supposed to do. You are so hardheaded. You have had opportunities that other blacks wish they had."

She tells him to write a letter to the judge, explaining what he wants to do with his life, and maybe then he can get out of jail.

Then she goes down to the jail cafeteria for a cup of coffee. She needs a break. It's only 10:30 in the morning, and there's a lot of work still to be done.

WELCOME TO OUR NEWLY NATURALIZED AMERICANS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pleasure that I congratulate the residents of New York's 22d Congressional District who have recently chosen to become citizens of the United States, with all of the privileges, freedoms, and responsibilities that American citizenship entails.

Our Hudson Valley region in New York State is proud of its newest citizens, and I invite my colleagues to join in welcoming the following newly naturalized Americans and in extending to them our best wishes for a happy and prosperous life in their new homeland:

Mr. Leopoldo Adelino Abad, Ms. Teresita Marinas Abad, Mrs. Fauzia Abdul-Quader, Ms. Melissa Abrigo Abordo, Mrs. Elnora Cruz Abraham, Mr. Elva Abreu, Mr. Ramon Antonio Abreu, Mr. Enver R. Acevedo, Ms. Chana Ackerman, Mrs. Cristina Acosta, Mrs. Fabiola Acosta, Mr. Tindalo Adaniel, Alba & Juan Afif, Mrs. Santosh Agarwal, Mr. Satish C. Agarwal, Mrs. Helena Guedes Agostinho, Ms. Marcia Guedes Agostinho.

Mr. Paulo Rodrigues Agostinho, Ms. Darshan Kaur Ahluwalia, Mr. Horacio Ahumada, Ms. Camie Aine, Mr. Daniel Elie Alam, Elie Fayaz Alam, Fayez Elie Alam, Mr. Jean-Frederic Elie Alam, Mrs. Odette Saad Alam, Mr. Charles Jacquelin Alexis, Mr. Prosper Alexis, Bruce Anthony Alfero, Mr. Syed Hamid Ali, Mr. Keld Alstrup, Mrs. Eleonor Elizabeth Alzate, Mr. Manuel D. Amador.

Mr. and Mrs. Marciano Amador, Mr. Riadh Abdul-Majed Ameen, Mr. Sergio Amendola, Mrs. Emanuela Andreoli, Mrs. Marie Andruseczko, Mr. George Angelakis, Jule Ann Antonecchia, Mr. Andres Cruz Antonio, Ms. Iluminada Antonio, Ms. Esther Appel, Mr. Zev Appel, Ernesto B. Arayata, Mrs. Juliana Arellano, Mr. Miguel Angel Arellano, Mrs. Luz Helena Arias, Mr. Cesar Augusto Arnao.

Ms. Yvrose Myriam Assade, Ms. Marie Martine Atisme, Mr. Lionel Aurelien, Ms. Yachet Austerlitz, Mr. Herman Gustavo Avango, Mr. and Mrs. Itzhak Avla & Family, Mr. Chaim Avla, Mr. Daniel B. Azabache, Ms. Lai Ho Babel, Mr. Mohammed Solimon Badr, Mr. and Mrs. Jamil H. Bahri, Ms. Gwendolyn Bailey, Mr. Joseph Baptiste, Mr. Broderick Mendoza Baquiran, Mr. Joseph Mendoza Baquiran, Mr. Boleslaw Grzegroz Baraniecki, Ms. Maria Baraniecki, Ms. Catherine Barsoukoff.

Ms. Ofelia Marzan Bascon, Giuseppe Battaglia, Mr. Hans Rudolf Baumann, Ms. Margaret Patricia Bayliss, Ms. Nocole Bernabe Beauvais, Ms. Carlito Florendo Begonia, Ms. Olivia Begonia, Ms. Mariquita Andaya Belen, Mr. Reggie Calisen Belen, Mr. Francois Edner Belizaire, Ms. Solange Belizaire, Ms. Marlene Bellamy, Ms. Edlyne Bellevue, Mrs. Bracha Ben-Porat, Ms. Michal Ben-Porat, Ms. Ofra Ben-Porat, Shalom Ben-Porat, Ms. Alice E. Benjamin.

Lucile Benjamin, Mr. Dave D. Bergman, Mrs. Rina Bergman, Mrs. Santa Librada Berisso, Ms. Devora Berkowitz, Ms. Leah Berkowitz, Mr. Moshe Berkowitz, Ms. Marie Tenemille Bernadeau, Mr. Mario Enrique Bernal, Mr. Yosef Bernstein, Mr. Mahomed Suleman Bhana, Ms. Noorjehan Mahomed Bhana, Mrs. Parveen Bhatti, Ms. Gunalakshmi Sudarshan Bhongir, Mr. Josef E. Bickel, Mr. Roger George Bilham, Ms. Elaine Grey Binns, Ms. Cirla Birnhack.

Mr. Meir Biton, Mrs. Edwidje Blanchard, Mrs. Helen T. Bodnar, Mr. George Osei Bonsu, Ms. Marie Jacqeuline Boursiquot, Ms. Emilya Braginsky, Mr. Yan Braginsky, Mr. Vasile Braguta, Ms. Christa Brandt, Mrs. Catherine Philomena Brennan, Ms. Geraldine Rose Brennan, Mr. Thomas Anthony Brennan, Ms. Certulia Brice.

Ms. Rivka Buchinger, Ms. Helen Adamis Buford, Mr. Francis Bui, Mrs. Lucille Burkett-Hoffman, Mr. Ralph Ahmad Burrows. Ms. Anat Adika Butrico, Mrs. Norma Letitia Caamano, Ms. Marie Jhovy Cadet, Mr. Giovanni Cafiso, Ms. Lizette del Carmen Camilo, Mrs. Edith Eveline Campbell, Ms. Lisa Campe, Mr. Edward Sirabion Cankosyan, Ms. Esther Cao, Ms. Giacomina Carnetto, Ms. Teresa Caruso, Mr. Miguel Angel Casas, Mrs. Pilar Casas, Ms. Lina Castel, Ms. Juana Castillo, Ms. Conchita Rosal Cerbolles, Ms. Cristeta Torres Cerbolles, Ms. Walburga Veronika Cerillo.

Mr. Chi-Leung Chan, Mr. Danny Yu Woo Chan, Ms. Kam Fong Chan, Mr. Michael Mun Woo Chan, Mr. Sik Chiu Chan, Ms. Sara Chui Yin Chan, Ms. Grace Chang, Ms. Jean Arvilla Chang, Mr. Michael Chang, Mr. Maurice Christopher Chang, Mr. Sung Yoon Chang, Mr. Yong Pyo Chang, Mr. Chi Kim Chau Ly, Ms. Neelam Kumari Chaudhary, Mr. Por Chuan Chen, Mr. Jimmy E. Chen, Ms. Tina Ming-Lee Chen, Ms. Victoria Chen.

Adam Chris Chenard, Ms. Ramona To-Ying Cheng, Ms, Galina Cherepakhov, Mr. Naum Cherepakhov, Lucienne Michel Cheron, Mrs. Yuet Ngor Chin, Mrs. Maria Luisa Chinchay, Ms. Christina Lee Chiu, Ms. Maria Chomyk, Mr. Simon Chomyk, Mr. Sameer Choudhary, Dong Yung Chu, Mrs. Eun Sook Chu, Ms. Linda Chiu-Feng Chu, Mr. Vincent Wai-Ming Chu, Mr. Yosik Chu, Hye Kap Chung, Mrs. Myung Soon Chung.

Marcelo Cichowsky, Ms. Gisela Altagracia Martinez Cintron, Mr. Antonio Cipollaro, Mrs. Elisa Cipriano, Mrs. Rosa Ciraco, Ms. Dihna Cohen, Mr. Efraim Cohen, Mr. Seymour Cohen, Mr. Joseph Guy Colas, Ms. Denise Colin, Ms. Lourdes Maria Collado, Mr. Henderson Decourcey Colymore, Mrs. Bienvenida Milagros Concepcion Suriel, Mrs. Kathleen Condello, Mrs. Rosa Francis Cooper, Ms. Ivelisse Cordero, Mr. Felix Corona, Ms. Elaine H. Corsbie.

Mrs. Susan Anne Crawford, Mr. Antonino Croce, Mr. Manuel Constantino Cruz, Mrs. Aida Cuador, Katherine Marie Cubisino, Ms. Germaine Cues, Mr. Jaime Cuevas, Ms. Jennifer Joan Cummings, Ms. Patricia Maureen Cummins, Ms. Marie Edna Cuvilly, Mr. Damiano D'Aleo, Mr. Sebastiano D'Avella, Ms. Marie Candid Da Silva Dinis, Mr. Mohammed Ali Dabaghchian Zanjani, Mrs. Nurys Dago, Mr. Orestes Benito Dago, Ms. Lurline Myolda Daley, Ms. Malherne Dardignac.

Ms. Charmaine Deborah Darling, Ms. Cheryl Ann-Marie Davis, Mr. Hector De Leon, Mr. Gerardo De la Cruz Francisco, Mr. Pierre Antoine De la Deveze, Mr. Ottavio DeRose, Mr. Del'aurore Roddy Delagrande' Anse, Mr. Yves Max Delphin, Mr. Joubert Delsoin, Ms. Francesca Demma, Mr. Anthony Demosthene, Mr. Joseph Derlin, Mrs. Nalini Desai, Mrs. Dolores Ruivo DiBiase, Ms. Maristella DiDato, Ms. Fiordaliza Diaz, Mr. Julio Diaz, Ms. Cyla Shifra Dirnfeld, Mr. Laiq Ram Dogra.

Mr. Ernesto B. Domingo, Mrs. Florinda Barrios Domingo, Mr. Ricardo Domingo, Mr. Barnave Dorante, Ms. Maria Cuelemans Dorf, Ms. Gislaine Dorismond, Mr. Vasile Dragut, Mrs. Cynthia Doreen Drakes, Mr. Leroy McDonald Drakes, Ms. Roselys Drouinaud, Mr. Thomas Dubuisson, Mr. Cesar Dulanto, Mr. Mieczyslaw Duma, Mr. Cesar Olalia Dural, Ms. Karine Lina Altagrace Duverger, Mrs. Anna Dzebolo, Mrs. Siel Ping Egn-Hong.

Mrs. Sara Eidlisz, Ms. Chaya Chana Einhorn, Mr. Israel Einhorn, Mrs. Asma Eljamal, Ms. Margareth Claudine Ellis, Mrs. Marcela Elvir, Ms. Cristina Ramos Ennis, Mr. Marc Eshel, Ms. Delfia Ana Dilia Espinal, Mr. Simeon Estiverne, Mr. Domenick Evangelista, Mr. Vincent Augustus Evans, Ms. Nora Fadl, Zoltan Farkas, Ms. Raffaele Fascilla, Mr. Gabriel Eugen Feinstein, Mrs. Margalit Feinstein, Ms. Dorit Feldman.

Mr. Mordechay Feldman, Mr. Joseph Felix, Mr. John Fenton, Mr. Jean Vonel Fevrier, Mr. Louis Clotaire Fevrier, Mr. Salvatore Filippone, Ms. Raymonde Fils-Aime, Ms. Susan Mindy Fleischmann Schlussel, Mr. Jean Meriel Fleurismond, Ms. Marlaine Fleurismond, Ms. Imelda Fungo Flocke, Mr. Juan Antonio Flores, Mr. Ralph Alfred Flynn, Mrs. Maureen C. Foley, Mr. Kevin Wyndham Foord, Mr. Francesco Forgione, Ms. Barbara Formus, William Z. Francis & Family.

Ms. Miriam May Francis, Mr. Luis Franco, Mr. Jean Patrice Francois, Ms. Marie Irma Francois, Mr. Roger Francois, Mrs. Naomi Fried, Mrs. Elena Friedman, Mr. Loukas Fytros, Ms. Eileen Philomena Gagnon, Ms. Ute Edeltraud Gallert, Ms. Angela Garcia, Mr. Jose Elias Gracia, Mr. Jacques Garcon, Mr. Bernardo Gastelu, Mr. Herbert Martin Gastelu, Mr. Martin G. Gatdula, Ms. Marcia Marie Gayle, Mr. Pierre Marie Gelin, Mrs. Carmel Genadri.

Ms. Juana Miledys Genao, Ms. Betty Grace Genato, Ms. Evelyn George, Ms. Sara John George, Mr. Rudy Antonio Germosen, Gil Dalida Gervacio, Mr. Jorge Carlos Gimenez, Mr. Gerardo Giordano, Mrs. Maria Cristina Giordano, Mrs. Maria Immacolata Giorgio, Mr. Carmine Giuliano, Ms. Ninon Glaudin, Mr. Louis Goddard, Ms. Halina Godlewska, Ms. Deborah Ann Goldschmidt, Mr. Ernst Felix Goldschmidt, Mr. Patrick Max Goldschmidt.

Mrs. Renee Goldschmidt, Mr. Anthony Gomes, Mr. Cecilio Simbol Gonzales, Mrs. Flordeliza Ignacio Gonzales, Mrs. Georgina Maria Gonzalez, Ms. Martha Cecilia Gonzalez, Mr. Rafael Gonzalez, Ms. Zoila Rosa Gonzalez, Ms. Claristene Gordon, Mr. Glenroy Wayne Gordon, Mrs. Thelma Gordon, Ms. Raisa Gottlieb, Mrs. Giovannina Grande, Mrs. Lynette E. Green, Ms. Marie Anne Lyse Guignard, Mrs. Maria Guimaraes, Mr. Bruno Gulla, Mrs. Fiordaliza Guzman.

Mr. Socrates Guzman, Mrs. Margaret F. Haider, Mr. Tony Hakanjin, Ms. Malky Hamburger, Mrs. Brigid L. Hand, Mrs. Marlise Hanna Marchand, Mrs. Veneta Georgieva Hanson, Ms. Jacqueline Angela Hardware, Mr. Norik Haroutounian, Mr. Abbas Hashemi, Mr. Victor B. Hatcher, Ms. Deborah Diane Havner, The Hon. Carl Helstrom, Ms. Edith Mae Hendricks, Ms. Anne Marie Henriquez, Ms. Juana Henriquez, Mr. Leopoldo Henriquez, Mr. Jude Henry.

Ms. Eliza Hercule, Ms. Maria Elena Hernandez, Mrs. Solveiga Heukeroth, Ms. Mary Higgins, Ms. Sheila Ho, Ms. Aurora Hoczek, Mrs. Young Soon Hong, Mr. Naftaly Horowitz, Mr. Sean Bernard Howard, Ms. Mien Tzu Huang, Ms. Dorothy Melvena Hugh, Mr. Calvin Aston Trevor Hunter, Ms. Cheryl Ann Hunter, Ms. Julanne Ruth Patricia Hunter, Mrs. Constance L. Hyatt, Ms. Bethsaida Hyppolite, Mr. Jean Jacques Hyppolite, Ms. Fe Lero Ikalina.

Mr. Augustine Isernia, Mrs. Lolita Bagay Isidro, Mr. Wa Iu, Ms. Larisa Izraylovsky, Mr. Mikhail Izraylovsky, Ms. Marie Florine Jobouin, Mr. Hildebert Belliot Jacquet, Ms. Ilakumari Janaksinh Jadeja, Mr. Mustafa Gulamhusein Jaffer, Mr. Sadique Mustafa Jaffer, Mrs. Sherbanu Jaffer, Mrs. Marina Jankuloski, Ms. Gloria Victoria Jara, Mrs. Blanca Maria Jaramillo, Mr. Michel Andre Ronsard Jasmin, Mr. Kernizan Jeanty, Mrs. Fatima Kazim Akber Jessa, Mrs. Angela Jimenez, Mr. Julio Leonardo Jimenez.

Mr. Carlton Roye Johnson, Ms. Josefa Romulo Johnston, Mr. Charles Berresford Jordan, Mr. Eric Robert Joseph, Mr. Frito Joseph, Ms. Ketly Joseph, Ms. Lina Joseph, Ms. Rosie Francoise Joseph, Mr. Thomas Joseph Joyce, Mrs. Soknan Han Jung, Mr. Franz Jurt, Mr. Youngho Kae, Mr. Vinod Kumar Kapoor, Mrs. Vijaya Kathpalia, Ms. Chava Kaufman, Mr. Andrew Patrick Keane, Ms. Ok Jean Keh, Mr. Jocob Obi Kene.

Mr. Arisdages Keshishian, Mr. Martin Keshishian, Ms. Nazeli Keshishian, Mrs. Maryt Khachetoorian, Ms. Efrosina Khaghani, Ms. Najm Us Sahar Khan, Mr. Adolf Khidekel, Mr. Alec Khidekel, Mrs. Larisa Khidekel, Ms. Natalya Kibrik, Mr. Alber Kilerciyan, Ms. Sema Kilcerciyan, Mrs. Barbara Kim, Ms. Sa Suk Kim, Ms. Soon Ja Kim, Mr. Su Hong Kim, Ms. Young Hee Kim.

Mr. Yongsuk Kim, Ms. Mary Z. King, Ms. Wallene Leolyn Kingston, Ms. Martha Molenar Kirchner, Mr. Emil Kleyman, Ms. Natalia Kleyman, Mr. Ghassan Lodersha, Mr. Inyung Kohng, Mrs. Ajsa Kolenovic, Mr. Boris Kolesnik, Ms. Larisa Kolesnik, Ms. Maria Kolesnik, Ms. Joanne Korines, Ms. Maria Korines, Mr. Timothy Korines, Mrs. Athanasia P. Kotzias, Mrs. Magdalena Kovacs, Mr. Dov Meir Kroiser.

Mr. Mark Kuperman, Ms. Trina Kuperman, Ms. Emily Wei Tan Kwan, Mrs. Hyun Joo Kwon, Mr. Mikhail Ladnik, Ms. Nenel Ladnik, Mr. Pablito Calongcalong Ladra, Ms. Corole Mathelier Lafleur, Ms. Marie Edith Lafleur, Mr. Ornan Lafrance, Ms. Alberte Laguerre, Mr. Asok Kumar Lahiri, Mr. Anthony Lai, Mr. Hung Chi Lai, Luce & Neyade Jean Lambert, Mr. Evans Emmanuel Laratte, Ms. Tina Tap Yun Lau, Mr. Lars Olof Laurell.

Mr. Huy Quoc Le, Ms. Philana Le, Mrs. Tran Tu Le, Ms. Chaya Batya Lebovits, Ms. Donisia Lisa Lee-Hugh, Mr. and Mrs. Chiu-Hsin Lee, Mr. Don Lee, Mr. John Tae Lee, Ms. Lorna Lee, Ms. Myung Ok Lee, Mr. Robert Shun-Hsiang Lee, Mr. Won Kyoung Lee, Mr. Cazis Legerme, Mr. Dimitrios Leontitis, Mrs. Marlene Lesmo, Mr. Nelson Edward Lesmo, Mr. Simon Eduardo Lesmo, Mr. Alexander Liberman.

Ms. Frida Liberman, Mrs. Yvette Marie-Jeanne Librader, Mrs. June Eun-Ai Lim, Mr. Hsueh Wu Lin, Mr. Michey Chen Foung Lin, Ms. Tish Jean Lin, Mr. Vittal Rao Lingisetty, Mr. and Mrs. Khaim Lisnyansky, Mr. Edgar Arturo Lituma, Ms. Josephine Livia, Mr. Rafael Lopez, Ms. Halina Lopuchin, Ms. Gertrudis Estenia Lora, Ms. Georgette Per Louis, Ms. Marie Jose Gladys Louissaint, Mr. Jose Trinidad Loveje, Mr. Robert Lozier, Ms. Anna Marie Lucas, Mrs. Lydia Arayata Lucas.

Mrs. Lena L. Lucio, Ms. Nicole Lucio, Mr. Peter Lucio, Ms. Mary Ann Luckman, Mrs. Terry Brigid Luttman, Mr. Hung Minh Luu, Ms. Judith Margaret Ann MacGuire, Ms. Fredis Estocapio Macalisang, Mr. Yann Machard, Mr. Elio Maddalena, Ms. Michele Maddalena, Mr. Tiovanni Madera, Mr. Paul Mathew Maliel, Mrs. Bertha Rebecca Malka, Mr. Filomeno S. Manapat, Mr. Nick Manetas, Mr. John Marcellus, Mr. Alon Marom.

Ms. Silvana Martelli, Mr. Juan Miguel Dario Martinez, Ms. Hagit Mass, Mrs. Filomena G. Mastria, Ms. Marie Lucienne Mathurin, Mrs. Grace Matos, Mr. Felix Matthews, Mr. Lecent Alderman Mattis, Ms.

Marion Anne McGilvray, Mrs. Pamela McIntosh, Mr. Horace George McLarty, Ms. Philomena Mary McLoughlin, Ms. Lily Medor, Mrs. Flora Mejia, Ms. Carmen Zunilda Mena, Mr. Gary Menard, Mr. Teodoro Mennite.

Mrs. Eva Emily Mezei, Mr. Andre Michaelian, Ms. Zipora Miles, Ms. Sonia Miller, Mrs. Susana M. Mirco, Mr. Pat Misantonis, Mrs. Maag Mitton, Mr. Raymond Mitton, Ms. Naseem A. Mohgal, Mr. Leslie Jean-Jacques Moliere, Mr. Freddy Molina, Mr. Abbas Momeni, Mr. Ali Momeni, Mr. Renold Mompoint, Mr. Nicholaus Monczyn, Ms. Maria Monterey, Mr. Ariosto Moore, Ms. Claire Myrto Morbeth.

Ms. Josephine Marie Moreau, Mrs. Rosa Moreira, Mrs. Florencia Moreno, Ms. Ruth Moreno, Ms. Ruth Moreno, Ms. Kema Zipporal Morgan, Mr. Paul Augustus Morgan, Ms. Movanie Esmina Morris, Mrs. Nicolette Moucha, Ms. Oana Patricia Moucha, Mr. Peter Moya, Mrs. Imelda Ann Mulvey, Mrs. Elda Isoline Munoz, Mrs. Mary Murphy, Mrs. Nazneen Muslim, Mr. Ferdinand Musngi Musngi, Ms. Marjorie Renee Najac, Ms. Marie Narcisse, Ms. Stennett Baron Nathan.

Ms. Flora Chaves Navarro, Mr. Simplicio Sioson Navarro, Mr. Gregoire Robelin Nelson, Ms. Marie Solidad Nelson, Ms. Le Nguyen, Mr. Tin Xuan Nguyen, Mr. Constadinos Nianios, Ms. Dominique Marie Nicolas, Mr. Antonio Nov Nikc, Mrs. Rigaletta Nikc, Mr. Mhill Nikollaj, Mr. Karanja Edward Njiiri, Ms. Forette Noisette, Mr. Vogly Noisette, Ms. Sarah Sarayi Nyamuswa, Ms. Marina O'Connor, Ms. Lynda Ann O'Keefe, Ms. Lucrecia Ochoa.

Ms. Alda Maria Oliveira, Mr. Jose Joaquim Oliveira, Ms. Lucrecia Mencias Ordinario, Mrs. Beatrice Irma Orr, Mr. Fedor Ovchinnikoff, Ms. Zina Ovchinnikoff, Mr. Gregory Ozuna, Mr. Eduardo San Juan Paderon, Ms. Maria Teresa Paderon, Mr. Gandharva Ramaswamy Padmanabhan, Mr. Jaime Alberto Palacios, Ms. Hermosa Paman Paderon, Mr. Carl Pampolina, Ms. Jenny Lin Lin Pan, Mr. Simon Siang-Tzu Pan, Pathmini Panchacharam, Mr. Suppayah Panchacharam, Ms. Argiri Pantelis, Ms. Altagracia Paralta.

Ms. Smita Parida, Mr. Alex Park, Ms. Myrtle Cinderella Parkes, Ms. Edna Pasternak, Mr. Mordechai Pasternak, Mr. Prasanna Atmaram Patale, Mr. Anilkumar Manibhai Patel, Mrs. Mira A. Patel, Mrs. Sarojben Anilkumar Patel, Mrs. Sandhya Dhansukhlal Patel, Mr. Jerry Eloy Paz, Mr. Abraham Peled, Mrs. Yudith Peled. Mrs. Luisa Pena, Ms. Maria Ramona Pena, Ms. Wei-Li Peng, Ms. Martha Peralta, Mrs. Luisa R. Pereira.

America Perez, Ms. Patricia Paz Abril Perez, Mrs. Quan Cu Huynh Phung, Mr. Frantz Pierre-Jean, Ms. Chantale Pierre, Mr. Maxo Pierre, Mr. Gerard Pilorge, Mr. Dimas Antonio Pimentel, Mr. Ricardo Anthony Pinheiro, Mr. Giovanni Pistoia, Ms. Maria Ines Pleites, Mr. Marino Antonio Polanco, Caroline Joan Ponzini, Ms. Teresa Eva Porte, Mr. George Paul Pradas, Mrs. Malena Carmen Praino, Mr. Sanjay Prakash.

Mr. Louis Presta, Vincenza Presta, Ms. Aime Puron, Mrs. Elvira Puron, Mr. Enrique Puron, Mr. Juan Quijada, Ms. Thelma Quijada, Mrs. Margaret Rader, Mr. Vicente Ramirez-Brito, Mr. Carlos Ramirez, Mrs. Digna Dinorah Ramos, Mr. Rajendra Jivubha Rana, Chytanya P. Rangaiah, Thejomani Rangaiah, Ms. Maria E. Raquel, Ms. Nupur Nayan Raval, Mrs. Elaine Anastasia Reid, Mr. Gladstone Reid.

Mrs. Migdalia Reluzco, Mr. Ruben Baradas Remigio, Ms. Julia Reyes, Mr. Fernando Reynaltti, Mrs. Irma Dionisia Rivero, Ms. Milagros Caridad Rivero, Ms. Norisia Roberts, Mr. Audley Hugh Robinson, Mr. Fernando Ferreira Rodrigues, Ms. Noemia Maria Rodrigues, Ms. Concepcion Santos Rodriguez, Mr. Julio Rodriguez, Ms. Liliana Rodriguez, Mr. Orlando Panergo Rodriguez, Mr. Tomas DeJesus Rodriguez, Mr. Gerald Joseph Rogers, Efraim Dario Diaz Rojas, Mr. Jomary Antonia Rojas.

Mr. Ernesto Oscar Romano, Ms. Josephine Isernia Romano, Mrs. Candelaria B. Romero, Mr. Agustin Buenaventura Romulo, Mrs. Gina Rosales, Mr. Andree Rose Eloi, Mr. Daniel Rosenfeld, Ms. Malka Rotenstreich, Mrs. Palmira Esteves Sa, Mr. Michel Sabba, Ms. Celia Mercado Sagullo, Mr. Mohan Singh Saini, Ms. Surjit Kaur Saini, Ms. Mercedes Saint-Cloud, Ms. Ketly Saint-Vil, Ms. Marie Chantale Saintil, Ms. Cira Saiz, Ms. Elvia Nelly Salazar.

Mrs. Gladys Sam, Mr. Nicanor David Samson, Mr. Cesar Orlando Sanchez, Ms. Maria Mercedez Sanchez, Mr. Carlos Sancho, Ms. Miryam Alexandra Sancho, Ms. Roza Sandel, Mrs. Margareta Sandmann, Ms. Angela Ynes Rodriguez Santos, Mr. Alvin Bernard Ceasar Fonacier Santos, Ms. Josephine Delos Santos, Ms. Nely Altagracia Santos, Ms. Virginia Guevarra Santos, Mr. Andre Ernst Sanz, Mr. Joao Pedro Sarabando, Ms. Paula Saraiva, Ms. Ana Maria Sarmiento.

Ms. Kamlesh Kumari Sawhney, Mr. Suman Kumar Sawhney, Mr. Vasile Sbengheci, Mrs. Brenda Isabel Scher, Mr. Jonathan Scher, Mrs. Johanna L.W. Schiff, Aliza Schild, Ms. Britta I. Schulz, Mr. Corazon Domingo Schuttenberg, Susan Wile Schwarz, Ms. Marva Evadney Scott, Mr. Svein Ole Sedeniussen, Clive Segal, Mrs. Martha Lilia Seminatore, Ms. Latisha Michele Raymond Senat, Pratish Mahendra Shah.

Mr. Rajendra Kantilal Shah, Mr. Mohamed Ali Sheriff, Ms. Bluma Shmuel, Ms. Irma Shterenberg, Mr. Markus Shterenberg, Mr. Adam Sidor, Ms. Maria Anna Sidor, Mr. Anthony Gerard Sieverding, Ms. Lorna Marcia Simpson Silberbush, Ms. Luzenda Farin Silva, Ms. Marie Remone Simeon, Ms. Marie Renee Simon, Mr. Avtar Singh, Mrs. Baldev Kaur Singh, Mrs. Elsa Cuevas Sirken, Ms. Haydee Marcela Skollar, Ms. Estelle Small.

Ms. Ann Marie Smith, Ms. Beata Barbara Smoron, Ms. Eva-Maria Sommer, Mr. Lutz Sommer, Ms. Kwanjai Ratanavonase Sookvibul, Mrs. Marie-Louise Sorhaindo, Mr. Juan R. Soriano, Ms. Barbara Mathilde Sosser, Mr. Gordon G. Spence, Mrs. Rivka Spielman, Mr. Jean-Claude St. Cloud, Mr. Pierre Monet St. Vil, Mr. Agostino Stagliano, Mrs. Elisabetta Stagliano, Ms. Elizabeth Standish, Miss Zipora Stein, Miss Kimberlee Stern.

Ms. Cipora Stockhamer, Mr. Jehoshua Stockhamer, Miss Sara Stotesbury, Mrs. Judith Strulovic, Ms. Mirka Studnicka, Mr. Zdenek Studnicka, Ms. Tania Stutman, Mr. Chiang Sung, Mr. Suraphongs Suphatranand, Mr. Ramon Antonio Suriel, Mr. Loreng Pacis Tacadena, Ms. Pauline Elaine Taylor, Mr. Troy Guy-Luis Theodore Taylor, Ms. Lourdes Almeda Tedesco, Mr. Antonio Testa, Mrs. Daksha Jyotin Thaker.

Mr. Dalton Dwight Thomas, Ms. Mary Thomaskutty, Mr. David Hsiung Ting, Mr. Wilson Zoen Gee Ting, Ms. Ivonne Tirro, Mr. Peter Tolentino, Ms. Visitacion Ranchez Tolentino, Ms. Sciencia Torshon, Mr. Louis Theart Touzin, Ms. Marie Martine Trevil, Ms. Sue-Jen Tsai-Chen, Mr. Chi Hong Tsang, Ms. Marisa Chui Mee Tsang, Mrs. Belkis Fatma Tugal, Ms. Ana Maria Auxiliadora Uribe, Mr. Suavi Dogan Usluca.

Mr. Giovanni Vairo, Mrs. Marisa Vairo, Ms. Marjorie Valbrun, Mr. Domenico Valente, Mr. Luis Valenzeula, Ms. Teodosia Valenzuela, Mr. Victor Valenzuela, Mr. Rolando A. Valle, Mr. Hai Van Nguyen, Mr. Yusuf Venjara, Ms. Venice Verdieu, Mr. Bruno Vesuvio, Ms. Martha Vidueira, Mrs. Mercedes Julia Villaflor, Mr. Antonio Villanueva, Ms. Josephine Baltazar Villanueva, Mrs. Maria Cruz Villegas, Mr. Alberto Viloria, Mr. Jovencio Ronquillo Viloria.

Ms. Caren Vilson, Mrs. Miriam Georgina Vinas, Ms. Ivorine Virgo, Mr. Ernest S. Voyard, Mrs. Eveline Voyard, Ms. Naina Tara Vunnam, Mrs. Wendy Patricia Waithe, Mr. Paramjit Singh Walia, Mr. Lloyd George Walker, Mrs. Ana Dolores Walters, Mr. Luis A. Walters, Ms. Adina Waltzer, Ms. Cindy Ruey-Tsang Wang, Mr. Howard Tsung Haou Wang, Mr. Karl Ke-Lu Wang, Ms. Kathy Kuei-Hwa Wang, Mr. John Joseph Ward, Ms. Rose Ward, Ms. Shahla Weg, Mr. David Weiss, Ms. Edith Weiss, Mr. and Mrs. Eliezer Weisz, Mr. Young Whi Kim.

Ms. Barbara Millicent Wilkins, Honor R. Williams, Ms. Nellie Marcia Melody Williams, Mr. Daniel Kamwah Wong, Mr. and Mrs. Jen-Chun Wu, Mrs. Shen P. Wu, Ms. Kei Yamamoto, Mr. Yoshihiro Yamazaki, Mr. Leon Luna Yasay, Ms. Chang Young, Mrs. Parvin Youssefyeh, Mr. Raymond Youssefyeh, Mr. Juan Francisco Yumart, Mr. Anatoly Zabludovsky, Mr. Michelet Zamor, Mr. Wiktor Donat Zarczynski, Ms. Sarit Georgia Zeidman, Mr. Tibor Zelig, Ms. Yanina Zeltser, Mr. German Zhuravlev, Ms. Iffat Ziaullah.

Ms. Hilda Celeste Franjul de Gomez, Mr. Macario Arabejo de la Paz, Mr. William Raul Hernandez, Sheila Neier.

DICK ARCARA TESTIFIES BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of my colleagues to the testimony of Erie County District Attorney Richard J. Arcara before the House Judiciary Committee's Crime Subcommittee on September 12, 1985. Mr. Arcara's extensive experience and excellent record in the area of law enforcement, as well as his role with the National District Attorney's Association, make him a valuable source of information on the subject of money laundering.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider Mr. Arcara's thoughtful suggestions concerning this matter.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF RICHARD J. ARCARA

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Crime Subcommittee, my name is Richard Arcara. I am a former United States attorney for the western district of New York and the district attorney for Erie County, Buffalo, New York and I speak to you today on behalf of the National District Attorneys Association. Our association represents

6,300 local prosecutors from around the country.

We thank you for this opportunity to address our concerns regarding the various money laundering bills which you consider today. My remarks will be confined to those proposed legislative changes which would create the new crime of money laundering and to forfeiture proceedings. The Nataional District Attorney's Association's primary concerns are that the legislation be broad enough to provide the Government a most effective tool to combat organized criminal groups, from drug trafficking rings to more traditional organized crime (families), yet narrow enough to avoid cumbersome, unnecessary and undesirable intrusions into matters of State concern.

Mr. Chairman, we feel that you have our latter concern in mind when you offered House Resolution 1474. You eliminate the intrusive aspects of the legislation by including as a crime only those transactions involving a financial institution. You further limit the scope of the proposed crime by including those transactions involving property derived from a crime under the Rico statute. In so limiting the offense, H.R. 1474 avoids the possibility of Federal intrusion into the province of the State. I think that all parties would agree, however, that organized crime does not confine its money laundering operation to financial institutions, nor does organized crime limit its illegal but profitable operations to violation of the Rico statute. While we understand that rationale for these restrictions, we feel that the desired harmony with State law may be achieved through means which would afford the Federal Government a greater opportunity to assail money laundering operations.

While the administration's proposals, H.R. 2785 and 2786, attempt to provide the Government with the ability to strike at virtually all money laundering operations, we feel that a literal interpretation of the administration's legislation may result in unintended Federal intrusions into crimes which are better suited to State prosecution. Specifically, any crime involving the transfer of money, checks, or other monetary instruments could be considered a money laundering "transaction" under the administration's proposal. A theft, a robbery, a bad, forged or altered check would become a Federal money laundering offense.

We came not to criticize, but to offer constructive alternatives which may reconcile the two important concerns of Federalism and effective law enforcement. Firstly, we recommend as an alternative to the limitation in scope to Rico offenses that the prohibited transaction be defined in such a manner that State crimes would not constitute a "transaction." Perhaps the transaction could be defined as a voluntary, nonfraudulent transaction between the parties. This should eliminate conflict with existing State laws. As an additional safeguard, we recommend that a jurisdictional threshold be imposed, such as a $10,000 minimum, in the definition of the proscribed transaction. This limit should not hinder the money laundering legislation's effectiveness, since the Federal Government lacks the resources to pursue smaller incidents. Also, it is unlikely that organized crime would engage to any great degree in laundering operations smaller in size.

Secondly, we recommend that the offense include the laundering of money obtained from State crimes. Since little, if any, State regulation exists in this area, and since the control of organized crime is historically and logically an area for Federal legislation, we feel comfortable with the application of the proposed money laundering offense to the illicit proceeds of State crimes.

Finally, we are quite concerned that the forfeiture provisions of the administration's proposals could lead to unnecessary interference with State forfeiture proceedings. Currently, approximately one half of the States provide for the forfeiture of proceeds of illicit activities. It would cause serious discord between the Federal and State enforcement agencies if Federal agencies were allowed to institute proceedings which would conflict with State forfeiture actions. Therefore, if this committee is inclined to include a forfeiture provision, we would urge you to codify a policy granting deference to State forfeiture laws or at the very least, prohibiting Federal preemptions of previously initiated State forfeiture proceedings. I thank you for your attention and stand ready to answer questions.

DAV OPPOSES GRAMM-RUDMAN-HOLLINGS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, although many of us in the House and Senate support the objective of fiscal responsibility and the elimination of the Federal deficit, it is becoming clear that the so-called Gramm-Rudman-Hollings balanced budget amendment is not what it purports to be. As passed by the Senate, the proposal would certainly eliminate the Federal deficit by 1991. It would do so, however, on the backs of the underprivileged and unfortunate in our society. This vehicle to balance the budget is rigged with a time bomb that will destroy the fabric of our society.

The Disabled American Veterans argue in the letter I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings amendment would unfairly discriminate against some 2.2 million service-connected disabled American veterans. The DAV correctly points out that in our quest to deal with the Federal deficit we cannot permit the wholesale pillaging of legitimate and essential social programs.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, DC, October 10, 1985.

GRAMM/RUDMAN/HOLLINGS BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT HAS BROKEN THIS NATION'S COMMITMENT TO ITS DISABLED VETERANS

DEAR MEMBER: Our nation's 2.2 million service-connected disabled veterans' disability compensation payments will be *cut* by *3% immediately* and almost *25%* over the next five years. In addition, *11,000* VA health care personnel will be *terminated* if the Senate-passed Gramm/Rudman/Hollings so-called "balanced budget amendment" is accepted by the House of Representatives.

As you know, this measure was stampeded through the Senate and slaps the burden for reducing the federal deficit squarely on the backs of this nation's disabled veterans and their families, while, at the same time, leaving Social Security intact.

While the DAV has no quarrel with any *fair* proposal that seeks to remedy our nation's economic problems, we are, however, adamantly opposed to any measure that fails to treat service-connected disabled veterans comparably with any other categories of federal beneficiaries.

Clearly, the Gramm/Rudman/Hollings balanced budget amendment proposes disparate treatment for our nation's disabled veterans.

Therefore, on behalf of the one and one-quarter million members of the DAV and its Ladies Auxiliary, I strongly urge you to reject the Gramm/Rudman/Hollings amendment.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. LINDEN, Jr.,
National Commander.

ON "REAGAPOLICY" AND THE POOR

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, today I want to share a letter with my distinguished colleagues, a letter from one of my constituents. She is a charming senior citizen who is socially conscious and is also a Social Security recipient. Her personal experience, a part of which is conveyed in the letter, can provide us with valuable insight.

While President Reagan gladly slashes funds from the Food Stamp Program, more of our fellow citizens suffer from hunger. Indeed, my constituent, with a keen eye, conveys dire distress at seeing men "taking food from the garbage bags in front of restaurants."

President Reagan pours a colossal, nearly incomprehensible, amount of money into the National Defense Program and cares very little for desperately needed social programs. Are defense needs truly met? If so, where is the defense for the poor?

My constituent lives in a maelstrom of proverty. She suffers poverty everyday of her life and has done so even before Reagan's election. I ask you: Is this a person who is supposedly better off than before, as President Reagan consistently argues about the status of the poor?

What has happened to the ideal of helping our neighbors when they are in distress? What has happened to the close companions of democarcy, that of sharing bread when there is little, that of looking foward to a brighter future?

My constituent and, no doubt, millions like her have little hope for the future. Yet, she graciously thanks us all for stopping the President from freezing Social Security benefits. Clearly, she's grateful for the little we can do.

I hope we all remember this letter when we vote on issues reflecting on the plight of the needy.

I appeal to the President's sense of humanity and compassion.

The letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1985.

I thank you for remembering my birthday. I'm grateful to Congress for not letting President Reagan freeze Social Security. Some of us get very little.

I'm concerned about unemployment and crime. Since Reagan became President, he cut out a lot of social programs. I've seen men taking food from garbage bags in front of restaurants. It's very sad. My son completed computer programming and can't even get a job in that field.

The next time we have an election, I hope a Democrat wins because they're for the poor and not the rich. The building I live in is city-owned. It used to be taken care of by agents and it became run-down. Now the city is fixing the building and the apartments. It will be better to live here. There is not place to move to.

I appreciate your newsletter. Keep them coming. I enjoy them.

Sincerely,

MRS. GENEVA WARLEY,
Bronx, NY.

UNFAIR TAXATION OF PENSION PLANS AND RETIREMENT BENEFITS

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues on the House Committee on Ways and Means are currently deliberating tax reform proposals. I have received a timely letter from one of my constituents, H. Samuel Spradling of my hometown of Mayfield, KY, who is manager of Mayfield's J.C. Penney Co.

Sam Spradling is opposed to changes to the income tax code which will limit the amount a person can contribute on a tax deferred basis to his or her savings and profit sharing plan. He is also opposed to other changes that will adversely affect a person's retirement benefits.

I agree with my constituent's comments about these proposals. I urge my colleagues to read his excellent comments. The letter to me from Sam Spradling follows:

August 28, 1985.

Congressman CARROLL HUBBARD,
2182 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CARROLL: I am writing to voice my concern over the Treasury Two Tax Proposals, as regards changes which will affect retirement benefits.

The proposed changes, as I understand them, would limit the amount which the participant can contribute on a tax deferred basis to my company's Savings and Profit Sharing Plan. Changes would also limit the amount which the Company contributes to this plan. Changes would also abolish the 10 year averaging provision, taxing the lump sum distribution at retirement as current year income.

I cannot understand the logic of this proposal in a time in which we have a national debt beyond comprehension, largely due to individual dependence on the Federal Government to provide for their personal needs. This proposal if passed will only remove the incentive for our associates and others to provide for themselves in the retirement years.

Although I agree with the proposal in principle, I must take exception to this part of the proposal in particular.

Much has been done in recent years to give incentive to the American taxpayer to provide for retirement needs, and not depend entirely on Social Security, Medicaid, and Medicare, plus other Government programs to provide for him.

I would hate to see this incentive removed, and millions of taxpayers become disenchanted with Retirement Savings Programs, becoming more dependent on the Federal Government to provide for them that which they could have provided for themselves.

I am personally counting on you to vote the voice of thousands in Kentucky who will be adversely affected by this proposal, and which will add a continuing burden on the Federal Budget for years to come. Your vote is needed NOW, to help provide for the needs of this and future generations, by encouraging them to provide for themselves.

I offer you my help and support, in any way possible, to defeat this proposal.

Sincerely,

H. SAMUEL SPRADLING,
Manager, J.C. Penney Co., Inc.

KEEPING AMERICA STRONG

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1409, military construction authorization for fiscal year 1986. The military construction package, put together by the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, benefited from the great leadership of Chairman DELLUMS.

We from the Sacramento area are very proud of our bases and concerned about their having the resources and facilities to do their jobs as well and economically as possible.

I endorse the military construction legislation as it presently stands before the House of Representatives. However, our colleagues in the Senate conference omitted one important provision, that of the Logistics Systems Operations Center at McClellan Air Force Base. I urge my colleagues to reinstate that funding in conference.

I call to the attention of the House a letter I have received, in support of the Logistics Systems Operations Center, from Maj. Gen. Dewey K.K. Lowe, former commander at McClellan.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
McClellan AFB, CA, July 19, 1985.

Hon. ROBERT T. MATSUI,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MATSUI: Soon you will be considering Military Construction Authorizations for FY86 in joint committee. As you do, I ask that you keep in mind the mission of McClellan AFB, and the importance of the Logistics Systems Operations Center to that mission.

As one of the five Air Logistics Centers in the Air Force Logistics Command, McClellan AFB must render critical support to logistics systems contributing to the readiness of our Armed Forces. Many of these systems are not as visible as the aircraft which populate other bases; however, the complex radar systems, electronic warfare and counter measures devices, world-wide communications equipment and aircraft embedded computers serviced at McClellan AFB are no less critical to a complete national defense posture. The operation of managing these logistics systems is a monumental challenge, and one which can only be met successfully and cost effectively by automated data processing equipment (ADPE). The ADPE must, in turn, be housed in a facility that provides adequate space, security and an efficient layout. The weakest link in this chain of technological support at McClellan AFB is the building, which is a scattered conglomeration of former warehouses. The existing facilities are poorly configured, physically impossible to secure to current standards, and incapable of supporting the growth of expanding systems. Failure to provide the facility will curtail the ability to support new ADPE for managing weapons systems and logistics programs affecting the entire Air Force. It will also derail a major improvement in information security and exposure to terrorist action.

The rapidly expanding technology support which McClellan AFB is tasked to provide makes it crucial that this facility be provided. The project is supported by the Administration's current budget and by the House Armed Services Committee; however, it was omitted from the Senate's authorization bill, due only to budgetary constraints. I am confident it merits your support for retention in the joint conference. If I may be of assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me or members of my staff.

Sincerely,

DEWEY K.K. LOWE,
Major General, USAF,
Commander.

I believe that the other projects at the three Sacramento bases, agreed to by the House Armed Services Committee, are equally essential to the maintenance and support of our conventional forces.

The bill includes two facilities at Mather Air Force Base: A life support equipment building and an accounting and finance building.

Currently, life support equipment for aircraft crews at Mather AFB is stored in four separate substandard buildings. These structures have become increasingly inadequate to protect sensitive and sophisticated equipment.

The accounting building is in similarly unsatisfactory condition. The environment is inadequate for the expensive computers housed inside.

The Sacramento Army Depot, Mr. Speaker, is in need of $4.5 million for an expanded electro-optics facility. The depot is the Army's principal base for repair and maintenace of night vision systems, thermal imaging systems, laser rangefinders, and laser target designation systems. In the next few years, it will be the prime maintenance center for a number of related systems. The principal structure housing this work was built in 1946. It makes no sense to house

more than $40 million worth of sensitive test and calibration machinery under old, leaky wooden roofs. This bill will provide an adequate shelter.

Another worthy project in the committee report is a new facility to service, adjust and test microwave communications and tactical radar equipment. The major repair of this equipment is now being done in three trailers and an old plywood barn. What is needed and is provided in this bill is one facility in which to locate all of the repair functions for this equipment. That building will serve to protect the test and repair machinery adequately and to shield the microwave radiation and sensitive signal information from damage.

The committee report requests five projects at our largest facility, McClellan Air Force Base, totaling almost $54 million. We from Sacramento are pleased that McClellan is being recognized as the only Air Force facility for repair and maintenance of aircraft on the west coast.

Three of the McClellan projects concern buildings where the repair and maintenance of airplanes is performed: One building is where work on airborne and ground generators and electromechanical components is being done, the second building is for electronic warfare and communications components and the third building is for automated data processing. The three functions are currently performed at more than 30 buildings on the base, separated by as much as 3 miles.

Because McClellan is a massive industrial complex, it needs an up-to-date facility for occupational medicine. That function is currently performed in a string of World War II-era buildings. A new clinic can provide primary care for the active duty personnel at the base and appropriate care for the large number of employees.

The construction work necessary to support a hush house will relieve noise problems on the west side of the base and allow increased jet engine testing in that area of the base.

I regret that funding for a regional waste water reclamation system was cut from the McClellan request for fiscal year 1986. I testified at hearings before the Readiness Subcommittee on the problem of toxic wastes at military bases. The objective is to do whatever is necessary to clean up existing contamination and prevent it in the future. This is not a problem which lends itself to deferred solutions. The growing production of water, used in the plant and treated, simply cannot continue to be permitted to flow into small ground streams; it needs to be conducted into the local sewage system.

Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the leadership of the Armed Services Committee and Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities. During the relatively brief period of time in which I have served as the elected representative of the citizens of Sacramento in Congress I have seen numerous improvements at our bases. Each of these improvements have enhanced the readiness of our conventional forces through increased productivity and improved morale among the people who work in those facilities.

ESSEX COUNTY COLLEGE DEDICATES GYMNASIUM

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, next week marks the beginning of a new era for a very important institution in my home district. Essex County College will hold a week-long open house to acquaint the people of Essex County with its educational programs. Two dedications will highlight the week's ceremonies—the new physical education building and day care center at the main Newark campus, and the newly expanded West Essex Extension Center in West Caldwell.

I am very proud to be participating in the dedication of the physical education building on Monday, October 21. Essex County College has functioned for seventeen years as an open admissions institution providing quality education at an affordable cost. There are currently 6,000 students enrolled at the main campus in Newark and at satellite centers throughout the county. The college has maintained a dedication to excellence in education, with academic programs specifically designed to meet the diverse needs of a diverse student body. In all its activities, Essex County College strives to consider the needs of each student, and to prepare them for life's future challenges.

The new gymnasium is a welcome addition to Essex County College. Even without such a facility, Essex County College has produced an impressive athletic achievement record, including 24 championship teams in track and men's and women's basketball. Eight student athletes from Essex County College track teams have participated in Olympic competition, and many others have gained all-American honors in soccer, track, and basketball.

Now, with this fine new physical education building, we can look to an even more impressive athletics program. The pursuit of excellence at Essex County College will be furthered by this new facility.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to salute some of the people responsible for making Essex County College the fine institution it is today. First of all, President A. Zachary Yamba, provides outstanding leadership, and is the guiding force behind the college. Another employee of Essex County College is my dear friend, Connie Woodruff, who brings tremendous commitment and professionalism to the college's public relations department. And all of the members of the board of trustees share a deep sense of dedication to Essex County College: Clara Dasher, chairperson of the board of trustees; Ann Cooper, vice chairperson; Sarah Bost, secretary-treasurer; and board members Frank Alexander, Alwin Arce, Stephen Edelstein, Thomas Ercolana, Alfonso Roman, Dr. Elena Scambio, Barbara Thomas, and Junius Williams.

JCRC STATEMENT ON APARTHEID

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on September 29, 1985, thousands of Philadelphians took part in a rally to express their outrage at the evils of the South Africa system of apartheid. The rally—and counterparts across the Nation—was sponsored of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Opportunities Industrialization Center.

I offer for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, the remarks by one participant at the rally, Mr. Barry Ungar, a respected Philadelphia attorney who serves as president of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Greater Philadelphia:

REMARKS BY BARRY UNGAR

We in the Jewish community well understand what apartheid means. We well understand what it means to be singled out, because of your birth, for deprivation, for persecution, and even for death. We know what it means when others do not realize that all you want for your family is what they want for their family—freedom and the right to participate in the shaping of your own future—and most importantly, the right to equal dignity to which all of God's children are entitled.

That is why, over 5 years ago, the Jewish Community Relations Council of Philadelphia publicly called for a common struggle against apartheid, declaring "that the South African apartheid system is incompatible with our traditional belief in the dignity of all humans and our commitment to secure full freedom for every man, woman and child. We find the concept that a person's rights and status in society can be defined by his birth to be totally repugnant."

And that is why over 5 years ago all of the major national Jewish organizations and 111 Jewish communities throughout the United States publicly reiterated and reaffirmed their unanimous and total denunciation of apartheid as repugnant to Jewish tradition and incompatible with the commitment of the Jewish community to equality and equal justice without regard to race, religion, nationality or sex.

And that is why the Jewish Community in South Africa itself has publicly recorded, and I quote "its support and commitment to justice, equal opportunity and removal of all provisions in the laws of South Africa which discriminate on grounds of color and race, and rejects apartheid."

Apartheid is a sin and an abomination. It is a sin and an abomination not only for the despicable principle upon which it is based, but also because it brings so much pain and suffering to real, individual, human beings. There are many brave people who risk their freedom and their very lives to resist this oppressive regime. We must resist with them. As Eli Wiesel has said, "Without such resistance, we would all be accomplices."

RADIO FREE AFGHANISTAN BEGINS SERVICE

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that, on October 1, 1985, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty began a new service broadcasting to Soviet-occupied Afghanistan. Radio Free Afghanistan has become a reality.

The Soviet occupation of Afghanistan remains the most blatant example of aggression in the world today. Immediately upon invading the country in 1979, Soviet forces murdered the Afghan head of state who had invited them in. The Soviets then installed their own puppet government, which continues to exist only because of the more than 100,000 Soviet troops still in Afghanistan. But because of the fierce Afghan resistance, the Soviets have become bogged down. They feel confident of their control only over the handful of major cities in Afghanistan. But even in the cities, including the capital of Kabul, resistance is strong, making life perilous for the occupying forces.

This fact was broadcast to the people of Afghanistan on Radio Free Afghanistan's first day of operations. In addition to reporting the Soviets' unsuccessful efforts to regain control of the town of Khost, the Afghans learned that a Soviet transport plane near Kabul had been downed, and heard confirmation of rumors of a rocket attack against the Soviet Embassy and the demolition of a depot in Kabul. It is revealing that in the democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the only objective source for news on the war comes from outside of the country.

As the ranking Republican member of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Operations, I was concerned about the lack of surrogate home broadcasting to Afghanistan similar to the highly respected services provided to the Soviet-dominated countries of Eastern Europe by Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty. During hearings on legislation reauthorizing the activities of the Board for International Broadcasting, we were informed that Afghanistan was not on the list of countries legally considered Soviet-occupied nations. Without such designation, broadcasts to Afghanistan were prohibited. The Department of State authorization bill, which passed Congress in July, corrected this glarirg omission. As the Member who offered the amendment permitting broadcasting to Afghanistan, it is gratifying that Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty acted swiftly, and had Radio Free Afghanistan on the air the first day the legislation took effect.

Throughout history, truth has always been tyranny's greatest enemy. I would like to submit for the delectation of my colleagues the reaction of the Soviet official news service, TASS, to the initiation of radio broadcasting to Afghanistan:

INCITING ENEMIES OF THE REVOLUTION

(By TASS Commentator Pyotr Parkhitko)

Moscow, September 30, 1985.—Disinformation is Washington's favorite trick used whenever it wants to justify its policy of terror in interstate relations—the policy spearheaded against national liberation movements. The latest proof of that is the report that a new radio station, provocatively calling itself "Free Afghanistan Radio" and payrolled by the United States, begins its broadcasts from Munich, West Germany, starting from October 1.

Why should the White House start a new operation in its "undeclared war" on sovereign Afghanistan? That's because the reality in that country contradicts the picture which U.S. propaganda is trying to spread. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan made a notable headway in economic development and in the social sphere. The high jirgah of frontier tribes held in Kabul recently took note of the growing unity of the Afghan people and its determination to defeat the forces of international imperialism and internal reaction. Refugees deceived by western mass media are returning home by the thousands. Former counterrevolutionaries down arms and take the side of the people's government. Despite intimidation and terror, the peasants who received land from the people's government for their free use are unwilling to meet the demands of the bandits sent into Afghanistan from Pakistani territory.

All this contradicts the plans of the White House which prods the enemies of the revolution into staging new operations against the legitimate authorities and the people of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, and provokes a military conflict in the region. That is why in a bid to intensify the anti-Afghan campaign Washington chose to spend the taxpayer's money in order to fund another lie-mongering radio station.

For the eighth year now the Afghan people is successfully building a new life and is courageously countering the designs of imperialism and reaction. And no radio station financed by Washington can reverse by means of lies and slander the ongoing development of sovereign and democratic Afghanistan.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE RETIREMENT OF THE REVEREND JAMES E. JONES

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, on October 26, 1985, the family and friends of Rev. James E. Jones will honor his 36 years of service to the Los Angeles community at a retirement luncheon to be held at the Airport Marriott Hotel. I join them in wishing him a happy and fulfilling retirement, and would like to share with my colleagues a brief glimpse of the man we have long admired and respected.

Pastor of the Westminster Presbyterian Church, Reverend Jones has been an integral part of the lives of hundreds of parishioners. His wise counsel and patient guidance has been a welcome and constant influence in the everyday decisions made by citizens of the Westminister community.

Over the years, Reverend Jones has been actively involved in summer remedial classes for elementary school children; coordinated a food, clothing, a book and medical supply drive for the people of Hattiesburg, MS; brought high school graduates to Los Angeles for a college education; counseled gang leaders and their followers; and maintained church classes for the mentally handicapped.

Reverend Jones also served on the Los Angeles School Board from 1965 through 1969, and was elected president of the board in 1968. During his tenure, he was a forceful leader in advocating programs that promoted educational excellence within the school system and encouraged academic achievement by LA students.

A member of numerous religious and civic groups, Reverend Jones exemplary organizational and leadership skills found additional outlets in his work as an innovator of Project IMAGE; advisor and supporter of the exceptional Children's Foundation; consultant to the Rockefeller Fund on Seminary Recruitment; playwright, director and producer of Religious Readers' Theater; and, as a lecturer and spiritual leader at various college campuses.

Even though he is retiring, I am certain Reverend Jones will remain a vibrant force in Los Angeles and in his ministry. His accomplishments at Westminster and in the Southern California community will always be remembered, and will serve as the yardstick by which the rest of us will forever measure our own sense of purpose.

Rev. James E. Jones is a thinker, a dreamer, and a doer. In acknowledging the accomplishments of his service to God and community, I give special recognition to a human spirit we should all strive to emulate.

I join his wife, Mimi, his children, Roger, Judith, and Lois, and his three grandchildren, Nicole, David, and Matthew, in welcoming him to a well-deserved retirement, and echo the sentiments of his friends in wishing him the very best as he begins this new chapter of his life.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, at the request of the administration, legislation to correct an oversight in the Bankruptcy Code that has severely affected the ability of the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Commerce to administer the Loan Guarantee Program for U.S.-flag vessels and fishery facilities. This proposal was prepared by the Department of Transportation and is related to a similar bill prepared by the Department of Commerce, which I have also introduced today.

Pursuant to the Loan Guarantee Program (title XI of the Merchant Marine Act

of 1936) the Government guarantees obligations to finance the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of U.S.-flag vessels. The Secretary of Transportation administers the program for U.S.-flag commercial vessels, and the Secretary of Commerce has similar authority with respect to fishing vessels and fishery facilities. The availability of title XI aid in financing various vessel construction and related projects has provided an incentive for modernizing and expanding our merchant fleet and fishing industry. The title XI Program has attracted capital from private investors on a long-term basis, because the purchaser of title XI guaranteed obligations knows that if the shipowner or facility owner does not pay the obligations, the U.S. Government will. This debt capital would not otherwise be available to applicants for title XI guarantees, except at a higher rate of interest and with much shorter maturities, or would not be available at all.

The security of the Government for issuing a title XI guarantee is usually a preferred mortgage on the vessel or a realty mortgage on the fishery facility. When there is a default by a shipowner or a facility owner on a title XI obligation, the Secretaries are responsible for the payment of outstanding obligations, and generally will foreclosure on the ship mortgage at an admiralty foreclose sale or on the realty mortgage at a foreclosure sale.

Prior to the enactment of the Bankruptcy Code—Public Law 95-598, approved November 6, 1978—section 703 of the act of July 1, 1898, prohibited the Bankruptcy Court from enjoining the Secretaries from foreclosing on a vessel mortgage of a debtor shipowner. The Bankruptcy Code did not continue the Secretaries' absolute immunity from these bankruptcy stay provisions. Instead, the Secretaries, as well as other secured creditors with interests in various types of transportation equipment, are now only entitled to partial immunity from a stay in chapter 11 reorganizations. However, the class of vessels to which partial immunity applies was inadvertently limited to certain inland and domestic vessels regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Moreover, almost all of the vessels currently covered by title XI guarantees are not ICC-regulated inland and domestic vessels. As a result, the enactment of chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code removed the Secretaries' authority to seek relief from the bankruptcy stay or injunctive powers for vessels used as security for a title XI guarantee. The consequence is that both the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Commerce are now blocked by the automatic stay provisions of the Bankruptcy Code from foreclosing on their title XI security for vessels and must resort to the time-consuming and often arduous procedure required to seek relief from the stay under section 362 of the Bankruptcy Code.

At a time when significant parts of the maritime and fishing industries are undergoing economic strain, losing the ability to foreclose in a timely manner on the mortgages taken as security for the title XI guarantee has further exacerbated an already bad situation. In addition, with respect to vessels in default, most of these vessels are being operated by their owners under the protection of the Bankruptcy Courts with little or no capital cost to cover, and they are causing significant injury to those operators who continue to honor their financial commitments. This has resulted in widespread rate cutting and has compounded the financial difficulties in the maritime industry, increasing the risk of further title XI defaults.

The legislation I have introduced today addresses these problems by restoring some of the protection accorded the Secretaries prior to the enactment of Public Law 95-598. The bill would amend section 1110 of the Bankruptcy Code to extend partial immunity from the automatic stay to creditors with preferred ship mortgages or mortgages on fishery facilities. It would broaden the class of vessels included within the exemption to all vessels potentially covered by title XI guarantees. The shipowner in chapter 11 bankruptcy who has defaulted on title XI obligation will be entitled to continue to use the vessel for 60 days. Thereafter, such continued use would be permitted only if the debtor cures all of the outstanding defaults. This includes all amounts, for example, advances, full payoffs, or assumption payments, paid by the Government under a title XI loan guarantee as a result of the default.

Section 1110, as amended by this bill, will not conflict with the Secretaries' obligations to the bondholders or noteholders under the Title XI Guarantee Program. It will, however, correct an unintended exclusion from the automatic stay provision and in so doing, greatly enhance the Secretaries' abilities to foreclose on a security for a title XI guarantee in the event of a default.

PUERTO RICO TRAGEDY PROVIDES INSIGHT

HON. JAIME B. FUSTER

OF PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. FUSTER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes we gain insight into the lives of others through the shock that comes from witnessing stark tragedy. I believe this is demonstrated by the reaction of many compassionate Americans to news of the landslides and floods that have afflicted Puerto Rico with staggering loss of life. We are grateful for the emergency assistance which the Federal Government, private agencies, and individuals have given to alleviate the suffering of thousands of homeless survivors.

We may never know how many people were actually killed. Probably around 500. What we do know is that these were very poor people, living in a dangerous situated shantytown in poverty so grim that it cannot help but tug at the hearts of more fortunate Americans.

But this tragedy should also be viewed from a larger perspective. The harsh fact is that these people—fathers, mothers, and children—died because they were too poor to afford decent housing, and because Puerto Rico has been too poor to construct all the housing its people need. Some 200,000 American citizens are forced to live in such shantytowns. Most, if not all, are among the 23 percent of Puerto Ricans who are unemployed. Very properly, the overwhelming policy thrust of Governor Rafael Hernández Colón and his government is to create new jobs, so our people can lead a decent and productive life, free from the misery and dangers of such shantytowns.

During the past months, I have been trying to convey to my colleagues the importance to Puerto Rico of retaining section 936 of the Internal Revenue Code, rather than eliminating or modifying it in an ill-considered attempt to achieve tax reform. I have argued that any change in section 936 would deprive Puerto Rico of a tested and vital tool to cope with its very adverse economic circumstances. Last week, the terrible natural disaster suffered by Puerto Rico dramatized the fragility of the island's economic infrastructure and the fearful vulnerability of many of its inhabitants.

The description offered by the New York Times article on October 11 titled "Shantytowns Termed Widespread in Puerto Rico" helps explain the vehemence of my plea not to hit Puerto Rico with a so-called reform that would be a devastating blow to our efforts to cope with the very difficult economic and social situation we face today. It reads in part:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 11, 1985]

SHANTYTOWNS TERMED WIDESPREAD IN PUERTO RICO

Tens of thousands of poor Puerto Ricans are living in unhealthy and dangerously situated shantytowns like the one that was struck by a landslide here four days ago, Government officials and housing experts said today.

The communities of squatters, so poor that they cannot pay any amount of rent, have sprouted on the outskirts of the island's main cities.

Many of them cling perilously to steep hillsides, as did the community of Mameyes on the northern edge of this city. The landslide early Monday morning literally wiped it off the earth, burying, the authorities say, as many as 500 people. Others, built of castoff scraps of lumber and tin by people who often have not even heard of building codes, sprawl across river flood plains and low-lying coastal strips where tidal flooding is common.

Aides to Gov. Rafael Hernandez Colon and other Government officials estimated in interviews today that more than 200,000 people lived in the shantytowns built here, as in many countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia, by people who abandoned the countryside in search of better jobs and were unable to find affordable housing.

For many government officials, the disaster at Mameyes has served to underscore the gravity of Puerto Rico's increasingly serious housing shortage. Some officials say that as many as 250,000 new housing units are needed to eliminate the shantytowns and ease the crowding in more substantial housing across the island.

Mayor Dapena said Ponce's housing shortage was closely related to the economic decline of the city that followed the closing of the oil refinery here and numerous small byproducts factories in 1980 and 1981. Some government officials estimate that unemployment rate is up to nearly 50 percent and they said approximately 90 percent of the people were receiving food stamps and other kinds of Federal aid.

The Mayor said he had created an agency to try to attract industry and that a project for growing citrus, mangoes and other fruit had recently been started. He said the city, with assistance from the government in San Juan, was investing $30 million in its port, hoping it would be a center for Caribbean trade.

"If we can't solve our economic problem," he said, "no matter what we do in housing, people will still be scratching. People won't be able to pay even a minimum amount for housing."

Mr. Speaker, dear colleagues, I ask you, in light of the already difficult conditions in the island, does it make sense to undermine the only mechanism of hope and social rehabilitation that Puerto Rico has? Does it make human or economic sense to eliminate section 936, a proven tax incentive to spur development, under the guise of saving negligible dollars while running the risk of plunging Puerto Rico into even deeper poverty and despair?

Mr. Speaker, even if the Puerto Rican Government and people had all the tools needed for improving their economy and living standards—of which section 936 is first and foremost—they still face a formidable job, requiring unrelenting tenacity and energy. The instrinsic handicaps under which the island labors are formidable, including probably the heaviest pressure in the world of population against livable space and resources. Even with decades of effort, our per capita income has risen to only one-third the average in the continental United States.

Retaining section 936 as an essential tool lies at the heart of the struggle of 3.5 million American citizens living in Puerto Rico who are fighting for a decent life and for an end to shantytowns. Amid the suffering and shock in our hard-hit island, Puerto Ricans more than ever are determined to work to create jobs that would end the need for people to live in such poverty and danger.

Without the help of section 936, Puerto Rico has little hope of succeeding in its uphill fight against poverty. With it, it has at least a good fighting chance. We need and deserve that chance, a chance which Congress can provide by retaining section 936.

THE SYNFUELS ENERGY DINOSAUR

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to an important and well written article by the Secretary of Energy, John S. Herrington. In this Wall Street Journal piece, the Secretary develops a cogent argument for closing down the poorly managed and misguided Synfuels Corporation.

Back in July, the House of Representatives started the process of killing the SFC by adopting my amendment to the Interior appropriations bill by an overwhelming margin, 312 to 111. Even though the House clearly demonstrated its opposition to spending more Federal funds on Synfuels projects, the Corporation Board of Directors has arrogantly proceeded to award millions in price supports for the most questionable projects, and this wanton spending may continue before the Congress has the opportunity to close the Synfuels tap for good.

In my 27 years as a Member of this House, I have never observed such disrespect for the will of Congress and wreckless spending of the taxpayer's money. Putting the rhetoric aside, recent actions by the Synfuels' Board are disgraceful and an embarrassment to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to carefully review this informative article:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 9, 1985]

THE SYNFUELS ENERGY DINOSAUR

(By John S. Herrington)

This week, Congress is struggling to agree on a plan to reduce the deficit. Regardless of the outcome, in the next few days members of both houses will have a unique opportunity to make an early downpayment on deficit reduction. Next Wednesday, the Synthetic Fuels Corporation's board plans to lock up more than $1 billion in taxpayer-supported subsidies for two uneconomical and unneeded oil-shale demonstration projects.

These projects are telling examples of why the SFC was, this July, targeted for extinction by a 312-111 vote in the House. The question now is: Will Congress as a whole put a halt to these projects before the SFC allocates the money for them next week?

The projects in question—$900 million in price supports and guarantees for a Union Oil project in Parachute Creek, Colo., and $184 million in like guarantees for Seep Ridge's Vernal, Utah, project—reflect more than their dollar amounts. They are a microcosm of what is wrong with the SFC. In an era when everyone is striving to reduce the deficit, the SFC could not have picked two more wrongheaded projects to pilot, nor could it be championing them at a more pivotal time in its short-lived history.

Parachute Creek has major technological weaknesses. Both Parachute Creek and Seep Ridge have technologies applicable to only a small portion of U.S. oil-shale resources. Both would have guaranteed price supports at a level several times the market price. Neither would make a lasting contribution to U.S. energy security.

I am opposed to these projects, and these circumstances have raised strong reservations about continued funding of the SFC. Terminating these projects would salvage at least $1 billion—and perhaps more, since the SFC will soon consider additional projects totaling $2.5 billion.

Congressional opponents of these projects need only to look to Union Oil's Parachute Creek operation for ammunition.

Union Oil first began acquiring oil-shale lands in Western Colorado in 1920. Sixty-five years later, its Parachute Creek project still has not been operated successfully beyond a period of a few days, despite the investment of $800 million by the company over the past six years.

Parachute Creek's problems are enormous. The price per barrel of the hoped-for 10,000 barrel-per-day plant is pegged at $72, in an economy where our Strategic Petroleum Reserve is buying oil at about $25 a barrel. Parachute Creek's retort scraper system—a mechanism that ejects spent shale—failed and still hasn't continuously worked as advertised. When it does work, the spent shale is coming out at a too-high temperature (900 degrees Fahrenheit) with an excessively high carbon content, a sign of inefficiency. Its fluid bed combustor, a component that would burn the carbon in the spent shale, is only in conceptual design, both unproved and untested.

The financial terms of the SFC agreement are such that six to 10 years from now, when subsidies are exhausted, Union could walk away from the project.

Union has failed to produce the oil that would allow it ultimately to earn $400 million in price supports. Nonetheless, the SFC plans to reward Union with an additional $500 million in loan and price guarantees to support the development of a combustor—and wants to extend Union's right to earn the $400 million in price supports. The total cost to taxpayers: $900 million.

Hand in hand with the Parachute Creek project, the SFC plans to provide $184 million in loan and price guarantees for Seep Ridge. SFC is guaranteeing its price per barrel at $55, more than twice the market rate.

Why the SFC is so ardently interested in Seep Ridge is something of a mystery. The project will offer no technological advance for synfuels development; the technology is already developed, and at full production Seep Ridge will produce only 1,100 barrels per day.

Supporters of these projects will no doubt weave their defense into the cloth of our energy future and national security through energy security.

The fact is that national-security and energy-security arguments do little to justify the Parachute Creeks and the Seep Ridges. When Congress established the Synthetic Fuels Corporation in 1980, oil prices were projected to reach $75 to $125 per barrel by 1990. Since oil prices peaked in 1981 following President Reagan's decontrol of oil prices, the world energy outlook has improved substantially: In nominal terms oil prices are down more than 30% from their 1980 levels.

As a result of these fundamental changes in the energy marketplace, virtually no projects pending before the SFC are likely to become economical in the foreseeable future. Thus, the development of a commercial synthetic-fuels industry at a pace envisioned by Congress in 1980 would require huge expenditures of federal tax dollars that would not be offset by economic benefits.

There is little point in building demonstration projects when the fuel costs are two, three or four times that of current and anticipated market prices. There is no compelling reason to subsidize construction of model synfuels plants when advanced technology, now under research and development by industry and the Department of Energy, will ultimately surpass these plants' existing technologies. Finally, there is little merit to the national-security argument ad-

vanced by supporters of synfuels. Were all the SFC projects currently planned ultimately able to produce at their maximum capacity, they would only supply substantially less than 0.5% of U.S. energy requirements over the next 10 years.

The sensible approach for U.S. energy development is to let the free market work its way up to the next band of energy opportunities. And in this respect, the synthetic-fuels industry is several decades away from practicality. Synthetic fuels are not competive with the next generation of fuels or expected energy gains through conservation and efficiency. Moreover, more exotic techniques such as enhanced oil recovery and the potential application of coal in slurries, advanced clean-burning combustors and high-efficiency turbines are today closer to the realities of the marketplace.

When the Synthetic Fuels Corporation was created in the late 1970s, its founders were acting with vision and partriotism during a time of rising oil prices and limited supplies. But times have changed and so have the circumstances that gave rise to these projects. Now we must adjust to the new realities. The proposed SFC projects offer Congress an opportunity to make meaningful budget savings with little acrimony and without compromising the public trust, national security or our energy future.

STATES' EXPERIENCE WITH EMPLOYER SANCTIONS

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House Judiciary Committee is now considering H.R. 3080, the Immigration Control and Legislation Amendments of 1985. As in the past, the proposal has raised concerns among many individuals and organizations about the fairness and effectiveness of employer sanctions as the means of controlling undocumented workers into this country. For too long employer sanctions have been billed as the only workable solution to this problem with little attention paid to the enforcement of existing labor laws.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some very interesting information on employer sanctions as they already exist in the United States. The report, entitled "Employer Sanctions Laws, Worker Identification Systems, and Undocumented Aliens: The States Experience and Federal Proposals," looks very closely at States' sanctions laws and concludes that they have not worked. I hope that a thoughtful review of this material will shed some light on employer sanctions effectiveness in States that have already imposed them.

Twelve of our 50 States have sanctions—and they don't work. Obviously, these considerations are very important to overall debate on how best to reform this Nation's immigration laws. I therefore offer an excerpt from the study for insertion into the RECORD.

If you should wish to obtain the complete study, please contact the author, Carl E. Schwarz, professor, Political Science Department, Fullerton College, 321 Chapman Ave., Fullerton, CA.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Renewed proposals for a national employer sanctions law, particularly as contained in the Simpson-Mazzoli bill now before Congress, should not be considered without careful examination of the enforcement experiences of the eleven states and one city that have similar laws. This study represents an analysis of how evidentiary requirements, penalties, residency criteria, and enforcement mechanisms in eight states compare with the versions introduced in Congress. Based on the experiences of the states under study, the author predicts severe problems with any national employer sanctions.

All jurisdictions with employer sanctions laws require a showing that the employer "knowingly" hired an alien unauthorized to work in the United States, such knowledge being attributed to the employer where the applicant failed to prove "legal residency" or to produce the necessary permits or identification documents. A similar provision exists in the federal proposal. Court decisions in both Connecticut and California have struck down the "lawful residence" requirement. *Marin v. Smith* and *Dolores Canning Co. v. Howard* both noted the discriminatory effect of such a narrow ground for worker eligibility on aliens otherwise "authorized to work" by INS or Department of Labor certification.

The proposed federal legislation does differ from sanctions laws already in effect in the various states. For example, state penalties for employers found to have violated the statutes are mild in comparison with those of the Simpson-Mazzoli bill. What particulary invites comparison and suggests some hard lessons for the proponents of federal employer sanctions, then, are the varying evidentiary requirements for establishing scienter on the part of the employer; that is, whether the law requires an affirmative, "good faith," or "reasonable" effort to check documents to determine worker eligibility at the time of hire or application, or merely a threshold inquiry as to immigration or citizenship status with a document check only upon a negative or suspicious response from the applicant. The Simpson-Mazzoli bill, as well as the legislation in the states of Connecticut, Montana, Vermont, and Virginia, places the more stringent requirement on the employer; California, Florida, Kansas and Massachusetts, the less burdensome. The 1981 report of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy opted for a similarly light verification requirement for employers in the absence of "a dependable mechanism for determining a potential employee's eligibility."

Both sets of verification requirements produce negative results. The less stringent evidentiary proposals, such as those contained in the Select Commission recommendations, seek to avoid forcing an employer to act as a surrogate immigration agent or to discriminate against U.S. citizens and legal aliens who share ethnic or racial characteristics with undocumented migrants. Even though the Supreme Court has limited challenges to private-sector employment discrimination on the ground of alienage, one commentator has warned employers of the risk of sanctions from the federal courts and the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission for discrimination against job applicants on the basis of race, national origin, or ancestry. The several federal court rulings that protect undocumented workers under civil rights statutes and the National Labor Relations Act reinforce this admonition. Because of the lesser evidentiary burden they place on employers, however, these laws provide for easy evasion of their central purpose: deterrence of hiring of illegal aliens by elimination of one of the "pull" factors attracting migrant workers to the United States.

On the other hand, if the law is more stringent and requires the employer to show that a "good faith" inquiry was conducted by looking at specific documentation on the mere suspicion that the applicant is illegal, then it encourages the employer to discriminate against anyone with ethnic or racial characteristics similar to those of most undocumented aliens. It also converts the employer into a surrogate police or immigration officer. Both of these effects were mentioned by the state trial court in *Dolores Canning*. Some employers have conditioned support of employer sanctions on the development of a secure form of worker identification to be used to verify an applicant's eligibility to work. But both Senator Simpson, chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and Representative Schroeder have said that they believe that such an onus on employers and workers would end up denying Hispanic workers access to the labor market. The Select Commission reflected these countervailing pressures. It agreed that there was a need for an effective verification system, one that would incorporate reliability, protection of individual rights, and "cost effectiveness." It could reach no consensus on a "dependable mechanism" to prove intent to hire illegals, however. The Simpson-Mazzoli proposal would handle the problem by requiring employers to check up to two standard pieces of identification, and the bill would require that the President establish a non-destructible and "fraud-resistant" card or number that could be verified through a call-in computer bank within three years of its enactment.

The problem with this hard-line approach is that it would encourage an employer to check all worker applicants with Hispanic characteristics simply because they compose the largest single group of undocumented aliens in the country. The rule consistently espoused by the federal courts in determining the constitutionality of INS searches and detentive questioning of suspected illegal aliens in businesses, highways, and neighborhoods is apt here: "Except at the border and its functional equivalents, officers on roving patrol may stop vehicles only if they are aware of specific, articulable facts, together with rational inferences from those facts, that reasonably warrant suspicion that vehicles contain aliens who may be illegally in the country." In *United States v. Cortez* the Supreme Court said, "Based upon the whole picture, the detaining officers must have a particularized and objective basis for suspecting the particular person stopped of criminal activity." Finally and most recently the Ninth Circuit in *International Ladies' Garment Workers Union v. Sureck* pronounced: "We feel the Fourth Amendment rights of workers would be impermissibly diminished were we to sanction the unconstrained use of warrantless, detentive questioning of the sort depicted by this record—questioning which is

frightening to the workers, intrusive, and often 'based on nothing more than inarticulate hunches.' " Thus, by converting the employer into an INS agent, the Simpson-Mazzoli bill will leave him to face a Hobson's choice. Underzealous compliance could lead to the employer's prosecution, while overzealousness could produce massive civil rights violations, including violation of the citizen's or resident alien's right to privacy. A whole new line of case and administrative law might well develop out of the complaints of ethnic and racial discrimination that would be filed against employers instead of the INS. Recall the holding of *Apollo Tire* where the court faced the choice of either subjecting an employer to prosecution under the California employer sanctions law, or upholding the rights of undocumented alien workers to reinstatement and back pay. The court chose to uphold the workers' rights.

Asked why their own employer sanctions laws were not enforced, state and local prosecutors most frequently cited "due process" concerns of the INS and judicial rulings on evidence of the employer's intent. This is similar to the experience of the twenty countries investigated by the General Accounting Office in its recent report to Congress. It also helps explain the current difficulties experienced in attempts to persuade courts to imprison farm labor contractors for knowingly recruiting and transporting undocumented alien workers. The perception of the fight against illegal alien employment as "a low priority task" constitutes another major reason for the prevailing reluctance of the states to prosecute. A corollary to this is the perception that prosecution is "someone else's business," in particular belonging to the local district attorney, the INS, or even the state legislature. The state legislature was most frequently mentioned in states, such as California, where the employer sanctions law had come under court challenge. A final and related reason for non-enforcement mentioned in these interviews was the feeling of frustration with or dependence upon the INS and the U.S. Department of Justice to secure the data and witnesses needed for successful prosecution. These officials characterized the INS as "effective but numerically inadequate" as an information provider, and even charged that the agency "operated in a separate orbit" and failed to cooperate consistently with local and state prosecutors.

A punitive approach to curtailing the employment of illegal migrants will serve only to create enormous bureaucratic costs, a police-state mentality, and widespread threats to the civil rights of job applicants. Enforcement of fair labor standards, coupled with generous amnesty program for permanent residents, on the other hand, could help to end economic exploitation of the undocumented "underclass." Recent studies show that a large proportion of undocumented workers receive less that the minimum wage and work in substandard conditions. Increased enforcement of existing fair labor statutes would direct the energies of federal and state authorities toward the goal of social justice with less administrative cost. Such enforcement might even make many jobs now held by illegal aliens more enticing to legal workers and, thus, deter undocumented migrants from entering the U.S. labor market as employers' incentives to hire them fall.

The reduction of undocumented workers would be particularly evident in urban commerce, where the FLSA and comparable statutes can be applied most rigorously. Politically, the effects of such a program would be much less divisive than those of a national employer sanctions law and its certain companion, a national worker identification system. Allowing the competitive forces of the free labor market system to prevent the economic exploitation of undocumented workers and to deter illegal immigration seems far better than militarizing the border, computerizing the labor force, and making the INS a "hit squad" against U.S. businessmen.

THE SOLUTION TO ACID RAIN IS CLEAR

HON. GERRY SIKORSKI

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. SIKORSKI. Mr. Speaker, acid rain continues its destructive rampage, with little regard for our environment or human health. Recent developments build a strong foundation for the argument that we must act now to control acid rain. In August two EPA studies determined that two otherwise immune regions of the country, California and Florida, are highly susceptible to acidic deposition poisoning of these States' lakes and streams. In the same month a study by the Environmental Defense Fund determined a direct correlation between smelter emissions in the West and higher acidity levels in the upper western part of California. Following on the heels of these new developments, Drew Lewis, the administration's special envoy on acid rain, admitted that saying sulfates do not cause acid rain is like saying cigarettes does not cause lung cancer. And a new study issued by the GAO finds that the EPA has put its stamp of approval on State implementation plans allowing for a net increase of 1.5 million tons of sulfur dioxide emissions during a 3-year period.

With this series of events pointing to the urgency to control acid rain at a national level, the administration continues to turn its back on the problem. I recently hosted an international conference on acid rain where international experts from Europe and Canada stressed that the United States must learn a lesson from its European counterparts before it is too late. We learned that acid deposition has reached advanced levels in many regions of Europe resulting in the destruction of historical monuments, the loss of aquatic life, and the death of huge forest areas.

I wish to enter a recent editorial from the Twin Cities' Minneapolis Star and Tribune which urges the administration to confront reality and attack acid rain.

The editorial follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star & Tribune, Oct. 6, 1985]

THE SOLUTION TO ACID RAIN IS CLEAR

Years after discovery of the damage it does, acid rain continues to fall over Canada and the United States. Dying lakes and forests now dot the continent—a tragedy for which President Reagan must accept some blame. He refuses to support legislation that would reduce sulfur-dioxide emissions and thereby reduce the threat. That shortsighted stand, as members of the newly formed International Council on Acid Rain observed last week, is an invitation to environmental disaster.

Few would deny that such a disaster is looming. Research by the Environmental Protection Agency shows that acid rain has already taken a toll in lakes from the Rockies to the east coast—a far larger area than originally thought. A University of North Carolina study indicates that trees in the southern Appalachians are dying at an increasing rate, mimicking the acid rain-related devastation of West German forests. And the EPA now estimates acid rain's corrosion damage to buildings at $5 billion a year.

Experts worldwide agree that the solution is simple. Reducing sulfur-dioxide emissions from coal-fired power plants would curb the damage; cutting such emissions in half would bring the problem under control. Scores of studies, including one conducted by White House-appointed scientists, confirm the link and the need for legislation. Even the president's acid-rain envoy, Drew Lewis, now concedes the point.

Spurred on by the facts, the Canadian government this spring adopted a new nine-year program to reduce its eastern sulfur emissions by half. Yet President Reagan still declines to support any kind of American counterpart. His intractability has prompted others to fill the leadership gap. The new international council, convened by Minnesota Rep. Gerry Sikorski in Navarre last week, offers lawmakers from Canada, the United States and several European countries a forum to develop a unified acid-rain strategy. Once the rest of the world agrees on an acid-rain plan, the council members theorize, Reagan will have to go along.

But why should such global pressure be necessary? The cause of the acid-rain problem is obvious. The solution is simple. The president should bow to reality, and embrace a program to attack acid rain at the source.

SCULPTOR HANBURY HONORED FOR LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment this morning to recognize the lifetime contributions of sculptor Una Hanbury. Una Hanbury has successfully communicated to the world her entire life through her gift of sculpting and for that reason she has recently received a "Celebration of a Lifetime of Achievement." I would like to insert into the RECORD an article that further points out her contributions to the art world.

SCULPTOR HANBURY HONORED FOR LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT

Internationally acclaimed sculptor Una Hanbury recently returned from Palo Alto, Calif., where she was honored in a "Celebration of a Lifetime of Achievement."

Her 7½-foot cold-cast bronze cut out relief "Dancing Along the Beach" was installed at the Webster House, a new building designed to contain 37 apartments for retired people.

"I enjoyed the trip," the artist said, "but it is heavenly to be back home. My first visit to Santa Fe was in 1946 and I have been in love with the light, the desert, the mountains and the people since that time."

Among the many bronze busts carved by the English-born Hanbury are those of Rachel Carson, Georgia O'Keeffe (both in the National Portrait Gallery of the Smithsonian Institution), J. Robert Oppenheimer, Andres Segovia and Santa Fe's beloved photographer, Laura Gilpin.

Artist Hanbury, who is also a member of the proposed Board of The Club of Santa Fe, which will be located in the Greer Mansion at 505 Don Gaspar opposite the State Capitol, studied at Chelsea Polytechnic and La Grande Chaumiere L'Academie.

She has exhibited at well-known institutions including the Royal Academy of London, Salon d'Automme in Paris, National Academy of Design, Corcoran Gallery of Art and Cowboy Hall of Fame.

"For me, search for the eternal values and endeavor to communicate to others what the artists may have been privileged to perceive is the role (of the artist)," Hanbury said. "To communicate the findings in a clear language is the struggle."

SEATBELT LAW SUCCEEDS IN MICHIGAN

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 1 of this year, the State of Michigan began to implement its mandatory seatbelt use law. Although the enactment of this important measure was met with tough opposition within the State, it appears Michigan did the right thing in making it mandatory to buckle up. During the first 2 months of the Seatbelt Use Program, the Michigan Secretary of State, Richard H. Austin, and the director of the Michigan State Police, Col. Gerald Hough, report that the rising pattern of traffic related deaths has reversed itself. Data for the first 2 months of the safety belt law show a reduction of 28 fatalities in July and a reduction of 30 in August when compared to 1984 fatalities for the same months and where safety belts were known to be available. These 58 fewer deaths amount to a 30-percent reduction from 1984. Whether this dramatic reduction in accident fatalities can be directly attributed to the enactment of a mandatory seatbelt law must be determined over the long run. However, I applaud the State of Michigan and the 14 other States which have enacted seatbelt use laws for taking this courageous step in saving lives on our Nation's highways. It is clear to me that increased seatbelt use saves lives by the simple and inexpensive act of buckling up.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert the letter to me from the Michigan Secretary of State, Richard H. Austin, and the director of the Michigan State Police, Col. Gerald Hough, detailing their preliminary findings on the implementation of Michigan's seatbelt use law.

The letter follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE,
Lansing, MI, September 24, 1985.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: September 1, 1985, marked the end of the second month of Michigan's safety belt law. Preliminary traffic accident data are now available to allow a comparison between these two months and the same period in 1984. While we believe it is too early to draw conclusions from the data, there are interesting statistical patterns beginning to emerge.

It should be noted at the outset that there has been a noticeable increase in total miles driven this year compared to 1984. An increase in driving is usually accompanied by an increase in accidents and fatalities, but not since July 1 of this year.

In order to establish a relationship between traffic fatalities and safety belt usage, the data for the first six months of 1985 must be examined. Through June of this year and prior to the safety belt law, there was an increase of 50 fatalities from the same period last year.

With the implementation of the safety belt law on July 1, this pattern of increasing highway deaths has reversed itself. Data for the first two months of the safety belt law show a reduction of 28 fatalities in July and a reduction of 30 in August when compared to 1984 fatalities for the same months and where safety belts were known to be available. These 58 fewer fatalities amount to a 30 percent reduction from 1984.

As stated earlier, it is perhaps too soon to attribute all of the decrease in highway deaths to the safety belt law. But, we have every reason to expect a continued decrease in traffic fatalities. We are confident by the end of 1985 the number of lives saved will be so dramatic, that the correlation between safety belt usage and safety can no longer be questioned.

Sincerely,

RICHARD H. AUSTIN,
Secretary of State.
Col. GERALD HOUGH,
Director, Michigan State Police.

SALVADORAN UPDATE

HON. ROBERT GARCIA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, Central America has not been on our front pages for the past few months, but unfortunately, problems continue to plague that region. Nowhere is that more evident than in El Salvador.

Edward Cody of the Washington Post wrote an excellent synopsis of the situation in El Salvador in today's paper. I submit that article for my colleagues' perusal, just to remind them that things are far from calm in El Salvador.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1985]

PEACE TALKS' PROMISE UNFULFILLED—A YEAR AFTER DUARTE'S INITIATIVE, SALVADORAN WAR SEEMS ENTRENCHED

(By Edward Cody)

SAN SALVADOR, Oct. 15.—A year after peace talks between the government and leftist insurgents lit a beacon of hope for Salvadorans, it has dimmed to a glimmer, eclipsed by bloodshed and recrimination.

Statements from rebel leaders, government officials and diplomats here indicate that even if another formal meeting can be arranged at some point, both sides have become resigned to a long military struggle. The civil war is generally considered to have started with a military coup on this date six years ago.

The war now will be on a smaller scale, they predict, but still violent enough to leave El Salvador's 5 million inhabitants without the peace and tranquility their leaders all say they want.

President Jose Napoleon Duarte's bold gesture—unexpectedly suggesting the talks and sitting down with rebel leaders last Oct. 15 in the mountain town of La Palma—has produced political dividends, burnishing his peacemaker image and helping win his party a legislative majority in elections last March.

The Reagan administration seems to have shared the perception of flexibility, without ceding in its determination to keep El Salvador's rebels from gaining a share of power.

But two events have punctuated the anniversary of Duarte's initiative and dramatized the effects of a stalemate likely to continue unless Duarte and his U.S. backers or the insurgents and their Nicaraguan and Cuban allies depart from longstanding positions in the conflict.

One came in the attack last Thursday on the Salvadoran Army's main training base by guerrillas of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front, the alliance of five rebel armies. The attackers killed more than 40 soldiers, by Army count.

The guerrilla forces showed they retain ability to mount occasional direct attacks on the Army despite massive infusion of U.S. money and equipment that has reduced rebel actions significantly in the last 18 months and prompted some Salvadoran officers to start taking about victory.

The other event was the abduction of Duarte's daughter Sept. 10 by gunmen who demand release of rebel prisoners in exchange for her safety. Duarte sent two other daughters and a daughter-in-law to the United States yesterday after saying his family had been threatened anew. He has offered to release most of 34 prisoners listed by the captors. But nine cannot be accounted for, according to Communications and Culture Minister Julio Rey Prendes.

The kidnaping of Ines Guadalupe Duarte Duran, 35, and her 23-year-old friend, Ana Cecilia Villeda, thus has put new venom into the atmosphere between Duarte and his rebel opponents for several reasons, making more remote the prospect of renewing the peace dialogue.

Rey Prendes, Duarte's closest aide, said the abduction "has changed the rules of the game with respect to humanizing the war." In the hope that followed the La Palma meeting, both sides had talked of small, concrete steps to "humanize" the conflict as a way to foster agreement on more difficult political issues.

"This is a new development that we have to come back and analyze with respect to the position of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front," Rey Prendes added, working on the government's conviction that the rebel alliance sponsored the kidnaping.

In addition, the kidnapers' demands for a prisoner release created a potential new source of tension in Duarte's relations with the Salvadoran officer corps, which has to

approve any decision to renew the peace contacts, cut off since a sour second meeting Nov. 30 in Ayagualo, just south of the capital.

The armed forces long have been the ultimate font of authority in El Salvador. But they have bowed to Duarte's leadership since his U.S.-backed election in May 1984. Despite reticence by some officers wary of setting a precedent, the high command also has endorsed the president's willingness to hand over rebel prisoners in exchange for his daughter.

This willingness could be shaken, however, by demands from the captors for detailed explanations of what happened to any prisoner on the list who cannot be turned over. Underlying the demands is an often repeated rebel charge that the armed forces have killed some rebel prisoners during torture.

Duarte, in radio conversations with the kidnapers, and Rey Prendes, in talks with reporters, have insisted that government investigations have turned up no trace of nine prisoners on the list.

Diplomats and other observers with long experience here said pushing the military hard on such investigations could disrupt a tacit understanding Duarte seems to have worked out with the armed forces: that his government will not embarrass officers with prosecution of past human rights abuses as long as the military halts such practices in the future.

Upholding his end of the understanding could delay release of Duarte's daughter and expose him to new rebel charges that he condones the abuses despite his frequent proclamations to the contrary, the diplomats pointed out, while discarding it could endanger his support in the military.

Duarte has encountered no known trouble from the military over his gesture in La Palma a year ago, largely because the talks quickly bogged down in mutual charges that both sides were only using the dialogue to gain propaganda points and never approached genuine bargaining.

Ruben Zamora, a leader of the rebel movement's political wing, the Democratic Revolutionary Front, told reporters recently that the dialogue got nowhere because Duarte and his U.S. backers never really wanted to negotiate. Duarte has contended for months that this was the rebels' position as well, labeling the talks mere "tactics" on their part.

Rey Prendes said Duarte nevertheless had been on the point of agreeing to a rebel demand that the next round of talks be held publicly in El Salvador rather than privately in another country as sought by Duarte and U.S. diplomats. But even that procedural concession has now been thrown into doubt, he declared.

REMEMBERING ANATOLY SHCHARANSKY

HON. BILL LOWERY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the House of Representatives to express my strong disapproval of the Soviet Government's disregard for human rights as witnessed in their treatment of Anatoly Shcharansky and other Soviet Jews.

As a member of the Congressional Coalition on Soviet Jewry, I have signed more than 100 letters to the leaders of the Soviet Union and have many times expressed to President Reagan and administration officials the urgency of vocalizing our concern over the blatant denial of liberty to Jews and others in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, as one form of outreach to these persecuted people, my wife, Katie, has joined the Congressional Committee of 21. As a member of this group of congressional wives, Katie has adopted Anatoly Shcharansky as her own "prisoner of conscience." As a way of expressing her special concern for his well-being, Katie has written Mr. Shcharansky and has also written President Reagan to urge him to bring the issue of Soviet Jewry before Mr. Gorbachev at the Geneva summit.

I would like to share with my colleagues the contents of these letters:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
August 27, 1985.

Mrs. AVITAL SHCHARANSKY,
Jerusalem, Israel

DEAR MRS. SHCHARANSKY, It was a surprise and a rewarding experience to have met you in May in Washington at the press conference for the Committee of 21.

Since I am the congressional wife who has "adopted" your husband, meeting you gave new meaning to my commitment to the goals of our group. As I have written in my letters to your husband, I am deeply angered and saddened by the conditions and injustice of your separation and his imprisonment.

The day-to-day events and the memorable occasions in my life serve as a reminder of those things denied your husband. As we baptized our infant son this month, and experienced the blessings of God for our children, it made me all the more aware that such simple expressions of faith are forbidden to Anatoly.

Please know that there are those of us who care a great deal and have pledged to continue to work towards the freedom of all the prisoners of conscience.

May the celebration of the Jewish New Year and the solemnity of Yom Kippur give you the strength to endure the separation and the wait until you are reunited with your loved one.

Most sincerely,

KATHLEEN B. LOWERY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
September 13, 1985.

President RONALD REAGAN,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The moving and sorrowful letter of Avital Shcharansky, that was published in the "Washington Times", compelled me to write to you as well.

As you may be aware, a number of Congressional wives have formed the Committee of 21. Its purpose is to work toward the freedom of those dissidents imprisoned in the Soviet Union.

Each of us "adopted" a particular prisoner of conscience, and in my case it is Anatoly Shcharansky. For that reason, you can understand why I feel a particular concern and would like to echo some of the pleas voiced by his wife.

I had the privilege of meeting Avital and hearing her speak to our committee. She was plainly dressed and wore no makeup. But when she began to talk, her love and her dedication to freeing her husband, made her beautiful.

At that moment, I felt so blessed to be a part of this country and to have the freedoms we enjoy, that I felt an even stronger conviction to stand up for those who are denied the most basic of rights.

Mr. President, as you engage in talks with Mr. Gorbachev, I would like to encourage you to speak of human rights and the unfortunate plight of all those imprisoned without cause by the Soviet Union.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN B. LOWERY.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 19, 1985.

Mrs. KATHLEEN LOWERY,
Longworth House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR KATIE: On behalf of the President, I would like to thank you for your September 13 letter indicating your concern over the plight of Anatoly Shcharansky and relaying the nature of your meeting with Mr. Shcharansky's wife, Avital.

We appreciate receiving your comments on the human rights situation in the Soviet Union and your recommendation that this issue be on the agenda when President Reagan meets with General Secretary Gorbachev in November. You may be assured that during these meetings, President Reagan intends to discuss the full range of issues impacting on U.S.-Soviet relations, including human rights.

Thank you again for letting us know of your personal interest in this regard.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

M.B. OGLESBY, Jr.,
Assistant to the President.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, the Soviets cannot be ignorant as to the gravity with which the American people and Congress view the continuing atrocities perpetrated against Jews who are either forced to remain in the Soviet Union against their will or simply wish to exercise their right to live and worship freely. We will not forget the plight of Anatoly Shcharansky.

ORPHAN DISEASES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I have written a letter to Dr. James Wyngaarden, Director of the National Institutes of Health, about the problems facing victims, and the families of victims, of Tay-Sachs and Dysautonomia. I would like to share this letter with you and our colleagues in Congress.

These two diseases are commonly known as "orphan diseases." They affect only a small percentage of the general population, mostly Jews of Ashkenazy descent. But their effect is felt by many, and research into possible cures would affect many more.

The Jewish community has conducted an extremely aggressive campaign of education and treatment, but they need our help. I urge my colleagues to work with NIH to look into further possibilities for cooperation between the Government and the com-

munity to find a solution to these debilitating diseases, which wreak havoc on those afflicted, their families, and their communities.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 11, 1985.

Dr. JAMES B. WYNGAARDEN,
Director, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD.

DEAR DR. WYNGAARDEN, Dysautonomia and Tay Sachs are two diseases directly affecting primarily the Jewish Ashkenazy population, but which have an effect on us all.

Although NIH has done some work on Tay-Sachs, research into this disease depends almost exclusively upon non-government fund-raising. In the case of Dysautonomia, all work is funded by private sources. In both cases, the donations usually come from the victims' families. Since the diseases are fatal, the contributions are made in the victim's memory.

I would urge your assistance in helping to make these donations vital ones, dedicated to living victims who have benefitted from our research. These diseases are classified in the "orphan" category, but research into both would benefit the population at large.

Tay Sachs is a fatal genetic disorder in children causing progressive destruction of the central nervous system caused by absence of a vital enzyme. Victims die by the age of five as the functions gradually fail until life can no longer be supported.

The educational campaign among the members of the target group is an exemplary one. Since the screening test for Tay-Sachs was developed, the Jewish community has engaged in an on-going educational campaign designed to test potential carriers of this genetic disease.

Dysautonomia affects the nervous system and the autonomic nervous system. Its victims have a decreased ability to feel pain, and the vital functions are affected. It is difficult to spot, but early diagnosis is essential to survival.

There is no federal funding for research for any aspect of Dysautonomia. New York University Hospital runs the only clinic in the world. One of the clinic's primary goals is to develop a screening test, but it cannot spare the resources it devotes to the treatment and education of the victims and their families.

A great deal can be learned from the N.Y.U. clinic's approach to the disease. Until recently 80% of the victims of Dysautonomia died before reaching the age of six; with the proper education and nutrition provided by the clinic, this statistic has been reversed and victims have the possibility of leading productive lives through their thirties.

Enzyme replacement as a cure for Tay-Sachs has been explored, but there is a problem because the disease affects brain cells which affect the blood barrier. Dysautonomia has been able to be controlled with an aggressive nutritional program, but the cure envisioned by specialist in the disease would be a specific drug to make nerves grow properly.

Both of these cures would be geared directly toward the victims of these diseases, but successful enzyme replacement, or a drug to make nerves grow properly, would have a much wider general applicability. We have already learned so much from the Jewish community's program of education, prevention and treatment, but they cannot find the cure without our help.

I urge you to do whatever possible to support funding for research into cures for Tay-Sachs and Dysautonomia.

Sincerely,

JACK KEMP,
Member of Congress.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF CYPRUS

HON. MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, October 1, marked a quarter century of independence for the Republic of Cyprus. Remembering our own roots, we rejoice on this occasion. But we also are sobered by the fact that for almost half of its young life, Cyprus has been a nation divided and occupied.

In July 1974, Turkish forces crossed the 40 miles of water between their shores and those of Cyprus, and, declaring that the 70,000 Turkish Cypriots were endangered by Cyprus' political unrest, invaded the small island. After negotiating with the Cypriot Government for 1 month, they broke off talks and advanced again, occupying over one-third of the country and wrenching 200,000 Greek Cypriots from their homes. Today, this emergency measure has become fait accompli, as 30,000 Turkish soldiers guard what the Turkish Cypriots have declared to be an independent state.

Since 1950, when the proindependence Archbishop Makarios III became political leader of Cyprus, the island has convulsed repeatedly in struggles for self-determination. Yet these battles have been fueled less by interior strife than by foreign interests in the strategically important region. For 5 years, Makarios sought independence from British colonial rule through diplomatic means, but seeing little progress, Greek Cypriots launched an armed revolt in 1955. After 4 years of fighting, Britain signed a treaty with Greek and Turkish Cypriot leaders, and invited Greece and Turkey to sign as guarantors. In 1960, the same parties signed the Constitution that established the Republic of Cyprus. Yet both these documents were shaped almost wholly by the guarantor powers, who were motivated chiefly by cold war concerns, and reflected poorly the internal realities of the new nation.

With Greece and Turkey distrustful of each other, and Britain lowering its profile in the region, America stepped in as the keeper of the peace. Yet rather than learn from Britain's mistakes, we continued in her wreckless course, which, regrettably, we still follow in other regions of the world, of fueling the Cypriot time bomb by viewing the country only through the geopolitical looking glass. Instead of ensuring the integrity of a Cypriot state under the overwhelmingly popular Makarios, we tacitly supported two rightist military revolts against him in 1963 and 1967, neither of which succeeded. We then proposed to solve Cyprus' problems by partitioning it essentially between Greece and Turkey, a plan rejected not only by Makarios, but by Greece and Turkey as well. Finally, in our haste to be rid of the Cypriot President who was growing closer to Moscow and weakening NATO's southern flank, we looked the other way when the Greek military launched another coup against Makarios in July 1974, and when Turkey invaded 5 days later.

Yet despite our country's flawed approach toward Cyprus' complex domestic problems, we have proven our ability to use our influence effectively to avert crises when we so choose. When civil violence erupted in Cyprus in 1963 and 1967, the United States acted decisively each time to prevent a Turkish invasion and a possible war between Greece and Turkey. American diplomatic intervention also helped keep Greek and Turkish troops on the island to levels dictated by the 1960 treaty. Thus, given our manifest interest in protecting Cyprus against foreign aggression, our acquiescence during the Turkish advance on Cyprus in 1974 represented an unfortunate and unexplainable turnaround in U.S. policy.

The United Nations has played an active and commendable role in Cyprus. Peacekeeping forces arrived on the island in 1964 and remain to this day. Thirty-five Security Council and General Assembly resolutions have kept the world attentive to Cyprus' plight. And the great efforts by the U.N. Secretary General over the past decade to bring the two sides to the negotiating table deserve the highest recognition. Yet even despite the U.N.-sponsored summit meeting between Greek Cypriot President Kyprianou and Turkish Cyriot leader Rauf Denktash last January, progress in this forum remains excruciatingly slow, while Turkish consolidation of the occupied territory, through such measures as illegal settlements and unilateral declarations, continues at an alarming rate.

This leaves the impetus for a solution to us. Congress met the task firmly in 1975 by placing an embargo on U.S. military aid to Turkey. In 1978, however, this embargo was replaced by a 7-to-10 ratio of U.S. arms to Turkey and Greece, in hopes that this would address Greek concerns and encourage Turkish cooperation. Yet while Turkey has since become our third largest foreign aid recipient, our hopes for its cooperation were dashed in 1983 by the declaration of an independent Turkish Cypriot state, which was recognized by Turkey alone. Congress responded by cutting military aid to Turkey and conditioning $215 million in grant military aid upon Turkey's progress in intercommunal talks on the reunification of Cyprus. Similarly, Congress authorized a special $250 million fund for Cyprus contingent on a successfully negotiated settlement. Yet while Turkish participation in talks at many levels may be seen as a sign of good will, their substantive movement toward an agreement has been minimal. While Kyprianou and Perez de Cuellar spent much of this year laboring over a new agreement, Denktash postponed action

to hold a constitutional referendum and general elections in the occupied territory last May and June.

The United States has been instrumental in bringing Greek and Turkish Cypriots back to the table. As relations between the two parent countries have deteriorated, so have our relations with each become more delicate. The Reagan Administration is to be commended for its attention to the issue, and for addressing our bilateral concerns with Turkey and Greece, our concerns with NATO, and the Cyprus problem. However, the administration's policy is still unbalanced; pushing for more aid to Turkey, and meeting with Turkish Prime Minister Ozal last April, while not being able to make time for President Kyprianou, have made many skeptical about the current administration's commitment to peace in Cyprus.

Such skepticism is unfortunate. Cyprus has befriended us repeatedly: It gave us crucial assistance after the catastrophic bombing of our marine barracks, it has been vigilant in controlling drug traffic from the Middle East, and, most recently, it refused to allow an ocean liner on which Palestinian terrorists were holding Americans hostage into its ports. Moreover, our considerable aid to both Greece and Turkey, and our unquestioned presence in the Eastern Mediterranean, give us the leverage to firmly press all parties involved toward a negotiated settlement. We should use this leverage to: Work actively through the executive branch for a just and peaceful solution of the problem. Support a solution based on past U.N. resolutions and the recent actions of the Secretary General. Call for a withdrawal of all foreign troops from Cyprus. Reaffirm our support of the principle of respect for independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity as it applies to Cyprus.

By letting global concerns blind us to critical local factors, the United States missed opportunities to build stronger bilateral and multilateral relations with the Eastern Mediterranean nations, and to thus better ensure regional and global security. We have seen how this blindness can have most serious repercussions when it applies to our own hemisphere. With Turkey bordering the Soviet Union and Cyprus a 20-minute flight from Lebanon, we cannot afford a similar eruption in the southern flank of NATO, the bedrock of Western security.

THE DAVIS CAROUSEL BALL FOR CHILDREN'S DIABETES

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, Marvin and Barbara Davis held their eighth annual Carousel Ball to benefit the Children's Diabetes Foundation at Denver. Incredibly, the bail raised $5 million. Through the love that these very devoted parents have for their daughter, a special caring and sharing has spread and the best day will be when a cure is found and there is no need for an annual ball.

Until then, it is very important to list the six stages a person goes through when they get this serious disease:

First. Anger ("Why is this interfering with my life?").

Second. Denial ("Forget it. I'm just not going to worry about it. If I ignore it, everybody else will.").

Third. Bargaining (With parents or God: "Please take this away * * * I'll go to church every day of my life. * * *").

Fourth. Depression ("Why me?").

Fifth. Acceptance (But not real willingness: "I'll still eat what I want.").

Sixth. Responsibility (Getting on with life and taking care of yourself.).

Dealing wth these stages honestly and understanding they are normal is very important.

If the dream of these loving parents becomes reality and a cure is found, then these difficult stages will not have to be dealt with. Until then, dealing with them is far superior to denying them.

A TRIBUTE TO THE NEW YORK RANGERS

HON. JOSEPH J. DioGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. DIOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress have spoken in the House Chamber to extol the accomplishments of their local sports teams. While the on-field exploits of talented athletes is commendable, it is their actions off the field which represent the mark of a true sportsman.

I rise today to commend not only a great organization with a rich hockey tradition, but also a group of individuals who are dedicated to the betterment of life for all of us. Mr. Speaker, I refer to the New York Rangers, who have joined the fight with thousands of others to prevent child abuse.

The New York Rangers are an integral part of the Westchester County community and we are greatly appreciative that their participation in county activities extends beyond their practice sessions in Rye. Early next week, the New York Rangers charity fund will be honored for their support of the Exchange Club Child Abuse Prevention Center of New York, Inc. The Ranger players and their wives have been able to raise vital funds for this organization and their efforts have greatly assisted Westchester County's ability to prevent child abuse.

I would also like to take this opportunity to praise all of the Exchange Clubs of Westchester County who have held numerous benefits to support the Child Abuse Prevention Center. The combined efforts of the Exchange Clubs and the New York Rangers will go a long way toward reducing the tragic occurrence of child abuse.

KILDEE LAUDS DAVID A. BRODY

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues the good work of David A. Brody, an outstanding person who travels among us during our daily life here at the Capitol. Mr. Brody has befriended many of us over the years and has won the respect of us all.

David is one of the rare few who, with his humor and personal magnetism, has the ability to bring together friend and foe alike. I am pleased to enter into the RECORD an article that appeared in the National Journal as a tribute to his many years of involvement in the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League.

[From the National Journal, Sept. 14, 1985]

THE INFLUENCE INDUSTRY—MAKING MATCHES MEANS ACCESS

Most Washington lobbyists boast about having connections. David A. Brody takes pride in making them.

The veteran Washington representative of the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League is an inveterate matchmaker who wends his way through the capital's power circles on the lookout for people who ought to know one another.

No sooner do his antennae pick up a nugget of conversational information about somebody's past or present interests than the next words out of his mouth are invariably, "I'd like to put you together with . . ."

The very next day, if not later the same day, Brody will be on the telephone proposing a luncheon involving himself and the two people he wants to bring together. Invariably, they are people who would have gotten together on their own at some point but, as Brody said in an interview, he finds that it advances his long-term interests if he can be the "facilitator or catalytic force."

"I do it so that the two people will know each other, so they will not be strangers when they need to deal with one another. Both parties usually welcome it," he explained. Those involved may run the gamut from Members of Congress, White House aides and ambassadors to reporters, fund raisers and constituents.

Twenty years at his job has taught Brody that at some point, his gestures of good will are likely to be returned in some form. "It's not so much that people are beholden to me, as it's a matter of providing greater access for me," he said, stressing the golden word of the lobbyist's trade—access.

The autographed pictures on the wall of Brody's office attest to his success in gaining access at the very highest levels. They also attest to his skill at hearing what people say and sensing what makes them tick and what their current concerns are.

"In this town, so many people talk rather than listen," explained Brody, giving away a major secret of his success. It also helps to be quick-witted enough to put information to immediate use. "If I happen to be in a Member's office and a name comes up, we'll often set up a lunch right then."

Brody is constantly on the lookout for likely connections, two Members of Congress who haven't met each other yet, a re-

porter who is starting out on a project involving principals he hasn't met, new arrivals at the Israeli Embassy who need to meet the people they will be dealing with in Washington.

"It's just a matter of having almost an intuitive sense about people's needs," Brody said. "I guess it is just a matter of knowing how to relate to people. I will occasionally bring Members of Congress together whose views may be divergent. In bringing them together, they find that they are able to work together on other issues."

Those other issues, with luck, may turn out at some point to be the very ones upon which Brody is lobbying. And, even if their votes do not always go his way, Brody at least gets a chance to have his say. In 1981, when Congress approved the sale of military aircraft to Saudi Arabia, Brody recalled, "a number of good friends of mine voted for the sale, but I still had the opportunity to sit down and talk to the principal—to the man who cast the vote."

That statement is also revealing. In lobbying, as in matchmaking, the permanence of relationships is important. Accordingly, significance attaches to Brody's reference to "good friends" who voted against his position. They still are his good friends, and maybe next time they will be with him.

Besides putting his lunch hour to regular use, Brody and his wife, Bea, entertain at their home, throwing dinner parties that may bring anywhere from a dozen to three dozen Washington notables together to trade information and get to know one another better.

"From time to time, press people are invited to my parties at home as friends," Brody explained. What goes on is not intended for publication, Brody noted, but it is recognized "a reporter may pick something up at a party." But, he added, "the story won't be that I had that group of people to dinner."

Brody added that he has never hesitated to bring politicians and journalists together in a social setting. "I don't draw any lines," he said. "When I find it useful to play that catalytic role, I do it." With reference to the politicians, he observed, "I think they welcome the opportunity too, otherwise they wouldn't agree to it."

To the best of his recollection, Brody over the years has never become a matchmaker in the romantic sense. He says that he knows of no marriages that have resulted between people he has brought together and quickly adds in a businesslike tone that "if it has happened, that would not be the purpose that the meeting started out with."

There is more than a bit of a Horatio Alger aspect to Brody's career. The man who now wines, dines and facilitates friendships among the high and mighty started out in life as the son of an immigrant garment worker who entered this country through Ellis Island. He grew up in Brooklyn, attended public schools and ended up studying law at Columbia University on a scholarship. He came to Washington in 1940 to work as a lawyer for the government and has been with the Anti-Defamation League since 1949.

Brody said he has developed his skills as a lobbyist-social connecter as he has gone along. "I like to say that the things I do, I never learned in law school." Nonetheless, the 69-year-old lobbyist makes it clear that he enjoys what he does. "I have no plans to retire," he said.

The matchmaker is obviously well matched to his calling.

SUPERFUND

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, a strong Superfund Program is crucial to the health of this Nation. The longer we wait to combat the problem of toxic waste, the more serious this problem will become. It is vitally important that we do all we can to protect and preserve our environment, not only for our well-being, but for the well-being of all future generations.

Earlier this year, the House Energy and Commerce Committee reported out a bill, H.R. 2817, to reauthorize the Superfund Program. A reauthorization bill is desperately needed and the $10 billion provided by H.R. 2817 should provide the financial resources needed to clean up toxic waste dumps. Nevertheless, I think that many improvements are needed in H.R. 2817. Some of these improvements have been made by the House Public Works Committee, which recently considered H.R. 2817.

Three particular areas that are of primary concern are: The standards for cleanup, the timetable for cleanup, and the public's right to know. Strict cleanup standards are essential to an effective Superfund Program. In the past, the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] has declared toxic sites clean when they were still causing pollution. During hurricane Gloria, the toxic waste site certified as clean by EPA began leaking thousands of gallons of toxic waste into a river in Pennsylvania. It is not enough to say that a toxic waste site is clean—it must be clean according to precise guidelines.

The EPA should also be required to follow a strict but realistic timetable for the cleanup of toxic sites. We cannot afford to give EPA the discretion to wait for years before conducting the cleanup process. Since Superfund was enacted in 1980, cleanup work has been completed on only six sites. (Ironically, one of them is the site that began leaking during hurricane Gloria.) We cannot afford to let toxic waste cleanup become a victim of bureaucratic inertia.

Superfund legislation should also contain a strong "Right-To-Know" provision. Citizens and public officials must have accessibility to information concerning toxic chemicals and wastes in their community. Requiring this information to be available is an important first step to providing for the safety of the public. There is just no excuse for keeping people in the dark and not letting them know when their communities and their very health may be endangered by toxic hazards.

The residents of Connecticut's Second District expect strong and decisive action from the Congress on Superfund. We have a Superfund site in our own backyard at the Yaworski Lagoon in Canterbury. We cannot wait for years and years for the EPA to clean up the Yaworski Lagoon. It will not be enough for the EPA to say Yaworski is clean; it must be clean. I urge my colleagues in the House to support a strong Superfund so that the Yaworski Lagoon and all the other Superfund sites in the country are cleaned up quickly and completely. The health of our Nation depends on it.

DISASTER RESPONSE ACT OF 1985

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will provide strong oversight to protect millions of electric utility customers from the hidden costs of natural disasters.

My interest in this legislation was sparked over the past 2 weeks as Long Islanders and their neighbors across the Long Island Sound struggled through the aftermath of Hurricane Gloria. While Gloria did not deliver the knockout punch that many expected, her winds played havoc with electric utilities throughout the Northeast. On Long Island, the storm disrupted service for 750,000 of the Long Island Lighting Co.'s 900,000 customers. Power was disrupted for 163,000 Virginians and 669,000 people in Connecticut. While the storm damage was equally severe across the Northeast, the response of individual utilities was not.

Many Long Islanders and Connecticut residents suffered without power for nearly a week. Long Islanders endured a multitude of problems as a result. Unlit traffic lights turned intersections into no-man's land, drinking water wells evaporated without electric pumps, and tons of unrefrigerated food in stores and homes rotted. Communities that regained their power one day lost it the next day as overloads, short circuits, and mistakes occurred. Unbelievably, Gloria's most powerful blow has yet to be dealt to Long Islanders.

LILCO has announced that, because it does not have storm insurance, the $40 million of storm damage to its system will be foisted on to the backs of LILCO customers. Reports from the Connecticut media indicate that Connecticut consumers may face the same fate. Suffering through a week of disrupted electrical service is one thing; paying for that privilege is another.

Hurricanes are not rare events in the Northeastern United States, and many States and utilities were ready for Gloria. Most of Long Island was prepared for a major storm this year. In the hours before the storm struck, State and local officials did a yeoman's job in evacuating people from low-lying areas and setting up shelters. Street-cleaning crews were out immediately after the storm clearing debris from the streets and they worked around the clock in the days that followed. LILCO field workers worked diligently, too. However, the solid preparation and quick action by local agencies stands in stark contrast

to the management of LILCO's chaotic response to Gloria.

I am introducing the Disaster Response Act of 1985 to guarantee that electric utilities in storm-prone areas like Long Island and southern New England take strong precautions to minimize storm damage. The bill mandates that, after a natural disaster, State utility commissions investigate the preparation for and response to a natural disaster by an electric utility. If the commission finds that the utility's managers did not take prudent and reasonable precaution against a disaster, the costs of the damage cannot be passed on to utility customers. Consumers who suffer greatly as a result of an unreasonable delay in the restoration of service can receive compensation from the utility.

Natural disasters obviously upset the daily activities of thousands of people. Governments generally act quickly to restore and maintain order in the wake of disaster. That is why the National Guard is often called out after a storm or tornado. But just as these events are not occasions for looting and general lawlessness, neither should they be excuses to throw fair and orderly business practices to the wind. My legislation is necessary to see that electric utilities prepare for disasters and act responsibly after they strike. And if they aren't ready, their customers will not be forced to pay for their lack of foresight. The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 3568

A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to require regulated retail electric utilities to undertake reasonably prudent response activities when natural disasters cause interruptions in electric service, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ELECTRIC UTILITY RESPONSE TO NATURAL DISASTERS.

(a) AMENDMENT OF PURPA.—Title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"SEC. 609. ELECTRIC UTILITY RESPONSE TO NATURAL DISASTERS.

"(a) INVESTIGATIONS BY STATE COMMISSIONS.—Each State regulatory authority which exercises ratemaking authority over a State regulated electric utility shall undertake an investigation under this subsection following each natural disaster which causes an interruption in the electric service of the State regulated electric utility. The investigation shall make an assessment of each of the following:

"(1) PREPARATION.—The degree to which the interruption in electric service associated with the natural disaster could have been avoided or mitigated by reasonable and prudent preparation on the part of the electric utility. Preparation shall not be deemed reasonable and prudent in any case in which repeated service interruptions have been experienced due to successive natural disasters.

"(2) INSURANCE.—The adequacy of insurance coverage maintained by the utility to cover the costs of repairs and reconstruction necessary to restore electric service following damage to transmisson equipment and other facilities resulting from natural disasters.

"(3) RESTORATION OF SERVICE.—The manner in which repairs and restoration of service was carried out, including the time involved and the measures used to avoid health, safety, and economic problems for electric power customers served by the utility.

"(b) TREATMENT OF REPAIR COSTS.—After an evidentiary hearing each State regulatory authority which exercises ratemaking authority over a State regulated electric utility shall make each of the following determinations, based upon the investigation under subsection (a) and upon any other available information:

"(1) PRUDENCY OF REPAIR COSTS.—A determination as to whether any costs incurred for the repairs of transmission equipment and other equipment necessary to restore service following a natural disaster were caused by imprudent action or inaction of the utility.

"(2) DAMAGES.—A determination of the amount of damages (if any) caused to electric power customers served by the utility as a result of any unreasonable delay in the restoration of electric service to any such customers.

Any electric power customer or group of electric power customers shall be permitted to intervene as a matter of right in the proceeding required under this subsection. If the State regulatory authority finds that any costs referred to in paragraph (1) were caused by imprudent action or inaction of the electric utility, such costs may not be charged to the customers of the such utility. In addition, if a determination is made under paragraph (2) that electric power customers served by the utility incurred damages as a result of an unreasonable delay in the restoration of electric service following a natural disaster, the State regulatory authority shall require the utility to compensate electric power customers for such damages. The costs of such compensation shall not be charged to the customers of such utility.

"(c) DEFINITIONS.—The terms used in this section shall have the same meaning as when used in title I of this Act.".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 is amended by adding the following new item at the end thereof: "Sec. 609. Electric utility response to natural disasters.".

BILL DOHERTY AND A.I.F.L.D. AT WORK ABROAD

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the development of free labor unions abroad is an important goal of America's international democratic strategy. But that is not to say that it is always government officials who can best carry forward such a strategy. A most impressive privately directed American program in this respect is the AFL-CIO's Free Trade Union Institute. Aided in its work by Federal funding from the National Endowment for Democracy and the Agency for International Development, the institute is the sponsor of the Asian American Free Labor Institute, the African American Labor Center, and the American Institute for Free Labor Development, A.I.F.L.D.

The letter is directed by the dynamic William C. Doherty, Jr. Mr. Doherty was recently the subject of a profile in Reader's Digest which well deserves reprinting for those of my colleagues who might not have seen it.

Mr. Speaker, the fight for democracy and freedom is waged by many other means than military ones. This House owes much gratitude to Americans like Bill Doherty.

The article from Reader's Digest follows:

BILL DOHERTY'S BLUE-COLLAR FREEDOM FIGHTERS

(By Donald Robinson)

Led by a gutsy U.S. labor leader, members of a brave band of trade unionists are risking their lives to keep democracy alive in Latin America

Hours after U.S. troops landed on Grenada in October 1983, communist propaganda blasted the invasion as an "imperialist assault" on the Grenadan people.

A gutsy U.S. labor leader answered the communist' big lie. William C. Doherty, Jr., executive director of the AFL-CIO's American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), wangled his way into Grenada before the shooting had stopped and contacted the heads of two unions. Both had fought Grenada's Marxist dictators with Doherty's support. He told them that a resolution condemning the American landing was about to be introduced at an international labor conference in Barbados. The three raced to the meeting.

"What do you mean we were invaded?" the Grenadans declared. "We were *rescued*." When the resolution was defeated overwhelmingly, democratic unionists everywhere took heart.

A hidden army of Soviet and Cuban agents is seeking control of Latin America's 50-million-member labor movement. Command of the trade unions would give the Kremlin a pivotal weapon against pro-Western governments. AIFLD, a band of brave men and women led by Doherty for 23 years, is spearheading resistance not only to the communists but to right-wing extremists as well.

It's been a savage struggle. More than 50 of Doherty's allies have been murdered, including two of his closest aides, and Doherty has received many death threats himself. But despite the odds, AIFLD has won notable victories.

In Honduras it helped to recapture the fruit workers' union from the communists, who had stolen union elections by casting votes for countless "ghost" workers.

In Ecuador the communists got a stranglehold on the Confederation of Ecuadoran Workers (CFE), the major labor organization. CFE was so strong that no Ecuadoran worker could drive a truck without its approval. AIFLD helped organize the Ecuadoran Confederation of Free Trade Unions (CEOSL) to oppose the Marxists. When CFE called a general strike to topple the democratic government, CEOSL licked it. Today, every major union in Ecuador is led by pro-democratic elements.

The Marxist dictator of Surinam was forced to reorganize his cabinet last year to include labor and business representatives after a series of strikes and international protests spearheaded by AIFLD.

A strapping man of 58, Bill Doherty has white hair, a full beard and bright-blue eyes that make him look like Santa Claus. But he can be tough. One day in 1980, he drove 30 miles through Paraguayan jungle to a barbarous prison in Ypacaray that few, if any, North Americans had ever visited. There he demanded to meet with 19 union leaders incarcerated for advocating democracy. When soldiers pointed machine guns at him, Doherty promptly held a press conference.

"When I see this Hitler-like concentration camp, I think I'm in Havana," he told reporters who had accompanied him. "This is how Fidel Castro treats labor leaders." After the press published Doherty's remarks, rightist dictator Alfredo Stroessner released the labor leaders and later closed the prison.

Doherty is a quick-witted speaker. In 1956, he debated Chilean communist Clotario Blest before 2,500 communications workers in Santiago. Doherty wanted the workers to affiliate with the pro-Western Postal, Telephone and Telegraph International (PTTI). Blest was bitterly opposed.

"Why do these well-dressed gringos come here, stay in first-class hotels, go to our best restaurants and tell us they represent the working class?" Blest sneered.

"Because we will not feel successful, Brother Blest," Doherty responded, "until you and all the workers in Chile dress well, stay in those hotels and eat the best meals. We're not here to destroy the capitalists. We want to live like them." The workers roared approval and voted to affiliate with the PTTI.

Doherty was born into the labor movement. His father was president of the National Association of Letter Carriers for 21 years. After air-combat duty during World War II, young Bill spent two years in a Catholic seminary before going to law school.

Doherty went to work in 1954 as Latin American representative of the PTTI. In those days, collective bargaining was nonexistent for most unions in Latin America; pay raises were obtained through rioting.

Determined to fight this, Doherty founded AIFLD and, with the backing of AFL-CIO president George Meany, built it into an activist organization that now has offices in 16 countries, a staff of 56 trade unionists and an $8-million annual budget. Ninety percent of its funds come from the U.S. Agency for International Development, the remainder from the AFL-CIO. Says Doherty: "Communists target organized labor for one reason—to secure power over foreign governments. We believe in a trade-union movement independent of governments, political parties, employers."

I recently traveled throughout Latin America observing AIFLD close up. Here's what I learned:

In war-torn El Salvador, AIFLD has helped organize 350,000 Salvadoran farmers and urban workers into democratic unions. With AIFLD's help, the farmers have formed cooperatives that buy land and pay workers to cultivate it.

The cost is blood of AIFLD's Salvadoran successes has been high. In January 1981, two AIFLD staffers and the director of the Salvadoran land-reform program were machine-gunned to death while drinking coffee in the Hotel Sheraton in San Salvador. But the AIFLD staff has resolved to stay. "We want to make sure the blood of our colleagues was not spilled in vain," says Doherty.

In Guatemala, AIFLD has helped to revive a democratic labor movement enfeebled by repressive dictatorships. Doherty's people had to risk their lives to accomplish it. In 1970, Guatemalan soldiers broke into the house of José Estrada, an American citizen who was the AIFLD director, and dragged him off to prison.

The U.S. embassy obtained Estrada's release. But five days later his home was searched; his books and papers were confiscated. This time the U.S. embassy suggested he leave the country.

Estrada left, but returned a month later. But last year, when elections were held in Guatemala for an assembly to draft a constitution, several labor leaders ran for office, and one was elected.

Castro's Cuba is another battlefield. Working closely with Cuban exiles, AIFLD exposes the tyrannies of the regime. Not long ago, AIFLD raised an international furor that saved the lives of farmers sentenced to death for trying to organize a union in the Cuban sugar fields.

AIFLD is also in the vanguard of the struggle against the Marxist-Leninist government of Nicaragua. AIFLD has been working with Nicaraguan exiles in the United States and Latin America to rally international opinion against the Sandinista regime.

AIFLD's greatest effort is in education. To date, 469,067 trade unionists have studied comparative economic systems, union leadership, collective bargaining and theories of democracy under AIFLD teachers in 17 Latin American countries. AIFLD has brought more than 4000 labor leaders to the George Meany Center for Labor Studies in Silver Spring, Md. Many graduates of the six-week course have risen high in the Latin American trade-union movement.

AIFLD has also helped establish hospitals, schools, credit unions and labor centers throughout Latin America. No project is too small. In Guyana, AIFLD representative John Heberle constructed a footbridge over a creek so children could get to school without dodging crocodiles.

Latin America's strong desire for democracy and economic aid and the efforts of AIFLD and similar organizations have had quite an impact. Six years ago, two-thirds of the people in Latin America and the Caribbean lived under dictatorships or military-dominated governments. Today, 90 percent of them live in democracies or under governments strongly leaning toward democracy.

House Majority Leader Jim Wright (D., Texas) and Rep. Jack Kemp (R., N.Y.), among our most knowledgeable legislators on Latin America, have praised AIFLD for its tireless work in fostering a democratic labor movement throughout the hemisphere. "It was the drive and commitment of Bill Doherty that made this possible," says Wright. Adds Kemp, "Freedom-loving people everywhere owe Doherty and his colleagues an eternal debt of gratitude."

INTRODUCTION OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE EQUITY AND GROWTH ACT OF 1985

HON. STAN LUNDINE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. LUNDINE. Mr. Speaker, at least 50 percent of the projected U.S. trade deficit for 1985 will be due to the inflated value of the dollar when compared to other major international currencies. Earlier this month, I introduced legislation to establish a short-term program to address our exchange rate problem. It mandates intervention in international currency markets to help bring the value of the dollar down gradually and creates a strategic capital reserve in the Department of Treasury to provide short-term stability in exchange rates movements.

Today, I am introducing legislation which seeks long term fundamental reform of our international monetary system. The bill I am introducing today, in cooperation with my colleagues, Mr. GEPHARDT and Mr. BONKER, mandates that President Reagan immediately take the leadership in calling for an international conference to reform the international monetary system. The bill requires Congress to withhold authority for another round of trade negotiations under the GATT until an international conference on monetary reform is convened.

I believe that the international monetary system is in serious need of reform. Such reform should move hand in hand with the effort to complete another round of trade negotiations under the GATT. To proceed with another GATT round without monetary reform is like stepping on an accelerator and brake at the same time. GATT talks cannot liberalize trade while monetary exchange is retarding it.

Since the world adopted floating exchange rates 12 years ago, the volatility of the dollar's exchange rate against the 10 major foreign currencies has substantially increased. Between 1976 and 1978, the dollar declined by 20 percent until it was halted by intervention by the Carter administration in the international currency markets. After a 21-month plateau, it then rose by an unprecedented 60 percent from mid-1980 to early 1985. Finally, we seem to have topped out, and are once again trying to use some limited intervention to push the dollar down to a more acceptable level. But the dollar remains 30 to 40 percent overvalued against other currencies. Long-term reform is needed to appropriately adjust and stabilize international exchange rates.

When the world was under a system of fixed exchange rates, the commitment to defend exchange rates made it difficult for countries to freely pursue their domestic economic objectives. Theorists and practitioners alike expected that floating exchange rates would enable countries to maintain rough balance in their international trade accounts while still affording them flexibility to pursue domestic economic objectives. They were wrong. What they failed to perceive adequately was the very large and independent role that capital flows would play in determining exchange rates, and the negative impact this would have on the trade accounts.

It is time to reassert some control over exchange rate patterns. We must find new ways to cooperate to provide greater stability in exchange rate patterns. Some have advocated a system of target zones or

crawling pegs whereby currency values would only be allowed to fluctuate within an internationally agreed-upon range before triggering intervention or other actions by trading nations.

Reasserting control will involve domestic economic tradeoffs to a greater degree. It may mean that the United States must reduce its budget deficit to lower U.S. interest rates and reduce the capital attraction to the U.S. market. It probably means that the Europeans and Japanese must accelerate their economies. It may mean greater liberalization of the Japanese capital markets. Some have even suggested that it may mean the creation of an entirely new international currency.

I think all of us welcome the recent initiatives by the Reagan administration which for the first time in 5 years acknowledge that the inflated value of the dollar is distorting international trade patterns and costing the United States jobs and markets. But the recent Reagan initiative is a beginning, not a conclusion of what must become an ongoing process of short-term actions leading to long-term fundamental reform.

To achieve competitive equilibrium and stability in international exchange rates will require reform of our international monetary system. For the last 5 years, dollar exchange rate trends have perplexed economists and policymakers in all nations. It is unhealthy for the world trading system to be subjected to such uncontrollable and unpredictable trends in our exchange rate patterns. For sure, more and more protectionist actions will be the only recourse of nations whose trading patterns are distorted by artificially inflated currencies. Tieing another round of GATT negotiations to a parallel international negotiating effort on exchange rates makes sense politically and economically. I urge you to join me in urging adoption of this bill to demonstrate our commitment to stable and reasonable exchange rates.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

HON. H. JAMES SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased today to attend the groundbreaking ceremony for the Holocaust Memorial Museum, and I was pleased to see the hard work of many people coming to fruition.

Mr. Speaker, this is a significant day, as the museum will serve as a reminder for generations to come of the awful manifestation of man's inhumanity to man that took place during the Holocaust. Remembrance of the Holocaust teaches us that racism of any kind is a curse to all mankind.

It was for that very reason that I sponsored legislation in the New Jersey Assembly in 1979 which eventually provided for an educational curriculum on the Holocaust in my home State. I believed then, as I believe now, that our children must know the full history of the Nazi rise to power, and the resulting horrors perpetrated against humanity.

And, I would like to invite my colleagues here in the House to join me in cosponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 133, a bill expressing the sense of Congress that each State should develop a curriculum for instructing schoolchildren in the history of the Holocaust. In this way, we can provide future generations the insight to prevent such travesties from ever occurring again.

MICKEY LELAND'S WAR ON HUNGER

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the very fine work of our distinguished colleague, Congressman MICKEY LELAND of Texas. I would particularly like to bring his dedicated work as chairman of the Select Committee on Hunger to the attention of the House.

Hunger does exist in our country. It may be found in our cities, in our rural areas, and deep in the mountains of Appalachia. It does not take on the horrible magnitude of the famine in Africa or the desperate struggle for survival in the Indian subcontinent. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a reality for many of our fellow Americans.

We are the wealthiest nation on Earth, and yet we have millions of poor people. We grow more food than any nation, and yet we have children who go to bed hungry at night. There is no excuse for this situation, Mr. Speaker.

Congressman LELAND has committed himself to eliminating hunger in the United States and abroad. He is to be commended for his efforts on behalf of those who would otherwise have no one to champion their cause. He is a true humanitarian and deserves the highest praise and recognition.

I would like to enter the following article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 27, 1985]

LELAND AND THE WAR ON HUNGER

FOR THE TEXAS CONGRESSMAN, AN ACTIVIST'S PATH

(By Jacqueline Trescott)

Rep. Mickey Leland (D-Tex.) was in an Ethiopian refugee camp, standing at what he calls "the end of the Earth." An official was explaining the desolation; Leland was looking at it.

"I was asking him about this little girl who looked to be about 70 or 80 years old—a skeleton of a person with a thin layer of brown skin draped on her, who had just a faint breath of life in her," says Leland, speaking slowly, with a sorrowful resonance. "While I was talking to him, she died. I can see her face right now. Every day I see her face."

The girl was 14.

Filled with hopelessness and impatient with the talk of statistics and plans, Leland walked away from the visiting congressional delegation. Then he ran into a child who spoke English and who wanted to know his name. "He started repeating 'Mickey, Mickey,'" recalls Leland. And in that instant, Leland found a way to "give them some good feelings about themselves." The U.S. congressman and the Ethiopian children chanted together. First, "Mickey, Mickey" for about 30 minutes. Then a kid yelled "Disco," and a new chant echoed around the barren camp.

By this point the entire delegation was watching the exchange of instant love. "Then I said 'I,' they said 'I,' I said 'love,' they said 'love,' and I said 'you' and they said 'you.' They were happy kids at that point," says Leland, 10 months and 7,000 miles away in a congressional dining room, recalling the moment he gained "an even larger heart."

In the past year, the 40-year old four-term congressman from Houston has applied what his friends call his "humanity" to influential tasks as chairman of the House Select Committee on Hunger and of the Congressional Black Caucus, which is holding its annual legislative weekend through Sunday. "I am now an activist on behalf of humanity everywhere, whether it is in Ethiopia . . . South Africa . . . Chile . . . in any part of the world where people are desperate and hungry for the freedoms and rights they serve as human beings," he says. "That is my community, that is my battleground."

But Leland's world is not limited to the 1980s wars on hunger. He also plunges into more politically risky business. He currently opposes the U.S. Conference of Bishops in their support of an antiabortion amendment to the proposed Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1985; Leland, a practicing Roman Catholic, says the fight causes him "a terrible internal struggle." He is the member of Congress closest to Fidel Castro and has been an emissary of the State Department to the Cuban president; "White I disagree with his fundamental ideology . . . I respect him for his intellect," he says.

In the 1984 presidential primary, he supported former vice president Walter Mondale over the Rev. Jesse Jackson, a position that angered many black colleagues and ultimately cost him his post as chairman of the Democratic National Committee's black caucus; he says he "still has the scars." He has bicycled through Israel, sends Houston youngsters to a kibbutz and describes himself as a "staunch friend of Israel," but he says he is also for the self-determination of the Palestinians. He has tangled repeatedly with television executives over off-camera employment and the image of minorities in prime-time programming, and with the Federal Communications Commission over affirmative action policies in the industry. A full year before Diahann Carroll and Billy Dee Williams showed up on "Dynasty," he grilled ABC executives about why the show didn't have any black characters. Now he is livid with Williams for saying his recent roles weren't due to any pressure.

In the Washington places where criticism of a liberal politician like Leland naturally breeds, he appears to have ruffled few feathers. "We vote 100 percent different," says Rep. Jack Fields (R-Tex.), but "we are able to dialogue and I find it ironic that I am teaching him how to play basketball." Rep. Bill Emerson (R-Mo.), a conservative who voted against forming the Hunger Committee but later joined it, says, "We agree on the problems. We disagree on most

of the solutions, but we do talk about those issues."

But some of his colorful retorts have angered Black Caucus colleagues. Earlier this year, for example, Roland Burris, an Illinois politician, was defeated in the black caucus of the DNC he ran for party vice chairman. Paul Kirk, the chairman of the DNC, then let the full DNC vote on the job and Burris won. "Burris let himself be used," says Leland, who says he supported Burris in the caucus but felt Burris should stand by the caucus' vote. In a press conference after the February vote, Leland used the analogy of the loyalty house slaves felt toward plantation masters. A reporter asked him what he was trying to say and Leland recalls saying, "The conventional term is Uncle Tom" "They are the ones who called him an Uncle Tom," he says. "I didn't . . . I opposed what Burris had done. And if the shoe fits wear it."

"I am not a conventional politican—by no means," he says.

Leland grew up in a working class neighborhood of Houston. He says he learned his values from the sacrifices of his mother, a teacher who had put herself through school working as a short-order cook.

Health and hunger issues aren't new to him. As a pharmacy student at Texas Southern, Leland was attracted to the work of the Medical Committee for Human Rights, a group of health professionals who established free health clinics, and the Black Panther Party, which was giving free breakfasts to school children and operating free clinics. He led a student group to invite Stokely Carmichael and other young civil rights leaders to campus. "They were expressing the anger and anguish of black people at that time. They were the ones who would step up and be bold enough to challenge the white establisment. I was impressed with that," says Leland.

Houston, which was not in the vanguard of civil rights and antiwar activities, was surprised at this emerging leader, who formed a group called The Black Community Action Team—or The Black Cats.

His political influences—which ranged from Malcolm X to writer Amiri Baraka to Tanzanian president Julius Nyerere—along with his look at the time—dashikis and a seven-inch Afro—naturally led to his being labeled a radical. "I never considered myself to be radical because I fought for the rights of human beings," he says. In the years between college and politics, he helped establish three health clinics in Houston and then taught at Texas Southern for a year.

In 1972 Leland began to focus on establishment politics as a continuation of his activism and won his first race for the Texas House of Representatives. In Austin, he championed health issues, battling the pharmaceutical lobby by pushing for a generic substitution bill and for legislation to make it harder for kids to buy over-the-counter cough medicine, which they were using as a stimulant.

But his impact was broader than the issues he focused on. "He could legitimately have been called a focal point in changing attitudes toward minorities. He showed that minorities in Texas were a coming political force," says Rep. Ronald Coleman (D-Tex.), who shared a desk with Leland in Austin.

When former Texas representative Barbara Jordan announced she was retiring, Leland decided to go for the national arena. "The legislature had closed in on me." So the summer he had planned to spend on a kibbutz he ran for Congress instead, and at age 33 beat two more-established politicians.

In the 13 years Leland has been an elected politician, he has developed a reputation for coalition building. "There are people inside [the House] who are more effective. But Mickey just needs more time in a day. His strength is in building that network inside and out," says Rep. Bill Richardson (D-N.M.) A close friend, Richardson talks about Leland's hyperactivity. "When we are both in town on Saturdays, we have gone to see three movies in a day to catch up with the way normal people live. One time we saw 'Rambo,' 'Missing in Action' and 'Back to the Future.' Mickey works and plays hard and he is effective both ways."

Leland started to advocate a caucus on world hunger when he joined Congress in 1979. At first he ran up against a stone wall. He was opposed by people who thought another select committee was crazy. And he was opposed by congressmen who thought he was infringing on their turf of foreign relations, agriculture and appropriations. He kept trying.

After four years, when even the horrors he described from a 1983 trip to Ethiopia didn't sway the sentiment, Leland, as he puts it, "went to the people." He rallied all the organizations that had hunger issues on their portfolio. Then he called in the celebrities, such as John Denver, Valerie Harper and Cliff Robertson. Then Speaker of the House Thomas P. (Tip) O'Neill Jr. lent his prestige. Finally turf was being threatened to be members of the caucus. Authorized in the spring of 1984, the committee in one year has provided the momentum and visibility that resulted in $800 million appropriated for famine relief.

In the range of telecommunications issues Leland has advocated, be has met greatest resistance on his push for stricter hiring percentages for minorities and women. "Two or three years ago, he wanted more stringent percentages of minorities and women for all jobs. Our position was that the commission's guidelines were adequate," explains John Summers, executive vice president, government relations for the National Association of Broadcasters. "But he is a good advocate for what he believes in. On an issue like that we understand where he is coming from."

But some groups feel Leland's work on the important House Energy and Commerce Committee hasn't gone far enough. "They have been jumping up and down about minority ownership and employment. But we work with these companies every day, we are always pressuring. His efforts could have been more effective if he worked with us on a regular basis," says Pluria Marshall, the president of the National Black Media Coalition.

Yet it is in lobbying for minority ownership that Leland has had his greatest success. Earlier this year when Capital Cities Communications announced it was buying the American Broadcasting Companies Inc., Leland initiated a meeting of Cap Cities executives and minority investors to discuss any acquisitions by minorities or women. As a result, a television station and two radio stations are minority-owned.

The Black Caucus, currently 20 Democratic members, has a role magnified beyond its numbers. It is regarded as representing a national constituency and acts as spokesman on a realm of topics touching minority America.

Traditionally, the Caucus has boxed vigorously with the White House, whether its residents were Democrats or Republicans, and more often than not the Caucus has found itself shadow-boxing.

That's true in the Leland regime. President Reagan hasn't met with the Caucus since 1981, but Leland met with him last December to discuss famine relief after the congressional trip to Ethiopia.

"He immediately upon our request diverted a ship that was going to India with food to Ethiopia. I was really happy—for the first time proud—that President Reagan was our president. He was far greater concerned than I had seen him on any issue dealing with human beings. That was a rare occasion, I might add," says Leland.

Otherwise, he says, the relationship between the Caucus and the White House is "very bad"—then reconsiders and continues—"It is not bad, it is not good, it is nonexistent." Not meeting with the Black Caucus, says Leland, "is past being just insensitive. It is an evil character who refuses to spend time with people who have a deep abiding concern about humanity when we are in severe jeopardy."

Each fall the Caucus sponsors a five-day round of panels, hearings, speeches and receptions. It's an unusual effort for a congressional body, and the events attract at least 10,000 people each year. They come here to listen, they come here to help us develop agendas for the next year," says Leland.

Some find romance. At the Caucus weekend three years ago, Leland met Alison Walton, then 24 and a Georgetown University law student. Nine months later they were married. "Well, I wasn't about to marry an older woman," he says archly of the teasing that came because of the couple's age difference. Leland, who looks both impish and handsome, was considered quite a catch. He is broad-shouldered and muscular with just enough swagger to give his Giorgio Amani suits some personal flair. He has an expansive smile and his light green eyes have that "who-are-you-kidding" skepticism.

Right now, the anticipation of fatherhood for the first time early next year makes Leland come alive even more than global questions. "One of the happiest occasions of my life was getting married and the knowledge I am going to be a father. I have always wanted to be a father," says Leland, who used to memorize the names of all the children of the fellow members of the Texas legislature, worked in the Big Brother program with a teenager in the Shaw area of Washington, and is trying to get a posthumous Presidential Medal of Freedom for David, the Houston youngster who spent most of his life living in a bubble.

His interest in young people seems constant. A few nights ago, outside Sen. Claiborne Pell's (D-R.I.) home, Leland struck up a conversation in Spanish—which he has used on the House floor—with a student parking cars. "When he said he was from Puerto Rico, Mickey said, 'Did you know Raul Julia is inside?' The student's eyes just lit up and Mickey took the guy back inside," recounts Alison Leland. "I turned to someone and jokingly said, 'This kid is probably coming over for dinner tomorrow night.' When he got in the car Mickey said, 'We are having dinner together on Sunday.' "

CHINESE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 80 YEARS OLD

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and congratulate the Chinese Chamber of Commerce of New York on its 80th anniversary this month. Economically and culturally, the Chinese community has contributed enormously to the city of New York, and a great deal of hard work and successful enterprise can be attributed to the work of the chamber.

The work of the chamber is very evident in the prospering sections of commerce, international trade, and manufacturing. The chamber has been instrumental as a communication link between the city and merchants in the Chinese community. The chamber works very hard to educate Chinese merchants on American business relations offering, among other things, workshops and seminars.

Again, I congratulate the Chinese Chamber of Commerce on its 80th anniversary, and I applaud its valuable services not only to the Chinese community, but also to the city of New York.

STRATEGIC TRADE INITIATIVE

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Trade Partnership Act of 1985—the first comprehensive package designed to reverse the deterioration of our trade balance.

I call this bill the strategic trade initiative: it is an innovative, forward-looking alternative to the mutual assured destruction that will befall our Nation and our allies if we invoke protectionism and provoke trade wars.

Instead of repeating the mistakes of the past, the strategic trade initiative seeks to build our exporting capability, while making it easier for companies that face unfair competition or trade barriers to gain relief.

It is a constructive approach rather than a destructive one.

And the strategic trade initiative also recognizes the plight of workers who have already lost their jobs to import competition or who will as industry adjusts to the more competitive environment.

By continuing trade adjustment assistance, this bill will ensure that these workers are not just cast off and forgotten. They must be retrained for jobs in growing industries.

As an aside, let me once again commend the attention of my colleagues to the Individual Training Account Act Congressman DURBIN and I have introduced. The bill would set up a broader, employer- and employee-funded job training program.

The strategic trade initiative would provide a comprehensive shield for the American economy, fending off unfair competitors, opening foreign markets, building exporters and aiding workers. Those are goals Members on both sides of the aisle share. I hope we can work together to achieve them through this bill.

THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF FAIRLEIGH DICKINSON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the Fairleigh Dickinson University School of Dentistry in Hackensack, NJ. The university will be celebrating this milestone with a reception to be held on October 16, 1985. I could not allow this occasion to pass without officially going on record to honor the faculty, administrators, and students associated with the school of dentistry.

Since it opened with its first class in 1956, New Jersey's only private dental school has educated more than 1,500 students, many of whom practice in the State. Another 300 students, most of them State residents, have become specialists after earning postdoctoral degrees at the school.

Thousands of patients, including children, the handicapped, and the elderly, have benefited from the school's clinical services. In addition to the 195-patient chairs at the school, there are more than 50 chairs in satellite clinics that serve an urban school district, a prison, several hospitals, and a physical and mental rehabilitation center.

On the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the school, I particularly wish to recognize the work of Dr. Ralph S. Kaslick, dean of the dental school, Dr. Anthony Picozzi, director of development and professional relations, and F.D.U. president, Robert H. Donaldson. I am proud to commend them for their many years of public service and am pleased to acknowledge their accomplishments on this special occasion.

It is important that we continue to support academic institutions such as the Fairleigh Dickinson University School of Dentistry in Hackensack. Their commitment to service and development should be an example to us all.

HONORING WINNERS OF YOUNG PRESIDENT'S ORGANIZATION CONTEST ON "EXPLORING FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY"

HON. BOBBI FIEDLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to the accomplishment of four very outstanding young people. They are the grand prize winners of the essay contest sponsored by the Young President's Organization, a contest that over 15,000 fifth and sixth graders entered. The Young President's Organization is awarding the winners a $5,000 scholarship bond and a personal computer in honor of their achievement. The topic for these essays was "Exploring Freedom and Democracy."

I congratulate Shane W. Finkel of Plymouth Valley, PA; Christopher Matthew Peter of Quincy, IL; Christopher J. Dall of Lavaca, KA; and Jason Hunsberger of Boise, ID; for their incisive essays on the concept of freedom.

We can all commend this youthful appreciation of the principles on which this country was founded, and the hope it expresses for the future of this country. The four winners and their parents can be justly proud of their accomplishment.

H.R. 3008

HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to clarify why I decided to withdraw the amendment I had offered to H.R. 3008, the Equitable Pay Practices on the Civil Service Act, on Wednesday, October 9, 1985, when this legislation was considered by the House of Representatives.

As you know, H.R. 3008, as passed by the House of Representatives, establishes a study to determine whether Federal pay practices impermissibly consider factors such as an employee's sex or race. The meaning of these terms is well understood in employment discrimination law. In fact, both terms are used in title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. But, H.R. 3008 goes on to add a new term which doesn't appear in the Civil Rights Act. The word is "ethnicity." This is a new term. Section 10 of H.R. 3008 defines the term "ethnicity" as used in this bill by stating it "refers to the quality of being, or not being, of Hispanic origin."

I assume that the term "ethnicity" as used in this context means that a person's ethnic background may not be used as a factor in setting that person's pay. I, of course, have no quarrel with that principle. In title VII law, however, the term we use to express this principle is "national

origin." That is, no person should be discriminated against because of his or her "national origin."

I felt that this bill should also use the term "national origin" rather than inventing a new term, "ethnicity." But, if the bill is going to use this new term, it should be defined in the same manner as national origin, rather than the contrived definition which the bill now contains. Thus, I had intended to introduce my amendment which would have amended that portion of section 10 stating that "'ethnicity' refers to the country where a person was born or the country from which his or her ancestors came."

This country includes many people of many different ethnic backgrounds and many national origins. Yet, with great insensitivity, H.R. 3008 defines away all of these ethnic backgrounds and tries to make the term "ethnic" a synonym for the word "Hispanic." I think that it is offensive to many people in our country, both Hispanics and non-Hispanics, for Congress to define ethnic background as meaning only "Hispanic."

I had intended to offer my amendment which would change the definition of "ethnicity" to be the same as the definition of "national origin" used in title VII of the Civil Rights Act. However, it was brought to my attention during my discussion with Ms. OAKAR when I was introducing my amendment that the term "national origin" had been previously clarified to mean all nationalities that have been historically discriminated against. This clarification occurred when Mr. SIKORSKI offered an amendment to expand the bill to include a study in the Federal Government of hiring and promotion policies with regard to discrimination on race, sex, and national origin. The discussion that transpired between Mr. LIPINSKI and Ms. OAKAR regarding the definition of "national origin" can be found on page 26937 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, October 9, 1985. Mr. LIPINSKI determined with Ms. OAKAR at that time that the meaning of the term "national origin" as used in Mr. SIKORSKI'S amendment would include individuals of all ethnic backgrounds that have been historically discriminated against, not just Hispanics.

It is therefore my understanding that the amendment as offered by Mr. SIKORSKI and as accepted by Ms. OAKAR would adequately satisfy my concerns that a person's ethnic background may not be used as a factor in setting that person's pay. If I find at a later date that the amendment offered by Mr. SIKORSKI does not adequately clarify that concern I was addressing with my amendment, I will attempt to see that this point is clarified legislatively when the bill is discussed in the Senate.

A TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH COOPER

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to salute an individual who has tirelessly served the New Castle community of the Fourth District of Pennsylvania.

Dedicated to the betterment of education and improvement of the school system, Mr. Joseph Cooper has been a member of the New Castle Area School Board for over 28 years. In addition to the position of vice president of the New Castle Area School Board, he has been a member of the Lawrence County Area Vocational Technical School Board since 1964 and president since 1978, as well as president of Midwestern Intermediate Unit 4 Board in Grove City, PA.

It is surely with sadness that friends, neighbors, and coworkers see Mr. Cooper, who has sat on the New Castle Area School Board longer than any other member, serve in his last year.

Since he was first elected to the board, Mr. Cooper has witnessed the growth and decline of the district. When first sworn in as a board member, the district, faced with a wave of enrollments, was building new schools. It was a prosperous era—a healthy economic environment, no teacher strikes, and rigorous athletic programs.

Now, the district is consolidating, having closed one school and considering the closing of others, due to a decline in enrollment. Mr. Cooper acknowledges that closing a school is one of the most difficult, yet necessary, decisions a director may have to make.

In addition to his steadfast commitment to the school board, Mr. Cooper has been dedicated to the athletics programs, as well. As chairman of the athletic committee, his influence on the system has been pervasive. He was largely responsible for the head football coach appointment at New Castle of Lyndo Lauro, who has brought back the winning tradition established by former coach Philip Bridenbaugh. For years, Mr. Cooper helped line the field before home games and handled the yard markers during the games. A loyal spectator, he has attended all New Castle High School football and basketball games in the past 50 years, except the ones he was too ill to attend.

The long-time efforts and accomplishments of Mr. Cooper have benefited the schools of the New Castle area. The community will certainly miss his knowledge and experience. I am proud to share with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, the achievements of such a fine and dedicated individual as Mr. Joseph Cooper of the Fourth District of Pennsylvania.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY ASSOCIATION

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the Sacramento-Yolo/Mother Lode Chapter of the United Cerebral Palsy Association, which is celebrating its 30th anniversary of inspirational service to the disabled citizens of the Sacramento metropolitan area on October 24, 1985.

This fine organization's dedication and concern is exemplified through the many high quality programs and services it offers to the community. Among them are the community living arrangements, services and programs, and independent living skills training program for disabled adults. Respite care is also available to the families of disabled persons to relieve parents and allow them time outside the home. A daily transportation service takes 160 disabled individuals to various educational and vocational training programs. Adult growth experience offers severely retarded adults classroom training in basic self-help skills and verbal and nonverbal communications.

In addition, the Cerebral Palsy Guild sponsors a car seat rental and sales program to prevent cerebral palsy due to head injuries children receive in automobile accidents. The association also conducts an annual telethon to raise funds to continue and expand its programs. All of these activities help to educate and inform the entire community on the challenges and the potential of disabled persons.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and commend the United Cerebral Palsy Association for its many years of outstanding service and its ready willingness to help others who are less fortunate strive to return to productive and meaningful lives. I salute all of the association's hard work and offer my best wishes for continued success in all of its programs and services.

GOOLCHER GRAZIER: A MARYLAND ARTIST INTRODUCES A NEW ART FORM

HON. ROY DYSON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. DYSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress a truly unique artistic achievement born of the inspired and creative efforts of a fellow Marylander, Ms. Goolcher Grazier. On September 9, 1985, at the Robinson Gallery in New York City, Ms. Grazier, a native of Bombay, India, and now an American citizen who resides in Berlin, MD, combined for the first time

ever music and still art—with a cassette on the frame, the music to play at the touch of a button.

For her first art-music creation, Ms. Grazier chose her painting, "Banyan," a close view of the Banyan and Pipul trees of India, intertwining in a forest of central India. The original music composed especially for "Banyan" comes from internationally reknowned jazz bassist, Bill Goodall. Speaking of his contribution to this new art form, Mr. Goodall had this to say: "Goolcher's 'Banyan' inspired me to compose an original composition whilst looking at the painting—its colors radiating and stirring my brain to move my fingers in notes, tones, and chords to create a whole impression."

Ms. Grazier's concept in "Banyan" is a source of genuine pride for many of us in Maryland's First Congressional District. It takes a very special type of person to traverse new territory, to act on new ideas. So, Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I commend Ms. Grazier for developing this new and exciting art form.

A CONGRESSIONAL TRIBUTE TO ROBERT C. McGRATH

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Robert C. McGrath, whose work as financial secretary of local 120 of the Bakery, Confectionery & Tobacco Workers International Union will be honored at a retirement dinner in Long Beach, CA, on October 24.

Born in Seattle, WA, Bob joined the U.S. Navy in 1941 and was at Pearl Harbor on the "day that has lived in infamy." He saw the battleship *Arizona* go down. After serving for the duration of World War II on a destroyer tender, Bob went to work as a baker in San Francisco. In remembrance of his experience, he also became a member of the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association.

In February 1958, Bob joined the Bakery, Confectionery & Tobacco Workers International Union, and by September, he became financial secretary of local 120 in Stockton, CA. Bob came to local 31 in Long Beach in April 1962 and served as financial secretary of this local until his retirement.

Although he will continue to be active in the community, Bob will now have more time to enjoy his hobbies of reading, traveling, and horticulture.

My wife, Lee, joins me in wishing Robert C. McGrath, his wife, Bette, and his two sons, Claude and Terry, continued success in their future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BOB LIVINGSTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, because of pre-existing commitments to my constituents, I was unable to be present for votes last Friday, October 11.

Had I been present I would have supported all efforts to enact the Gramm-Rudman-Mack-Cheney Deficit Reduction, Balanced Budget Plan. Since no vote on that specific issue was permitted, I would have voted for the Michel motion to instruct the House conferees to promptly report amendments to the Budget Control and Impoundment Act which provide mechanisms for deficit reductions, including specific and mandatory budget goals for achieving a balanced budget within the next 6 years.

TRIBUTE TO COACH HERSHEL MOORE

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the work of an outstanding citizen and coach.

For 35 years, Hershel Moore has worked with young men in middle Tennessee and they will gather to honor him October 18 with special homecoming festivities.

His players have been very successful both on and off the field and are a testament to his dedication and integrity.

Many of Moore's players have said that they learned "a lot more than just football" from him. He does not measure success just by the number of games a team wins, but in each team's ability to work together and in each athlete's efforts to achieve academic and athletic excellence.

Historian Henry Brooks Adam once wrote that "a teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." Coach Moore is one of those rare individuals who has deeply affected the lives of hundreds of students and we are fortunate to have him in our community.

I know that my colleagues join me in saluting this fine coach who has given not only of his time, but his spirit, to help shape middle Tennessee's young men into conscientious citizens.

IN LOVING TRIBUTE TO RONA GALLICK

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to an especially compassionate and generous constituent of my Fourth Congressional District in Pennsylvania.

Billie Dawn Gallick of New Castle has shown her neighborliness by again hosting a second annual fashion and hair styling benefit show for the Hospice of St. Francis Hospital in New Castle, PA.

For the second year, Billie Dawn Gallick has performed this tribute to honor her sister Rona, who succumbed to cancer at age 30, following the best of care at St. Francis' Hospice during the last month of her life, which ended January 22, 1984.

I commend Billie Dawn Gallick for her loving and caring ways, and for devoting her energy throughout the year, to this worthy fundraising cause.

As coordinator of this fashion gala to support hospice and help others—such as her sister—she also helps hospice patients face their future with faith and dignity.

Billie Dawn Gallick's fundraiser enables her and the other employees of her hair-styling salon to donate their time and energy creating outstanding hair styles for models who will display the latest clothing fashions.

The clothing for the fashion show will be provided by The Duchess of West Gate Plaza in Union Township, Lawrence County, and Gary's Place of New Castle in Lawrence County.

Today, before the U.S. House of Representatives, I salute Billie Dawn Gallick and offer my congratulations and best wishes for success in her annual affair of the heart.

NATIONAL DICTIONARY DAY PROCLAMATION

HON. BILL GREEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, as Representative of the district housing Simon & Schuster, Inc., publisher of America's most honored dictionary, I should like to take a moment of this Chamber's time to recognize the importance of lexicography on this, National Dictionary Day.

As noted in Webster's New World Dictionary 2d College Edition, "Americanism" is defined as "A word, phrase, or usage orginating in, or peculiar to, American English," I would like to share a number of these with my esteemed colleagues: Champ, geek, hoagie, gizmo, scuba, snafu, beeline, thinktank, clipboard, movie, cloudburst, stevedore, sidewalk, freightcar, French toast, Canadian bacon, Chinatown, English muffin, chow mein, chicken a la king, caramba, cloverleaf, coffee table, preempt, paycheck, riproaring, ripsnorting, shovelhead, teddy bear, internal revenue, sideburs, belly flop, letterman, jigsaw, bathtub, barbeque, jumbo, babysitter, chili, lacrosse, teepee, roughneck, floozy, Mickey Mouse, smog, catnap, coyote, crackerjack, and of course, caucus.

Thanks to David Guralnick, editor-in-chief of Webster's New World Dictionary

51-059 O-86-23 (Pt. 20)

for supplying us with 14,000 Americanisms, in addition to the small sample listed above.

SOCIAL SECURITY NOTCH

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday several hundred senior citizens visited the Capitol to deliver petitions in support of higher benefits for so-called notch babies—Social Security recipients who were born between 1917 and 1921.

These Social Security beneficiaries believe they are receiving lower benefits than they rightfully deserve and that they have been the victims of discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from the October 11 edition of the Washington Post speaks to this issue and I urge my colleagues to read it.

"NOTCH BABIES" MARCH

Even as Congress considers deep new cuts in spending, a group of beneficiaries is planning a march on Washington to demand higher benefits. The self-styled "notch babies"—what a term!—claim that, by virtue of having been born in the years 1917-1921, they have been unjustly deprived of higher Social Security pensions. In fact, their treatment has been perfectly fair. The only unfairness is that excessive benefits were paid to slightly older retirees.

The Social Security marchers point to the fact that people in their age group are having their initial retirement benefits calculated according to a formula that is less generous on average than the one applied to persons a year or more older than they are. As a result, they claim, they are victims of a government program "notch"—a quirk in social policy that makes one group of people substantially worse off than other people from whom they differ only slightly.

The shift in program rules came about because in 1977 Congress belatedly corrected a faulty formula added to the Social Security law in 1972. That error, which involved the way benefits were adjusted for inflation, had alredy resulted in a sharp—and unintended—increase in benefits received by people retiring in the late 1970s. If the error had not been corrected, people retiring in this decade would have received benefits equal, on average, to 50 to 60 percent of their prior earnings as compared with an average rate of only 36 percent when Congress put the inflation formula into law. If this situation had continued, Social Security would have been put into permanent bankruptcy in short order.

However, by the time Congress realized what was the matter and got around to fixing it, many people had already been overcompensated. Since taking away benefits from people who already have them is very harsh treatment, Congress decided to leave alone those people who had already retired or passed the age of 62 under the faulty rules, but straighten things out for following generations—starting with the "notch babies."

Inevitably this meant that younger retirees would get somewhat less on average than those slightly older. But the marchers' claim for special compensation lacks merit because they have not received any less than they were entitled—the people before them simply got too much. Congress even included transitional rules giving the 1917-1921 generation somewhat favored treatment compared with those, with comparable earnings records, who are younger than they. In fact, like all Social Security retirees to date, the marchers can expect to receive benefits far exceeding their actual contributions. Instead of demanding extra benefits, they should be glad that Congress corrected an error that might have put all Social Security benefits in jeopardy—including their own.

LABOR ZIONIST ALLIANCE HONORS HUMAN RIGHTS LEADER MAX MONT

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I feel it a privilege to have the opportunity to inform my colleagues here in the House that the Labor Zionist Alliance will bestow the first Tzedek Award on Max Mont, a dear and long-time friend of many in this Chamber. That ceremony will take place at the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles this Sunday. The award is inspired by the words of the Hebrew prophet Micah: "Tzedek, Tzedek Tirdof"—"Justice, justice shall you pursue." Those of us who know Max know exactly why this particular honor could not be bestowed on a more deserving man. Max's life has been spent in the pursuit of justice for the downtrodden.

Most people in California political life are well aware of the esteem in which Max is held by organized labor for his many years of service to the members of AFL-CIO. But I remember a Max Mont whose dedication to those without adequate representation stretches back decades. He was one of Cesar Chavez's earliest and strongest allies in the effort to bring decency to the lives of farmworkers in California. Those early efforts were hard and thankless. Attempts has been made to organize farmworkers as early as the 1920's, and always the attempts were crushed. It took people like Chavez and Mont to make the decisive difference.

Max's devotion to justice has never known bounds of color, ethnic background or border. When Martin Luther King, Jr., came to Los Angeles to help cut a nationwide swath of civil rights reform for black people, Max was right there by Dr. King's side. It was Max and people like him who helped to cement the close ties between Jewish people and black people that has survived to the present day despite efforts to break the alliance.

Members of the black legislative delegation in California, and in that delegation I include the black Members of Congress and the black members of the California Legislature, have always considered Max one of their most solid and dedicated friends. In my nearly 30 years in California politics, I cannot remember a time when Max was not there for us.

And so, it is my abiding honor to pay tribute to this selfless man, this man of justice, this man of love. The Tzedek Award is elevated in prestige by having been presented to as great a man as Max Mont.

CHARLES KRAUTHAMMER ON THE MYTH OF PLO MODERATION

HON. JIM COURTER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. COURTER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist Charles Krauthammer is suggesting that the diplomatic din over the *Achille Lauro* case is the reverberation of an explosion—the explosion of the myth of the PLO's moderation. That myth is an enduring one, however, and the present scandal might be forgotten by the world's opinion makers as swiftly as where so many others.

The Krauthammer essay from today's Washington Post deserves to be placed in the RECORD for just that reason: We cannot afford to forget again:

ITALY'S SHAME

Rarely has a single terrorist incident created such international commotion. The Achille Lauro affair has produced anger between Egypt and the United States, strains between the United States and Italy, a convulsion in Italy's ruling coalition, anti-government riots in Egypt and cancellation of a breakthrough meeting of the British foreign minister with the PLO. Even the General Assembly, under heavy American pressure, tabled a planned invitation to Yasser Arafat. The diplomatic din you hear is the sound of a myth exploding. The myth is PLO moderation, its vaunted turn from terror to diplomacy.

On this assumption has been built the Middle East policies (its centerpiece: engaging the PLO in the "peace process") of Egypt, Italy, Britain and, increasingly, the United States. Policies, alliances, even governments are now being rearranged not because of individual blunders or lies, but because of the logic of the situation: after the Achille Lauro, to talk of a new, moderate, post-terror PLO is to risk ridicule.

To avoid the risk, the British government took the precaution of asking the PLO delegation it was to meet with in London to sign a statement renouncing terror and recognizing Israel's right to exist. As if to confirm everything that had happened aboard the Achille Lauro, the PLO delegation refused. The British foreign minister then called off the meeting.

Not everyone decided (for the time being at least) to bend before the facts. Italy decided to send the facts to Yugoslavia. At the first available moment, it released Abul Abbas, the notorious Palestinan terrorist (the White House's phrase) who was aboard the highjackers' getaway plane that the United States diverted to Italy.

With Abbas, the PLO double game—commit terror, talk peace—is up. Here is the man sent by Yasser Arafat as an "intermediary" between civilization and the Achille

Lauro hijacker-murderers. Abbas turns out, in fact, to be the man who sent them. He turns out further to be neither a freelancer, nor a PLO renegade, nor head of a PLO "offshoot," as the chronically apologetic Western press speculated for as long as it could. He is a top Arafat aide, a loyalist whom Arafat himself placed on the PLO's highest body, its 11-man executive committee.

Why did Italy let him go? Incomprehensible, said the White House. Ever mindful of alliance sensibilities, the administration was being kind. It is entirely comprehensible.

The first consideration is fear. After a 1973 PLO attack on a Pan Am airliner at Rome airport, foreign minister Guilio Andreotti (who was then prime minister) worked out a deal with the PLO: Italy agrees not to get in the way of the PLO, and the PLO finds non-Italian targets for its terror. In case Andreotti had forgotten the arrangement, Arafat reminded him last week, warning Italy of "uncontrollable reactions" if it did not release Abbas.

A more grandiose but no less cynical consideration is Italy's diplomatic *amour-propre*. A pro-PLO policy to win the favor of the Arab states is the cornerstone of Andreotti's Medpolitik. This policy not only guarantees Italy access to oil but allows one of the weakest of the former imperial powers to puff itself up as the most influential European power in the Mediterranean. It ain't Abyssinia, but it's something. That this "power" is gained purely by appeasement—for example, acquiescing to Arab demands for releasing a criminal whom Italy was treaty-bound to the United States to hold for at least 45 days—is an inconvenient but apparently not insupportable detail.

Above all, releasing Abbas was for Andreotti and prime minister Craxi a kind of cognitive necessity. Their entire Middle East policy is built on the assumption that the PLO has turned moderate. Abbas—and his association with Arafat, sure to come out at any trial—is its refutation. Theory and fact collided aboard the Achille Lauro. Italy, not for the first time, chose theory.

The facts, after all, are intolerable. Abbas' group issued a communique in Cyprus explaining that its men had really planned to land at "Ashdod harbor in occupied Palestine" to attack "military targets." Now, Ashdod is not on the West Bank or Gaza. It is within pre-1967 Israel, the Israel that Andreotti & Co. insist the PLO is ready to accept. If Ashdod is "occupied," then all of Israel is occupied. So much for recognizing Israel's right to exist.

As for "military targets," Israelis are painfully familiar with Abbas' targets. In its most successful raid, Abbas' group kidnapped a family in Nahariya, shot the father and dashed the head of his 5-year-old daughter against a rock. The man who did this was at the top of the list of 50 "fighters" the Achille Lauro hijackers demanded released from Israeli jails.

As if to confirm the point, on the very day the U.S. Navy intercepted the hijackers' getaway plane, a booby-trapped soft drink bottle exploded in a cafe in Tel Aviv. The owner was slightly wounded. In Tunis the PLO took credit for the blast, in which, it said, "many Israeli security agents were injured." Every cafe owner, a security agent. So much of renouncing terror.

On the Achille Lauro, one man was murdered. The defense of the man who sent the killers—when not absurdly denying the fact of the murder—is that he intended instead the killing of other innocents. That is a kind of defense, a PLO defense.

What is Italy's?

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today, at the request of the administration, legislation that is intended to solve problems created by the Bankruptcy Code. This bill, which was prepared by the Department of Commerce, will complement similar legislation prepared by the Department of Transportation.

The legislation would add a new section to chapter 13 of the Bankruptcy Reform Act of 1978 (Public Law 95-598) to permit the Secretary of Commerce to foreclose on mortgages of small fishing vessels and fishery facilities financed under the Loan Guarantee Program of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Title XI authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to guarantee obligations in the private market for financing or refinancing the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of domestic fishing vessels and fish processing facilities. The Secretary of Transportation has similar authority for other U.S.-flag commercial vessels.

Prior to enactment of the Bankruptcy Code, the Secretaries of Commerce and Transportation could foreclose on vessel mortgages of debtor shipowners who filed for bankruptcy if such foreclosures were deemed to be in the best interest of the United States. The Bankruptcy Code eliminated the authority of the Secretaries to foreclose on the mortgages in a timely manner while the vessel owners are before the Bankruptcy Court. Although section 1110 of the Bankruptcy Code partially exempts a limited class of parties with security interests in common carrier aircraft and certain inland and domestic vessels from the automatic stay provision (11 U.S.C. 362), the exemption does not extend to the secured interests of the Secretaries under the title XI Loan Guarantee Program.

The administration, through the Department of Transportation, has proposed legislation to restore some of the protection accorded the Secretaries in the administration of the Title XI Program prior to enactment of the Bankruptcy Code. That bill, which I have also introduced today, would amend chapter 11 to extend partial immunity from the automatic stay to creditors with preferred ship and fishery facilities mortgages.

The proposed amendment to chapter 11 would provide protection for the Government's interests only in cases of business reorganization covered by that chapter. It would not solve an additional problem unique to the fisheries Title XI Program regarding bankruptcy cases filed under chapter 13.

The primary purpose of chapter 13 is to allow individuals to develop a plan for repayment of their debts over an extended period of time. Sole proprietorships and so-called mom and pop businesses are eligible for the protections of chapter 13, including the automatic stay provision, if their noncontingent, liquidated, unsecured debts are less than $100,000 and their noncontingent, liquidated, secured debts are less than $350,000.

The vessel ownership under the Department of Transportation program are not eligible for chapter 13 filings because their levels of secured and unsecured debts are too high; however, many Department of Commerce fishing vessel ownerships and fishery facility ownerships are eligible for chapter 13. For example, almost every fishing vessel in the Gulf of Mexico and the southeastern shrimp fleet, as well as portions of other fishing fleets, would qualify for chapter 13 coverage, and many of the vessels are owned by individuals. The shrimp fleet is heavily financed by Department of Commerce title XI guarantees. If chapter 11 were amended to allow the Secretary to foreclose on ship and fishery facility mortgages, owners who are eligible for chapter 13 filings could avoid repossessions under chapter 11 by filing for bankruptcy under chapter 13.

The legislative changes to chapter 13 and to chapter 11 are necessary to protect the interests of the Federal Government specifically in the administration of the title XI.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN E. GROTBERG

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. GROTBERG. Mr. Speaker, due to a commitment in my district, I was not present and voting when the House agreed to the Michel motion to instruct House conferees on House Joint Resolution 372, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt. The instructions called for the conferees to promptly report amendments to the Budget Control and Impoundment Act which provide mechanisms for deficit reductions, including specific and mandatory budget goals for achieving a balanced budget by fiscal year 1991. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the motion to instruct.

THE HIGH COST OF EDUCATION

HON. PAT SWINDALL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. SWINDALL. Mr. Speaker, autumn is a season which brings several time-honored occurrences to mind such as football games and falling leaves. Yet for many people with school-age children, fall signals the return of a steadily increasing financial burden—the cost of education.

The annual average cost of sending one child to college in the 1984-85 academic

year was $4,881 for public schools and $9,022 for private institutes. As for private elementary and secondary schools, the average cost of tuition last year was $1,029.

Few citizens make enough money to afford such high costs, and because of our current tax policy, it is extremely difficult for parents to plan ahead to save money for their child's education. Over the years the Federal Government has extended a helping hand to students, particularly college students, by establishing several student aid programs. However, this student aid has cost the Federal Government a staggering $12 billion in 1984 alone, and still not all students who sought this aid qualified.

Where should we turn to find a solution? Some suggest that we turn to the Government and expand our Federal aid program. Yet, with the 1985 Federal deficit looming at over $200 billion, increasing Federal aid hardly seems a viable solution.

Because of my commitment to making quality education available to our future generations and because I believe families ought to bear the primary responsibility for educating our Nation's young people, I am today introducing legislation to help American families plan for their children's education.

My legislation will create a method whereby individuals may set aside money in a nontaxable savings account to be used for any child's future education. Similar to an individual retirement account, an individual education account allows tax deductions for money set aside in a savings account for a child's future education. This legislation will provide all Americans, including those in middle and lower income families an incentive to save for their children's education and, at the same time, will encourage a real increase in savings for economic growth.

According to the provisions of my individual education account bill, relatives, friends, neighbors or any interested individual can contribute up to $3,000 annually to be used for elementary, secondary, or postsecondary education expenses.

One of the most appealing aspects of the individual education account which I am proposing is that it is equally beneficial to families who have children in public and private schools.

Passage of this legislation would not only give Americans the freedom to educate their children as they see fit, but would grant them that right without further burdening the Federal budget.

CONGRESSIONAL SALUTE TO HON. JOHN A. GIRGENTI OF NEW JERSEY—1985 MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 19, residents of the city of Paterson, my congressional district and State of New Jersey will join with the congregation of St. Gerard R.C. Church in testimony to an outstanding community leader, distinguished citizen, and good friend, Hon. John A. Girgenti of Paterson, NJ, whose standards of excellence throughout his lifetime have earned him the highly prestigious citation of merit award of St. Gerard's parish—the Man of the Year. I know that you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our warmest greetings and felicitations to him and his good wife Rose upon this milestone of achievement in their family endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, there is much that can be said of John Girgenti and his most dynamic and active leadership in public affairs. Since his election in 1978 to the New Jersey State General Assembly he has been reelected to each succeeding term to the present and has served the people of our State of New Jersey with distinction as a full-time legislator.

Assemblyman Girgenti received his B.A. degree cum laude in political science at Seton Hall University in 1969 and attained his M.A. degree in government and political science, specializing in public administration, at St. John's University, Jamaica, NY in 1972. From 1973 to 1977 he served as legislative aid to New Jersey State Assemblyman Vincent "Ozie" Pellecchia, was commissioner of the Hawthorne Board of Education (1973–76) and by unanimous vote of the board served as vice president of the Hawthorne Board of Education for 2 consecutive years (1974–76).

As a member of the New Jersey State Legislature, he served on the following legislative committees: municipal government (chairman 1982 to present), county government (vice chairman 1980–82), commerce, industry, and professions, penal study, and blue laws study (chairman 1978–80).

Mr. Speaker, the quality of leadership and sincerity of purpose that John Girgenti has imparted to our people in government, political and civil affairs are mirrored in his many accomplishments and the warmth of his friendship that have won him the confidence and support of all of us who have the good fortune to know him. He is a major bulwark of strength in the Democratic Party. He was President of the passaic County Young Democrats (1973–78); president, State Young Democrats (1975); executive committee member, Passaic County Regular Democratic Organization (1975 to present); first president and charter member of the Hawthorne Democratic Unit (1975–79) and Hawthorne District Borough Leader (1976 to present).

John has been a staunch supporter and active participant in many civic and community improvement programs and we applaud his leadership endeavors in the vanguard of service to people's needs. He was a member of the board of directors of Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Passaic and Bergen Counties (1980–83); chairman, "Friends of Scouting Campaign," North Valley District, Passaic Valley Council, Boy Scouts of America (1981 and 1983); member, Great Falls Development Corp., Paterson (1979 to present); member, Paterson Elks, B.P.O.E. No. 6 (1979 to present); member, Paterson Boy's Club Board of Directors (1978 to present), Hawthorne Columbus Circle (1978 to present), Italian Circle of Patterson (1977 to present), Passaic County Mental Health Board (1976–77), Hawthorne Lions Club (1975 to present), Passaic County Manpower Advisory Board (1975–77); and Hawthorne municipal chairman, National Cancer Crusade (1973).

Prior to his election to the New Jersey General Assembly, John Girgenti was employed as director of mental health for the County of Passaic (1977–78); director of public relations and development, Straight and Narrow, Inc. of Patterson (1975–77) and financial aid counselor, Passaic County Community College, Paterson (1974–75).

Mr. Speaker, John has received many citations of merit and honor for his many charitable and rewarding contributions to the quality of life and way of life for all of our people. He was honored by the New Jersey Jaycees in 1982 as one of Ten Outstanding Young Citizens and in 1978 as Outstanding Young Man of America. In 1978 he was selected as Man of the Year by the Charles Alfano Association of Paterson, NJ.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed appropriate that we reflect on the deeds and achievements of our people who have contributed to the quality of life here in America. As we gather together on October 19 in tribute to John's leadership endeavors and personal commitment dedicated to service to people, we do indeed salute a great American—The Honorable John A Girgenti of New Jersey—1985 St. Gerard R.C. Church's Man of the Year.

CLEARWATER JAZZ HOLIDAY

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, if music can be considered a "salve for the soul" then Clearwater, FL, will be providing a cool and refreshing retreat for thousands of people this weekend. From October 17 until October 20, Clearwater celebrates its sixth annual "Clearwater Jazz Holiday" and will feature jazz performers known around the world.

What makes the "Jazz Holiday" so very special is that the entire event, considered one of the best in the country, is run totally through volunteer efforts. The Greater Clearwater Chamber of Commerce is the overall sponsor with a special task force providing the muscle that will net countless toes to tapping.

This year that task force includes: Bob Booth of Smith Barney & Co., Linda Burger of Merrill Lynch Realty, Steve Carlisle of Carlisle Lincoln Mercury, Valerie Clay of Creative Graphics International, Lynn Fuller of the chamber of commerce, Commissioner Rita Garvey of Clearwater,

Marge Hofacre of Jazz Publications, Nancy Kaylor of Pioneer Savings Bank, Mark Lapham of the Aegean Sands Motel, Bonnie Prinse of Bell & Associates, Frank Spena of the St. Petersburg Junior College, Mary Vaughn of the First National Bank of Clearwater, and Donna Yarbrough of Delta Airlines. The task force is being chaired for the second year in a row by Cozee Smith of Barnett Bank. Together, these people create an event so full of enthusiasm that everyone catches the excitement of "Jazz Holiday."

In addition to the Clearwater Chamber of Commerce other businesses making an investment in their community through sponsorship of the "Jazz Holiday" include: Barnett Bank of Pinellas, Carlisle Lincoln Mercury, city of Clearwater, Eckerd Drugs, Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Merrill Lynch Realty/Florida Inc., Pioneer Savings Bank, St. Petersburg Times, Surfside Holiday Inn, and WRBQ-AM/FM Q105 radio.

I would like to commend the chamber of commerce task force and the business sponsors of the "Jazz Holiday." It is through their commitment to their community that thousands of individuals will be able to enjoy 4 days of wonderful music along a beautiful bayfront park of downtown Clearwater.

Mr. Speaker, let Clearwater, FL, and her citizens be an example to all of us. For a community in celebration of itself is, indeed, the sweetest melody an Amercian could ever hear.

THE ROBOTS ARE COMING

HON. SHERWOOD L. BOEHLERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, I was pleased to have the House Science, Research and Technology Subcommittee hold a hearing in my upstate New York district on robotics.

Chairman WALGREN and I heard a great deal of interesting testimony, which summarized both the promise and the challenge posed by the growth of robotics.

I am placing in the RECORD an editorial from the Utica Observer-Dispatch of October 9 which faithfully reviews some of the testimony we heard and underscores the issues we face as robotics develops.

I believe the Federal Government must continue to play a leading role in robotics research and must develop new retraining programs to help workers that robots may displace. The individual training account [ITA] bill—H.R. 26—introduced by Congressman DURBIN and I, is one such effort to help dislocated workers.

I hope my colleagues will pay attention to the points made by the Utica paper:

[From the Utica (NY) Observer-Dispatch, Oct. 9, 1985]

THE ROBOTS ARE COMING, THE ROBOTS ARE COMING!

Lots of science fiction movies have been made about robots taking over the world. Man is portrayed as being at the mercy of machines with superhuman intelligence.

That's not going to happen. The most sophisticated of computer-driven machines are no match for the human brain.

Some robots can do some tasks better and faster than man, but the machines only can do what scientists program them to do. Man is still master and always will be. Which is not to say that man has nothing to fear from robots.

The increasing use of robotic machinery in the workplace is a threat to human jobs. That was one of the main concerns discussed at a meeting of the U.S. House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology at the SUNY College of Technology this week.

The session was organized by Rep. Sherwood Boehlert, R-25, the ranking minority member of the committee. One of the reasons he scheduled the committee. One of the reasons he scheduled the meeting here is that robotics research is very much a part of SUNY Tech's curriculum.

It was a valuable session. Based on the views of several experts who testified at the hearing, it is clear that America and its workers must adapt to the new robotics technology.

There will be difficulties. Some people will lose their jobs, but many new jobs will be created. People who lose their places on the assembly line will have to learn new jobs building, installing, repairing and running high-tech equipment. Companies and workers must learn to cope with changes that are inevitable.

The inevitability is dictated by the marketplace. The plain fact is that machines can do many jobs more effectively and cheaply than human workers. All of the speakers at the hearing agreed that U.S. industry must turn increasingly to robots, computer technology and automation if it is to remain competitive with foreign markets.

George Peace of Robotics International, a research organization, said that U.S. domestic sales of robots are about 5,000 units annually, while Boehlert pointed out that Japan has more than 100,000 operational factory robots.

Peace predicted that robots would replace 4.3 percent of this country's workforce by 1995—and as many as 20 percent of the workers in some industries. But Peace also said that the manufacture of robots will create new jobs.

The importance of hearings such as the one at SUNY Tech is to make the public aware of these changes and to encourage national debate on problems related to the emerging new technology.

Peter Cayan, president of SUNY Tech, put the issue in perspective when he said that increased automation will mean "a painful adjustment for some workers and different opportunities requiring different skills for others." But he said it also could mean "more challenging jobs, better products and an enhanced quality of life."

The immediate problem is that of job displacement, which Cayan called one of the most serious issues facing the robotics industry. "Increasing use of robots in the next decade will vastly improve the efficiency of American industry, but it could also displace, at least temporarily, hundreds of thousands of workers," Cayan said.

This transition in the workplace may sound frightening, but in the long run American industry will be the better for it. If U.S. firms do not pursue automation aggressively, they may be swept aside by foreign competitors who do.

The robots are coming. America must be prepared to meet the challenge. Government and industry should do all they can to ease the transition for human workers. Retraining programs must be set up to prevent wholesale layoffs. Robots don't have to eat; humans do.

PORN ROCK AND THE PMRC

HON. JOSEPH J. DioGUARDI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. DIOGUARDI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following remarks as food for thought:

[From Radio 85 Conference, Dallas, TX, Sept. 12, 1985]

PORN ROCK AND THE PMRC

"WITHOUT THE BANNER—THE PARADE WILL GO ON"

(Remarks of William O'Shaughnessy, President, WVOX and WRTN, Westchester, Director, National Association of Broadcasters)

This is a great and good profession, as Ward Quaal refers to it.

I believe, as my Westchester neighbor Julian Goodman (a former chairman of NBC) once observed, that we broadcasters have an "awesome trust." It is a lovely and graceful phrase.

And so here we are again at this high council in Dallas—churning and struggling with this difficult problem—and trying, as is our custom, to do what Mario Cuomo, the gifted Governor of my state would call: "the right thing".

We've come a long way since Mitch Miller telephoned Oscar Brand, the brilliant folk singer who wrote "A Guy is a Guy" for Doris Day. Mitch Miller told Brand it was a great song—"But", said Mitch Miller, "they have to get married at the end." And so Oscar Brand was made to add the memorable line: "So I walked down the aisle—like a good girl should!"

First, for my part, I want to thank you Eddie Fritts for having the foresight, and perhaps even some courage, to put this on our agenda and before us. The keen interest of Martha Dale Fritts, the First Lady of our profession, also commends this to our attention. It will even be discussed next week in the Halls of Congress. So it is timely that we treat with this. Here and now.

I want to acknowledge as well my respect and admiration for Mrs. Tipper Gore. And Susan Baker—and Pam Howar—and Sally Nevius. Instead of Buzzing around Washington in an endless round of polite teas and receptions as the wives of powerful senators, or the Secretary of the Treasury, they have decided to climb into the arena and do battle for something in which they deeply believe—the environment in which their children will be raised.

As I have acknowledged, we struggle and we churn about this and we worry with the Parents Music Resource Committee—and we are mindful, most of us, of that prophecy of John Kennedy: "When the dust of centuries has fallen over our cities—we will be remembered not for the battles we have won—and we would add, not for the numbers or rating points we have achieved or the advertising sales we have made—but

rather for our contributions to the human spirit."

We broadcasters are permittees and trustees and we have a fiduciary relationship to the airwaves which rightly and properly belong to the people of this country. Many, perhaps even most, of us believe that a radio station achieves its highest calling when it resembles a platform, a soapbox for the expression of many different viewpoints.

We speak out on controversial issues and try to provide leadership in our community. The First Amendment is very important, almost sacred, to us. We will fight anyone who would dare to stifle one of our newscasts or editorial pronouncements. I'm not sure that the popular songs of our day might not deserve the same sensitivity and protection and consideration as our own pronouncements. No matter how gross, no matter how clumsy, no matter how outrageous.

My son Matthew Thayer O'Shaughnessy, in whom I am so well pleased—most of the time—has his very own program on one of our stations and I should tell you, in the intimacy of this room, that he plays a lot of that drodsome heavy metal stuff Mrs. Gore has mentioned here today, in all too graphic detail.

A song is like an eyewitness report. The writers of those songs write of the daily life in America . . . the daily passions of our countrymen, the milieu in which they live. They write in the vernacular and with the currency of the day.

In any society there is a fine line of taste which constantly changes. The populace redraws it every season. And we can't stop it. People have been making songs to reflect their environment since the beginning of time. The first music was probably a repeated note similar to the insistent rhythm of an Indian tom-tom. (And incidentally, the American Indian has a marvelous trove of baudy songs.)

I make a living playing the songs of Fred Astaire—and Mabel Mercer—and Bobby Short. I don't even understand most of the songs on today's hit parade. But I'm persuaded they deserve respect and sensitivity from us.

The immortal Cole Porter was a genius at detecting shifts in social behavior and standards. What would Cole Porter write today? Would he write of the chic, sophisticated world of high society which has expired and no longer exists? Would he write for the approval and edification of his classmates at Yale?

There are lovely songs being written by Murray Grand and Dave Frishberg and Rupert Holmes and Sondheim. But they are heard only on the lips of lonely and often obscure saloon and cabaret singers, the minstrels of the night.

Puritan America would not let us use the word "hell" on radio for many years. Indeed, and somewhat ironically, the word "virgin" was considered unacceptable for a good, long time. But to assume that popular songs could be apart from the vernacular itself is a mistake.

What is the difference between a suggestive lyric and a dirty lyric? What is the difference between prurient and risque? I'm afraid that the scraggly haired, unshaven songwriter of gross, clumsy, prurient—even vulgar—lyrics has to be treated with the same protection and sensitivity we now give, in retrospect and with great affection, to Cole Porter or Johnny Mercer or Johnny Burke.

Today's songwriter and record producer and artist have been accused of "doing it for money". And yet Cole Porter, we know, considered his songs as "goods, merchandise". And as the introduction to that stunning collection of his lyrics which was published last year pointed out "The primary aim of popular music's songwriters and publishers then (in the pristine 20's) was unabashedly commercial."

Few people then, including the creators of songs, thought of songwriting as one of the higher arts. Just as today, the great, classic American songs, the playing of which on WRTN provides me with a handsome income, began as "product"—meant to become as automatically obsolescent as last year's fashions. It's too easy and perhaps risky to say that the music of today will never emerge as enduring work.

Are the songs of Cyndi Lauper or Venom or Def Leppard or Prince any worse than those of some of the ikons of the musical stage? Listen again to Noel Coward's "Mrs. Worthington—Don't Let Your Daughter Go On The Stage." Listen again to the great Cole Porter: "Some get a kick from cocaine . . ." and listen to the orgasmic suggestion and pulsating rhythm as the airplane goes higher and higher. Or the girl in "Kiss Me Kate" who is "Always true to you darling, in my fashion." Or "Love For Sale." Or "Let's Do It." And that lovely song: "Bewitched, Bothered and Bewildered." "He's a joke, but I love him . . . because the jokes on me."

The so-called great songwriters wrote of sugar daddies . . . and mistresses with such anthems as "My Heart Belongs to Daddy." Listen carefully to that classic Abe Burrows' song, "Adelaide's Lament" from "Guys and Dolls" and Frank Loesser's lyrics about the travails of a single girl getting "a kind of a name for herself." Or Eddie Cantor's "Making Whoopee." Making whoopie was doing "you know what" in the vernacular of the day. Scandalous and shocking indeed. "What they do for . . . is all for . . . making whoopee!" "They had a child . . . where did it come from? . . . making whoopee!"

It was probably Voltaire who said nobody was ever raped by a book. At least it sounds like Voltaire.

I come from a place in the east where once lived an obscure printer called Zenger. John Peter Zenger. He risked all to be able to rage against the despotic governor. He chose to do this with his pen and with a printing press. But what of the songwriter—the bard—the poet—the minstrel of the day who talks of his demons and the things which oppress him—whether that song is a polemic, a political statement, or just a lonely cry for understanding?

A Justice of the United States Supreme Court wrote pornography. Look up "Humoresque": "Passengers will Please Refrain from Flushing Toilets While the Train is in the Station."

"We go strolling through the park, goosing statues in the dark. If Sherman's horse can take it, why can't you?"

His Honor, Mr. Justice William O. Douglas wrote that!

Rudyard Kipling wrote: "The Bastard King of England" and a somewhat lesser known work: "The Great Farting Contest."

We're talking about lyrics and words.

William Shakespeare, the Bard of Stratford-on-Avon called someone "a hoarsome-bitch" and his character Flewellyn in "Falstaff" made great jokes about urinating.

Benjamin Franklin wrote songs that would shock some of those senators who will consider this subject next week.

And so did Ogden Nash.

And "The Ballad of the Joking Jesus" was not written by Michael Jackson. Or Prince. The writer was James Joyce.

Nothing "encourages" people to sin or change history. Not an anthem like "La Marseillaise" or "Lili Burero" which is often incorrectly accused of encouraging the British to destroy the Irish. Damn them!

Songs are signs . . . banners: They do not make history.

In Elizabethan times the language was much broader. The vernacular included words we would not accept in daily usage or in the media. Restricting language is only possible in a totalitarian atmosphere.

It was possible in Germany. It is possible in Bulgaria. It is possible today in Cuba. It is possible where one mode of communication predominates. You can't sing an off-color song in Bulgaria. And yet, absent these songs, they have drunkedness—and adultery—and masturbation. And suicide.

But not on the radio.

Mrs. Gore and her colleagues, about whom I have already expressed my considerable admiration, want the atmosphere and the milieu of their homes to prevail in society at large. They are of good heart and motive. We all want our ideas to predominate . . . to be the ideas of the marketplace.

But that wonderful, warm, stable, secure atmosphere in the Gore home—or the Baker home—or the Fritts home—is not the same as the atmosphere or milieu which confronts a ghetto kid in Harlem—or the farm boy in Bismarck—or a beach boy in Berkeley—or even an oil rig worker in Houston or Dallas.

It is all different.

So perhaps there is a larger question here than an X rating for a specific song.

Perhaps we're considering what the editor Don West calls the more "cosmic" issue: Who owns America?

And: Is it possible to restrict language in a democratic world?

The Parents Music Resource Center wants a world which is: uncomplicated; without pain for their children; not obscene; and not profane.

But, the hard truth is that their children, our children, in their private lives, are meeting the very influences we are trying to restrict. Indeed, if you've ever debriefed a child on returning from summer camp . . . you will realize that children make up their own songs which are a lot worse than those on the radio!

I'm afraid we have a great fear of what we already know.

Those who fight pornography know the meanings of the words. They have used and lived them. But nothing had happened to them. They are upstanding and respectable. Because nothing takes the place of an honest home.

We are concerned about children, our most precious resource. They are of us. They are ours. But the only thing we can hope for is that what we give them at home will prevail and carry them through life. If parents give our children the right kind of vehicle those kids will float on any kind of debris. The censors and the blue noses can't, however, get rid of the debris.

It's always been there. It's part of the landscape. It's called life.

A song is a banner.

But without the banner, the parade will go on.

John Updike writes that "Popular composers from generation to generation, if

they do not teach us how to love, do lend our romances a certain accent and give our courting rites and their milieu . . . a tribal background, a background of communal experience."

I'm afraid we parents have just simply got to hold on . . . until that happy day when our youngster walks in to say, as he will: "You know, Mom . . . that Frank Sinatra really knows how to sing!" Or, "Dad . . . that fellow Fred Astaire . . . what's the story on him?" But even that great occasion should be observed with a bit of caution and perhaps some skepticism. The fear, of course, is that as sophistication sets in—like rigor mortis—there is always, in society, a tendency to restrict the language.

It was not too long ago in this nation that Richard Nixon established a "Presidential Commission on Pornography." And when the report came back with the finding that pornography was an outlet for passions which might have been expressed in violence, the story is told that the President used some unprintable and very bad words indeed. We survived Richard Nixon's colorful language. And we will survive porn rock.

I do indeed believe there is such a thing as evil in the world. And my remarks should not be interpreted as a denial of its existence. I also believe we should resist evil . . . on whatever battlefield or with whatever franchise is provided us. But first in our personal lives and in our own families.

And then as we go forth to do battle in society at large, we should do it with a careful, generous attitude and with a loving heart—armed always with the knowledge that we could be wrong sometimes. We could make some mistakes along the way.

We could—strike at us. Or, at our own children. In this, as in everything else, actions speak louder than words. Or songs.

And now finally . . . as that good man Senator Mac Mathias of Maryland said on C-SPAN this week about one of the other great issues of the day: "I have thought a lot about this . . . and I acknowledge the possibility that I could be wrong."

I could be wrong.

WORLD FOOD DAY

HON. COOPER EVANS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. EVANS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, with today designated as World Food Day, I thought it would be appropriate to bring to the attention of my colleagues the work being done by the Food and Agriculture Organization in the area of consumer protection and food standards in the world marketplace.

In conjunction with the World Health Organization, the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization continues to work on a vitally important aspect of its charter to secure internationally negotiated agreements on food standards and other recommendations to facilitate fair trade in food products and to protect consumers against food health hazards and fraud. Both the Government of the United States and the country's food industry have been continuing and strong supporters of this effort.

A joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Program was initiated in 1962. Its principal organ, established in 1963, is the Codex Alimentarius Commission, which now has 129 member countries.

The importance of agriculture to the U.S. economy and the importance of food trade to U.S. agriculture are too well documented to need embellishing: one out of every three American farm acres produces for export, earning more than $38 billion in 1984. USDA estimates that these exports provide more than one million jobs in food production, transport, and processing, even without calculating purchases of goods and services along the food chain from tractors to insurance.

Food trade involves highly complex interrelationships of production, prices, marketing, transport, and national policies. But underpinning these basic economic and political factors is an equally complex world of national laws and regulations, and international agreements, in such areas as food hygiene, use of food additives, methods of processing, weights and measures, permissible levels of pesticide residues, labeling of manufactured products, methods of analysis and sampling—and the possible use of any of these as intentional or unintentional nontariff barriers to trade. Harmonization of national regulations in these areas is the work of the FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission.

The United States, as the world's largest food exporter and food importer, has a vital interest in both the consumer protection and trade aspects of Codex, and has been one of the most influential national contributors to this work owing to its expertise and the size of its market. This U.S. interest has also fostered a unique and valuable partnership between Federal agencies and the private food sector, which has proved to be of great benefit to both and to the world as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a description and explanation of the Codex Alimentarius System which has been supplied by the FAO:

THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS SYSTEM

The Codex Alimentarius Commission has created 29 committees and also uses the findings of two FAO/WHO expert groups to carry out its work. Five Codex committees deal with general policy and coordination, seven with subject matters relevant to all commodity groups, and 17 with specific groups of food. In addition there are the Joint FAO/Who Expert Committee on Food Additives and the Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues. The Commission also receives the findings of the joint FAO/IAEA/WHO Committee on Food Irradiation.

All of the general subject committees and most of the commodity committees are chaired and hosted by member governments, which work closely with the Codex secretariat, located at FAO headquarters in Rome. Committee activities are funded by the host countries, and governments actively seek the host function.

As of the last meeting of the Codex Alimentarius Commission in July of this year, actions taken included: 170 product standards, with at least 10 more under development; 22 codes of hygienic and/or technical practices; maximum limits for pesticide residue for 138 pesticides covering more than 3,000 potential pesticide/plant and animal combinations; and 54 methods of sampling and analysis.

At its July meeting, the Codex Alimentarius Commission created a new Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs. This new committee will be hosted—and its chairman chosen—by the United States. Owing to the importance of its meat, poultry and animal feed exports, the United States had actively sought the right to host this committee. Three other committees are hosted by the United States—the Committee on Food Hygiene, the Committee on Processed Fruits and Vegetables, and the Committee on Cereals and Cereal Products, Pulses and Legumes. Two other committees—the Committee on Food Labeling and the Committee on Vegetable Proteins—are hosted by Canada, with the United States has close working relationships.

WHY THE U.S. GOVERNMENT VALUES CODEX

Internally, the United States sets mandatory standards for many processed foods and voluntary grading standards for many more fresh and processed foods. These U.S. standards and regulations are designed and monitored by USDA and FDA. Along similar lines, the Codex Alimentarius Commission recommends international standards, although these are in no way mandatory. Because the United States looms so large in international food trade, both as exporter and importer, this country has an obvious interest in harmonization of national and world regulations. Codex provides an impartial, international forum in which scientific and technological expertise are used to prepare recommendation for use by governments. One point cannot be overemphasized: the United States—more than any other country—has a vital interest in sensible and safe food processing and manufacturing systems and sound food law regulations, with the highest possible degree of harmonization among all its trading partners. Codex provides the vehicle for achieving this goal.

The first chairman of the Codex Alimentarius Commission was an American, as is the current chairman. U.S. delegations, nearly always combing government officials with private food industry representation, attend virtually all Codex meetings. U.S. scientists regularly serve on FAO/WHO regular or ad hoc expert committees, in which scientific and technical information is analyzed without regard to national political interests. The United States has approved, despite its own highly complex food regulatory laws, more Codex standards, codes and practices than any other country.

U.S. governmental support for Codex was underscored in July 1983 at the 15th session of the Commission by Assistant Secretary of Agriculture C.W. McMillan:

"This meeting provides me an opportunity to reaffirm the commitment of the United States to the goals of the Codex Alimentarius Commission. We look at it as the international group with the scientific, technical and professional capability to address and solve food standards issues. In fact, the United States considers Codex the primary organization for the promotion of food safety and consumer protection internationally."

The U.S. Government has two other reasons for its support of Codex:

First, inside and outside the UN system there are a number of other bodies, both regional and international, which are studying and sometimes promulgating food safety

and food trade laws and codes which overlap and even contradict the work of Codex Alimentarius. FAO, WHO and the scientists and technicians which provide the solid grounding for Codex standards have striven successfully over many years to keep political partisanship to a minimum and to maintain scientific integrity. The U.S. Government has always strongly opposed any fragmentation of this responsibility and is eager to maintain the Codex Alimentarius Commission as the principal agency for recommending international food standards.

Second, although most of the funding for the Codex secretariat and expert committees is provided by FAO, the funding system places primary emphasis directly on governments through the committee host system. Furthermore, as pointed out by Assistant Secretary McMillan: "By adjourning committees when their work is accomplished and by maintaining a non-expanding and efficient secretariat the Codex Commission is unique. It gets maximum use of its funds and it benefits all countries."

WHY THE PRIVATE SECTOR SUPPORTS CODEX

The U.S. food industry understands fully the importance of international standards to the promotion and free flow of trade. U.S. delegations to Codex meetings, usually the largest of any country, combine representatives of Federal agencies concerned, private industries and associations, and often consumer groups. Because of their technical expertise, despite the intergovernmental nature of Codex, private sector representatives are welcomed at these sessions, and play an important role in assisting in the preparation of technically sound U.S. contributions to the standards discussions.

At a recent symposium on Codex Alimentarius work, the industry view was given by Mr. Charles Feldberg, a director of CPC International and U.S. representative to the International Federation of Grocery Manufacturers Associations:

"Codex provides a balanced forum—Its strength derives from the system it has developed which welcomes input from all interested parties: governments, industry and consumers. The Codex deliberations are open to representatives of all these groups. Full debate is encouraged so that decisions can be reached by consensus—A spirit of compromise exists, and political rhetoric and demagoguery are avoided. The decisions reached are generally balanced, technically sound and in line with the best interests of the public—The Codex system has stood the test of time and I consider it one of the best systems for international agreement."

A measure of industry interest in Codex can be taken by the make-up of the U.S. delegation to the July meeting of the Commission. Apart from 10 delegates from federal agencies it included 15 representatives from the private food sector and consumer groups. On this list were: Hershey Technical Center, Ralston Purina Co., Coca-Cola Co., Institute of Food Technologists, Dole Processed Food Co., International Minerals and Chemicals Corp., General Foods Corp., International Frozen Foods Assn., Corn Refiners Assn., the Nestle Co., McNeil Specialty Products, American Assn. of Cereal Chemists, General Mills Inc., Kraft Inc., and the Food and Drug Law Institute.

At commodity committee meetings, depending on the standard or code under review, these and dozens of other companies, trade associations, technical institutes and consumer oriented private voluntary organizations attend as official delegates or observers.

Above all, industry welcomes the complete openness of the Codex system. It is not, as is sometimes the case in other international bodies, that private industry views are "heard," but that they are welcomed and anticipated as part of the scientific and technical material on which decisions are based. In most cases, no realistic appraisal of an issue could be made without industry expertise, and this is fully understood by all governments in the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

TEN BENEFITS FROM THE CODEX SYSTEM

The bottom line in any country's decision to participate in an international organization is, at least in part, "How do we benefit?" Here are 10 kinds of benefit from participation in the Codex Alimentarius Commission which are widely recognized by the U.S. Government, the food industry and consumer protection groups:

Consumer protection from contaminants and fraudelent practices in food imports;

Uniform, internationally recommended rules and procedures for food processors and manufacturers seeking export markets;

Protection for exporters against non-tariff barriers arising from different laws and regulations in importing countries;

New foreign market opportunities stemming from the Codex commitment to equality of treatment between national and imported food products;

Simplification of trade negotiations through mutually agreed international standards and codes;

Facilitation of foreign investment for food processors and manufacturers through internationally agreed standards and processes;

Facilitation of customs procedures and diminution of shipment detentions affecting both exporters and importers;

International scientific and professional review of new products, processes and techniques, thus speeding their acceptance in international trade;

Periodic technical review of existing standards and practices in the light of new scientific findings; and

Routinized identification of national market requirements through published Codex listings of standard and code acceptance.

In these and other ways, the Codex Alimentarius Commission, created and serviced by FAO and WHO, serves all its member governments in facilitating trade and protecting the health of consumers.

THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS CONTRIBUTION TO THE MEDAL OF HONOR GROVE AT VALLEY FORGE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 16, 1985

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Bipartisan Ad Hoc Congressional Committee for Irish Affairs I wish to share with my colleagues an account of an event which occurred several months ago but is still etched firmly in the minds of those who participated. I refer to the dedication of the memorial obelisk by the Ancient Order of Hibernians in the Medal of Honor Grove at Valley Forge, PA.

The purpose of the ceremony sponsored by Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge was for the AOH to pay tribute to the estimated 150 foreign born recipients of the Medal of Honor who cannot be accredited to a state due to a lack of documentation. It is estimated that of this group 65 are Irish. These 65 join the other 254 Medal of Honor recipients born on the Emerald Isle.

The Medal of Honor is the highest distinction that can be awarded to a member of the U.S. Armed Forces. It is awarded for acts of extreme bravery or heroism. The Ancient Order of Hibernians, our Nation's oldest and largest Irish Catholic organization, and from whose ranks hail many men who fought to keep freedom in America, wanted to have this memorial obelisk added to the Medal of Honor Grove. It joins obelisks representing every State in the Union and that State's respective Medal of Honor recipients.

In 1986, the Ancient Order of Hibernians will observe their 150th anniversary. On August 24 at Valley Forge, the AOH as they have done so many times since 1836 gathered from near and far to once again pay tribute to the achievements of their fellow Irish and fellow Americans. A highlight of the ceremony was the moving address offered by the national president of the AOH, my good friend Joseph A. Roche. Joe vested with the responsibility of officially dedicating the memorial reminded us of the valor of the 65 honorees from Ireland and of the still familiar struggle for justice that their countrymen in Northern Ireland endure to this day.

The AOH Memorial, which was provided through the generosity of the distinguished former Prime Minister of the Republic of Ireland, Charles Haughey, is but another effort by the AOH to remind us of the pivotal role which Irish Americans have and continue to play in American history and society. In Valley Forge that day, prayers were offered, speeches made, pipes and drums played and they all served to reaffirm the Irish passion for freedom and liberty. This passion is what spirited the 65 men who were honored.

At this point in the record in order to be able to share more of this day with my colleagues I wish to insert the names of the 65 Medal of Honor recipients from Ireland who are commemorated by the AOH Memorial. In addition I will insert the program from that historic event a brief history of the AOH a history of the Medal of Honor Grove and National President Roche's statement that day.

MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS FROM IRELAND

1st Sgt. Richard Barrett, USA; Sgt. Major Augustus Barry, USA; Pvt. James Bell, USA; Pvt. Edward Branagan, USA; Sgt. James Brown, USA; Farrier Patrick J. Burke, USA; Pvt. Richard Burke, USA; Sgt. Denis Byrne, USA; Pvt. Thomas Carroll, USA; Pvt. George Carter, USA; Cpl. John Connor, USA; Col. Charles H. Dickens, USA; Sgt. Cornelius Donavan, USA; Pvt. Daniel Farren, USA; Sgt. James Fegan, USA; Sgt. John H. Foley, USA; Pvt. Nicholas Foran, USA; Pvt. Michael Glynn, USA; Sgt. Patrick Golden, USA; Pvt. Frank Hamilton, USA;

Pvt. Thomas P. Higgins, USA; 1st Sgt. Henry Hogan, USA.

Cpl. Daniel Keating, USA; Pvt. John Keenan, USA; Pvt. Charles Kelley, USA; 2nd Class Fireman John Kelley, USN; Pvt. Thomas Kelley, USA; Pvt. John Kennedy, USA; Pvt. Philip Kennedy, USA; Sgt. Thomas Kerrigan, USA; Farrier David Larkin, USA; Pvt. James Lenihan, USA; Col. Patrick J. Leonard, USA; Sgt. Patrick T. Leonard, USA; Sgt. George Loyd, USA; Sgt. Patrick Martin, USA; Pvt. William McCabe, USA; Pvt. Bernard McCann, USA; 1st Sgt. Michael A. McGann, USA; Col. Owen McGough, USA; Sgt. Michael McLoughlin, USA; 1st Sgt. James McNally, USA; 1st Sgt. William McNamara, USA.

Sgt. Robert McPhelan, USA; 1st Sgt. John Mitchell, USA; Col. John J. Mitchell, USA; Chief Maa Daniel Montague, USA; Pvt. John Moran, USA; 1st Sgt. James L. Morris, USA; Pvt. Edward Murphy, USA; Pvt. Jeremiah Murphy, USA; Cpl. Philip Murphy, USA; Col. Thomas Murphy, USA; Sgt. Thomas Murray, USA; Farrier Richard J. Nolan, USA; Pvt. Timothy O'Connor, USA; Pvt. Moses Orr, USA; Pvt. George C. Platt, USA; Sgt. Frederick Platten, USA; Pvt. James C. Reed, USA; 1st Sgt. Joseph Robinson, USA; 1st Sgt. David Roche, USA; Sgt. Patrick Rogan, USA; Pvt. David Ryan, USA; 1st Sgt. Dennis Ryan, USA.

HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS (AOH)

The AOH traces its origin to Ireland in the year 1565, but its roots in Irish history stretch back to the days of the Fianna, the knightly Irish order of almost 2000 years ago. In 1836 Irish immigrants in New York City and later in the coal fields of Pennsylvania received permission to form branches, called divisions, in America. By the late 1850's the organization had spread to about a dozen states and several thousand members in cities and towns where the Irish immigrant population was strong. Although the aims of the AOH included the preservation of the cultural traditions of the old world, a major effort of the order was to acclimatize the newly arrived immigrant to his American surroundings.

This merger of the old and new world produced many fine new patriots, but sometimes patriotism can demand a heavy price. On July 4, 1853, the AOH Divisions marching in New York's Independent Day parade were attacked by anti-Irish mobs. After several years the organization was able to safely participate in July 4 commemorations.

Although not a military order, a civic society like the AOH with many young men in its ranks proved a great asset to the country with the outbreak of civil war in 1861. Hibernians rushed to defend the flag in great numbers. Whole divisions such as Pittsburgh's and others in Boston entered the military en masse with other members joining as individuals across the country. A major conference of the order was held in Philadelpha in 1862 to devote its energies to the war effort. For many years thereafter the AOH ranks on St. Patrick's Day won public acclaim for the large number of G.A.R. medals (The Civil War Veterans Organizations) worn by AOH members.

In the Spanish-American War in 1898, Hibernians once again answered their country's call. The Hibernian Rifles, an AOH militia unit of the time, provided trained members to the American forces. The tradition of volunteer Hibernian units persisted down to World War I.

Today the Ancient Order of Hibernians is the nation's oldest and largest Catholic Lay organization and the only nation-wide Irish American fraternal group. It is organized from New York to Alaska and California with chapters ranging from local to national levels. It is involved in a variety of cultural, educational and philanthropic endeavors.

DEDICATING ADDRESS BY MR. JOSEPH ROCHE, NATIONAL PRESIDENT, ANCIENT ORDER OF HIBERNIANS

Distinguished guests, honorees, and fellow Hibernians, I am indeed privileged to participate in this moving tribute which will long stir my memory and, I trust, yours. There is a verse in O'Donnell ABU which was just magnificently played by the Tara Pipes & Drums of Division 15, which speaks of the Irish in their fight against English oppression as "strangers to flight and fear." This is particularly fitting because we honor today 65 Irish men who distinguished themselves in an extraordinary way in the service of their country and who were certainly strangers to flight and fear. Most of these men fought in defense of a Union which survived and endures to this day due to the bravery of honorees like James Lenihan, John Foley, and Richard Nolan. Their courage, and that of whole Irish regiments like the 116th Pennsylvania, gave new birth to a Nation without equal in its commitment to democracy and justice.

All of those whose names grace this splendid monument shared at least two things. One, in times of great danger they all displayed great courage in uncommon acts of valor. Two, they all shared in Irish heritage—A heritage which is rich with acts of bravery and defiance in the face of unbridled tyranny.

It would be impossible to distinguish their individual acts of sacrifice from all those commemorated here at Valley Forge. Nor would it be possible to differentiate the just cause for which they all risked and often lost their lives—the freedoms of our constitutional democracy and the defense of liberty both here and abroad. Why then does Ancient Order of Hibernians take this time to recognize the achievements of these men? We do so for three reasons.

First, we seek to more fully inform the American people of the contributions of those of Irish descent in shaping and making this country the great Nation it is today. Each generation yields more objective historians, and individuals of remarkable dedication like Sr. Marie, who offer new insight into the Irish peoples search for peace and justice in Ireland and America. Second, we must alert Amerians to the tyranny these men fled and to its endurance today in Ireland. Few Americans today know that the Irish declaration of independence statement that "the Irish people are by right a free people . . . and that English rule is, and always has been based upon force against the declared will of the people" is as valid today as it was in 1919. Finally, we must remind the American and Irish people who share this moment with us today that the price of their freedom and liberty is vigilance, courage, and sacrifice. Pope John Paul II in central Africa emphasized this when he exhorted his audience "to become free. Freedom is not a gift; it is earned." The anguish of Ulster requires courage and sacrifice from its leaders if it is ever to be truly free.

With these objectives in mind we hope to make this day a lasting tribute. A tribute which will convey this message to those who may not view the beauty of this Wicklow Granite or who may never experience the peace and solemnity of this grove.

It is known to many of you here assembled that the Irish legacy of these heroes is a dark one. It includes such complete and sinister subjugation that the poet Thomas Moore once described Ireland as "a land where freedom now so seldom wakes." But freedom did awake in 1798 and the forefathers of these honorees struck a blow for freedom from the shores of County Mayo to Vinegar Hill in County Wexford. The leadership of a few like Robert Emmett and Wolfe Tone gave courage to the many. Such is man's quest for freedom that it is rarely satisfied until achieved. As an author noted "freedom's battle once begun; bequeathed by bleeding sire to son, though battled oft is ever won." Thus the Irishmen we commemorate today carried this battle to America and, although often arriving as criminals, prisoners and penniless refugees, distinguished themselves in every field of endeavor. How? They were simply free to do so. A previous few would earn the gratitude of a grateful Nation by receiving its highest military award—the Congressional Medal of Honor.

It has been said that "freedom has a thousand charms to show; that slaves how 'ere contented never know." For these Irishmen freedom had more than charms to show—it had the very seeds of survival. I am confident that Patrick Leonard, David Roche and the others we remember here felt especially privileged to defend freedom for they were tasting of it for the first time in their young lives. Many of these men could celebrate their Catholic faith openly instead of in caves or in fields. They could own property instead of being owned by absentee landlords. They could vote and pursue an education all of which were not simply denied them by English law but were punishable if violated.

Let me be clear. These men were born in a bondage every bit as complete as that of the American slave. The Catholic emancipation of 1829 preceded by three short decades the emancipation of the slaves by president Lincoln. Faced then with the sorrow of emigration or death by oppression or starvation it is not surprising these men and thousands like them swelled the ranks of the Union Army. While England comforted and courted the Confederacy in yet a third attempt to crush America's spirit, the blood of these Irishmen bleached red the fields at Antietam and Fredricksburg. Thus the stage was set for this unprecedented display of gallantry and patriotism which brings us here today and which will continue to bring people to this memorial as long as truth and justice remain an American ideal.

As I gazed upon the statue of George Washington kneeling in prayer I could sense the strength of his conviction and the justice of his cause. He was kneeling not to a king but to the power of a providence that gave us all a unique value, dignity and free will. I then thought of these words of a soldier not unlike the ones remembered today.

"There is no height nor bloody might a freeman can't defy;
There is no source or foreign force (each man can know);
That his free will no thing can kill; and from that freedom grows."

Freedom will grow whenever men like the author, Bobby Sands, and our honorees are willing to lay down their lives for their fellow man. I ask of all here present that we

dedicate not only this stone but ourselves to challenging oppression wherever it reigns and to preserving truth and justice at whatever the cost.

Thank you most sincerely for your presence and your commitment to the ideals of this commemoration.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 17, 1985, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 18

9:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Energy Regulation and Conservation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on innovative approaches in industrial energy efficiency.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Conferees
On H.J. Res. 372, increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.
345 Cannon Building

OCTOBER 21

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Household Goods Transportation Act (P.L. 96-454), and the Bus Regulatory Reform Act (P.L. 97-261), and on S. 1711, to reduce federal regulation of the motor carrier industry.
SR-253

Joint Economic
To hold hearings on fiscal policy.
2118 Rayburn Building

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, Reserved Water and Resource Conservation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1558, to settle certain claims affecting the Pyramid Lake Paiute Indian Tribe of Nevada.
SD-366

OCTOBER 22

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Natural Resources Development and Production Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 570, S. 372, and S. 946, bills to improve the administration of the Federal coal leasing program, and other coal related issues.
SD-366

Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 445 and S. 1225, bills to revise certain provisions of the Atomic energy Act of 1954 regarding liability for nuclear incidents.
SD-406

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To hold hearings on espionage activities in the United States.
SD-342

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the impact of trade on employment and productivity.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on S. 1335, Money Laundering and Related Crimes Act of 1985.
SD-226

Judiciary
Security and Terrorism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on terrorism in South Africa as it affects the security of the United States.
SD-G50

2:00 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nominations of Vernon L. Grose, of California, Kenneth J. Hill, of Virginia, and John K. Lauber, of California, each to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board.
SR-253

Governmental Affairs
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review innovative State and local programs to expand student and parental choice in elementary and secondary education and on Federal policies to provide such innovation.
SD-342

Judiciary
Courts Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up S. 704, to establish an Intercircuit Panel of the United States Courts of Appeals to decide cases referred by the U.S. Supreme Court.
SD-226

OCTOBER 23

9:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nominations of Michael A. McManus, Jr., of New York, and Neal B. Freeman, of Virginia, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation (COMSAT).
SR-253

9:30 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Nuclear Regulations Subcommittee
To continue hearings on S. 445 and S. 1225, bills to revise certain provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 regarding liability for nuclear incidents.
SD-406

Judiciary
Patents, Copyrights and Trademarks Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1543, Process Patent Amendment of 1985.
SD-628

Labor and Human Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-430

Select on Intelligence
To resume closed hearings on the development of a national intelligence strategy (Phase II).
SH-219

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Judiciary
To hold hearings on the nomination of Charles J. Cooper, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General (Office of Legal Counsel), Department of Justice
SD-226

Select on Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 1684, to declare that the United States holds certain Chilocco Indian School lands in trust for the Kaw, Otoe-Missouria, Ponca, and Tonkawa Indian Tribes of Oklahoma, S. 1724, to authorize the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma to design and construct hydroelectric power facilities at W.D. Mayo Lock and Dam, and S. 1728, to authorize the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma to lease certain lands held in trust for up to ninety-nine years.
SD-562

OCTOBER 24

9:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Sea Power and Force Projection Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 535, the National Shipbuilding Industrial Base Act of 1985.
SR-232A

Veterans' Affairs
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation to provide a cost-of-living increase for fiscal year 1986 in the rates of veterans disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation for surviving spouses and children.
SR-418

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Natural Resources Development and Production Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 570, S. 372, and S. 946, bills to improve the administration of the Federal coal leasing program, and other coal related issues.
SD-366

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on ground-water level and use and on ground-water quality and flow in the United States.
SD-406

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To hold hearings on the role of the entertainment industry in deglamorizing drug use.
SD-342

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on the nominations of Sidney Lovett, of Connecticut, Richard J. Neuhaus, of New York, W. Bruce Weinrod, of the District of Columbia, John N. Moore, of Virginia, Dennis L. Bark, of California, Evron M. Kirkpatrick, of Maryland, and W. Scott Thompson, of New Hampshire, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace.
SD-430

2:00 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of Carol G. Dawson, of Virginia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.
SR-253

4:00 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
Closed briefing on worldwide intelligence matters.
SH-219

4:30 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
Closed briefing on the Philippines.
SH-219

OCTOBER 28

9:30 a.m.
Finance
Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1551, to provide for administrative appeals and judicial review under Par B of Medicare, and to review the beneficiary and provider appeals provisions under Parts A and B of the Medicare program.
SD-215

OCTOBER 29

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Motor Carrier Safety Act (P.L. 98-554).
SR-253

Labor and Human Resources
Handicapped Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the Tenth Anniversary of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142).
SD-430

Rules and Administration
Business meeting, to consider S. 581, to authorize construction of facilities for the Whipple Observatory in Arizona and to authorize repair and replacement of facilities at the Tropical Research Institute in Panama, S. 582, to authorize funds for museum programs of the Smithsonian Institution, S. 583, to authorize funds for construction of additional facilities for the Cooper-Hewitt Museum in New York, S. Res. 28, S. Res. 29, and S. Res. 81, measures to set forth regulations to implement television and radio coverage of Senate Chamber proceedings, and administrative business.
SR-301

10:00 a.m.
Armed Services
Defense Acquisition Policy Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings to review the status and impact of certain legislative provisions to reform the defense acquisition process.
SD-628

Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To hold hearings on the Federal enforcement of the Bank Secrecy Act (title 31 of the U.S. Code).
SD-342

Judiciary
Constitution Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1580, to revise federally mandated attorneys' fees applicable to civil, criminal, and administrative proceedings involving the United States and civil proceedings involving State and local governments.
SD-226

OCTOBER 30

9:30 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
To resume hearings to examine certain barriers to health care.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-366

Labor and Human Resources
Children, Family, Drugs, and Alcoholism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the effects of domestic violence.
SD-628

OCTOBER 31

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 240, to start daylight savings time on the first Sunday of March, and S. 1433, to start daylight savings time on the first Sunday of April and to end it on the first Sunday of November.
SR-253

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the impact of trade on employment and productivity.
SD-430

10:00 a.m.
Small Business
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Small Business Administration's Office of Veterans Affairs.
SR-428A

4:00 p.m.
Select on Intelligence
Closed briefing on U.S. intelligence monitoring capabilities.
SH-219

NOVEMBER 1

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Staggers Rail Act (P.L. 96-448).
SR-253

NOVEMBER 4

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Surface Transportation Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the implementation of the Staggers Rail Act (P.L. 96-448).
SR-253

NOVEMBER 5

9:30 a.m.
Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on proposed legislation to provide for public financing of Senate general election campaigns.
SR-301

NOVEMBER 6

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings on the space world administrative radio (WARC).
SR-253

10:00 a.m.
Judiciary
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee
Courts Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings on farm bankruptcy.
SD-628

NOVEMBER 7

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on insurance and space commercialization.
SR-253

NOVEMBER 8

9:15 a.m.
Finance
Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings on a Department of Health and Human Services report on proposed reform of the Federal hospital insurance program (Medicare Part A) method of paying for capital costs.
SD-215

NOVEMBER 12

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings on espionage activities in the United States.
SD-342

Labor and Human Resources
Employment and Productivity Subcommittee
To resume hearings on the impact of trade on employment and productivity.
SD-562

NOVEMBER 13

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on LANDSAT commercialization
SR-253

Labor and Human Resources
To hold hearings on nutrition and fitness in public health.
SD-430

NOVEMBER 14

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations
To resume hearings on espionage activities in the United States.
SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the President's July 8, 1985 National Defense Stockpile "modernization" proposal and its potential impact on the domestic mining industry.
SD-366

Governmental Affairs
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on regulatory activities of the Office of Management and Budget.
SD-562

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Higher Education Act.
SD-430

NOVEMBER 15

10:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
Toxic Substances and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on ground-water level and use and on ground-water quality and flow in the United States.
SD-406

NOVEMBER 18

9:15 a.m.
Finance
Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the Federal supplementary medical insurance program (Medicare Part B) payments for physician services, focusing on efforts by the Department of Health and Human Services and others to assess the current payment mechanism and develop reform options.
SD-215

NOVEMBER 19

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business, Trade, and Tourism Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the promotion of domestic tourism.
SR-253

CANCELLATIONS

OCTOBER 17

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold oversight hearings on the farm credit system.
SR-328A

OCTOBER 24

10:00 a.m.
Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts, and Humanities Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Higher Education Act.
SD-430